

**STATEMENT OF
PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY
RYAN HENRY**

**HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS**

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2008

Good afternoon, Chairman Snyder, Ranking Member Akin, members of the Subcommittee. I am pleased to be here today to discuss the critical issue of how we are preparing our Department and our government to meet 21st century international challenges.

Meeting those challenges in the current and future international security environment requires a variety of diplomatic, development, defense, and other tools all working in harmony. Our enemies seek to exploit weak and failing states for use as sanctuary. A stove-piped, slow U.S. Government can offer them a kind of sanctuary as well. We are working to avoid such exploitation.

Our enemies have proven effective to capitalizing on weak governments, disorder or collapse with rapid relief or coercion, thereby gaining and empowering local support for their activities. U.S. Government responses to societal disorder, on the other hand, can be relatively slow and ill-fitting to the needs. We have struggled to convert our ability to achieve military victory into successes in providing essential services, rule of law, a viable market-based economy, and effective indigenous governance.

Key to winning the Long War is the ability to adapt and respond even more rapidly and creatively than our enemies. While the national security architecture created in 1947 worked well for the Cold War, it is straining to meet today's security challenges, which blur the line between peace and war demanding a continuum of responses, involving multiple government agencies and Congressional committees.

To succeed in this environment we need the tools to rapidly develop effective indigenous governance and capabilities, calling on the most appropriate interagency, international, regional, and local partners for support. Obviously, the ability to marshal these tools and capabilities are not the purview of any one agency.

Our current government architecture (both executive and legislative) – in terms of resourcing, authorities, and derivative capabilities – must reflect the growing recognition that U.S. national security cannot rely on the use of the military instrument of power alone but requires coordinated, whole-of-government action. We are taking steps to move away from practices that encourage an over-reliance on military capabilities and continued agency stove-piping.

We need to better ensure that our national security system is adapting to provide the proper tools, processes and incentives to encourage cooperation across the government – between the Legislative and Executive Branches, and among Departments and Agencies, offices, and individuals. To realize this goal may require some bureaucratic restructuring and will require larger cultural shifts – causing us all to step away from our institutional biases and make the system work coherently on a national level. Our collective aim should be to improve our national security apparatus to be more:

- Strategy-driven, not reactive;
- Flexible, agile, and prepared;
- Coordinated to ensure unity of effort;
- Appropriately resourced; and
- Operationally-focused and rapidly deployable.

Fortunately, the President’s National Security Strategy (NSS) highlights this need to transform key national security institutions. While underscoring progress in key areas, the NSS outlines a way ahead to sustain and expand upon that achievement through a re-orientation of our foreign policy institutions and improvement in Executive Branch agencies’ abilities to plan, prepare for, coordinate, and execute integrated responses. While progress is being made, the needed reform will take time and concerted effort by a

variety of actors working together. I would like to highlight three areas in which this change is being realized and more can be done:

- 1) Capacity (People & Training)
- 2) Planning
- 3) Operating

These efforts draw from our experiences here at home, and in overseas operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and other operations, and together should help improve the U.S. government's ability to meet the national security challenges of the 21st century.

CAPACITY:

There is an old adage that when all you have is a hammer, everything looks like a nail. The U.S. military is a powerful, effective hammer. But that does not mean we can achieve our goals with only hammers and nails, with the rest of our toolbox remaining inadequately equipped and employed. Secretary Gates has spoken recently about the need to increase and improve the U.S. government's civilian capabilities and their integration with our military capabilities in order to better address current and future security challenges. That a Secretary of Defense is calling for increased resources for other agencies only highlights the need to address seriously the current situation and the urgency the Department feels regarding the state of our national security capabilities.

Limited civilian agency capacity means an expanded mission set, footprint and time on the ground for the U.S. military – at substantial cost to other national military needs. We need the capacity of our civilian agencies to be equal to the challenge at hand. The Department of Defense supports the Civilian Stabilization Initiative (CSI), a \$249M program in the State Department's FY09 budget request, which answers the President's call to improve the United States' ability to respond to instability and conflict. By funding the development of an Active, Standby, and Reserve Corps across eight civilian agencies, CSI provides the trained, equipped, and mission-ready civilian experts who can partner with U.S. Armed Forces in an integrated fashion to achieve our international strategic

objectives. To fully realize the capabilities of the Civilian Stabilization Initiative, the Department also supports passage of H.R. 1084, the Civilian Stabilization and Reconstruction Management Act of 2007.

Capacity for executing critical national security activities – at home or abroad – can also be increased across the government by providing incentives and opportunities for national security professionals to gain the experience, education, and training required to integrate the capabilities of individual U.S. Departments and Agencies to achieve common national security objectives. The Department of Defense supports and remains an active participant in the National Security Professional Development initiative launched via Executive Order last year.

PLANNING:

Increased civilian capacity should be coupled with increased effort to integrate planning on multiple levels. We cannot expect field-level activities, such as Provincial Reconstruction Teams, to be coordinated and integrated without effective structures to plan for and support them at the country, regional, and national level. DoD is a key player in the interagency development of strategic planning processes for combating terrorism, reconstruction and stabilization, and homeland security. DoD continues to support the interagency implementation process led by the National Counterterrorism Center under the direction of the 2006 National Strategy for Combating Terrorism which underscores a planning requirement not only for the military, but also for the employment of diplomatic, financial, intelligence, and law enforcement capabilities in a coordinated and integrated fashion. In accordance with National Security Presidential Directive-44 (“Management of Interagency Efforts Concerning Reconstruction and Stabilization”), DoD supports the State Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization in the development of a U.S. Government Planning Framework for Reconstruction and Stabilization which is currently undergoing testing and revision. DoD also supports the Department of Homeland Security in execution of Homeland Security Presidential Directive-8 (“National

Preparedness”) Annex I, which directs the establishment of a standard, coordinated set of plans by all levels of government to enhance our national all-hazards preparedness. Further, the Department supports many interagency planning efforts, mostly at the field-level, to proactively address specific policy objectives.

Nascent whole-of-government planning processes, however, face obstacles in the form of limited civilian agency capacity dedicated to planning and differences in agency planning cultures. In addition to developing national-level processes, past experience has proven that the quality of military plans improves with appropriate participation from other U.S. Departments and Agencies. Currently, the Department shares aspects of many of our plans with other agencies and we are working to further expand our outreach to civilian agencies during our planning process.

Additionally, we are focusing more effort in our military planning on robust steady-state military planning that aligns ongoing military security cooperation, shaping activities, and contingency operations with national security goals. This type of planning focuses on integrating the day-to-day engagement efforts of various defense organizations to shape the actions of others towards accepted behaviors, create a more stable international environment, develop partnerships to assist in addressing current and future challenges, and help win the Long War. This planning process is designed to ensure the Department applies resources across all missions, thereby preparing to respond to crises, preventing or mitigating conflict, building capacity, and developing common perspectives on security challenges.

Two recent initiatives of Congress and this Administration have fostered integrated planning at the programmatic level. They demonstrate that when resources are available and flexible, when effective interagency planning and implementation structures exist, and when there is accountability, agile responses to challenges can be achieved. Both initiatives provide resources for rapid execution of programs to seize opportunities and mitigate emerging threats. Section 1206 authority (“Global Train and Equip”) allows the Department to train and equip foreign forces to address their own security problems,

recognizing a military requirement in avoiding future military interventions and mitigating long-term risk. This authority is executed under joint “dual key” (State and Defense Department) procedures, requiring joint approval of proposals by Combatant Commanders and Embassies in the field, and both the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State in Washington D.C.. Section 1207 authority (“Security and Stabilization Assistance”) provides the U.S. Government with greater flexibility to bring the right civilian expertise from across our government to bear alongside or instead of U.S. military forces. These authorities complement foreign assistance resources for security, stabilization, and reconstruction assistance. The Department encourages Congress to support DoD’s proposed Building Global Partnerships Act to re-authorize and expand these vital authorities.

OPERATING:

The Department of Defense recognizes that strategic success in a variety of national security operations will only be possible with unified civil-military planning, deployment, and action – from the earliest time possible. Institutionalizing integrated civil-military operational structures and mechanisms will provide the final pillar to support the type of interagency cooperation that is required in the current national security environment.

The Department is engaged in the development of operational models for improved civil-military integration of planning and operations during crises through support to NSPD-44 implementation. That process aims to build upon the best practices from Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Iraq and Afghanistan to create even more effective civil-military teams for the future.

There is also a need for more integrated efforts across the range of day-to-day interactions overseas. We need to build upon long-standing successful interagency coordination mechanisms, like the Joint Interagency Task Force – South, to most effectively execute the nation’s strategic objectives. The establishment of AFRICOM and

the transformation and reorganization of SOUTHCOM herald a new way forward for interagency operations in the field. Both commands offer new approaches for restructuring the traditional Combatant Command and highlight the critical role civilian agencies play in the planning and operations of the Command. These changes should primarily improve “steady-state” security cooperation in critical countries and regions and serve to better align military activities with ongoing diplomatic and development efforts in a way that complements the responsibilities, authorities, and resources of the Chiefs of Mission. These new organizational structures integrate civilian expertise into the Combatant Command and establish integrated interagency teams with functional divisions reflecting the types of missions they are likely to be called upon to execute.

Through improved capacity and integrated planning and operations, the U.S. government will be better poised to execute the critical interagency activities required to manage evolving national security challenges. As war blends into peace and our enemies become more amorphous and adept at exploiting the seams of society and government, the line between civilian and military activities, which we previously thought to be clean, can become blurred. Defining the appropriate roles, responsibilities, capabilities, and relationships between the U.S. Armed Forces, domestic and international civilian agencies in whole-of-government operations is challenging.

In this new environment, civilian agencies, both domestic and international, must be supported in their efforts to become more operational, expeditionary, and capable of planning for contingencies. But let me also be clear that the Department of Defense needs to adapt its own capabilities. Several existing guidance documents, such as DoD Directive 3000.05 and the Quadrennial Defense Review highlight the importance of improving the capabilities of our military forces to carry out and support non-kinetic missions, and integrating them into their traditional combat missions. As we assess the proper balance of capabilities, shifts are being communicated throughout the Department through strategic-level guidance documents that will have cascading effects in

programming, resourcing, and organizational structure to ensure our military is better prepared to work with its civilian partners to achieve our national security goals.

Finally, Congressional engagement in the evolution of our national security architecture – particularly regarding required authorities and resources – is critical and I welcome this Committee’s interest and participation.