

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

STATEMENT OF  
GENERAL MARTIN E. DEMPSEY, USA  
CHAIRMAN  
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF  
BEFORE THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE  
FY13 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BUDGET  
JUNE 13, 2012

SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

(THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK)

Chairman Inouye, Senator Cochran, and distinguished members of the Committee, it is my privilege to update you on our Armed Forces and the President's budget proposal for fiscal year 2013. The context for this year's posture testimony is unique. Our military has transitioned many of our major operations. We have new defense guidance that sets strategic priorities. And we are facing real fiscal constraints and an increasingly competitive security environment. The President's proposed fiscal year 2013 defense budget accounts for these realities. It provides a responsible investment in our nation's current and future security.

### **Global Military Operations**

Today our Armed Forces stand strong. We are proud of the performance and accomplishments of our men and women in uniform over the past year. They have carried out far-ranging missions with much success. They have defended our homeland, deterred aggression, and kept our Nation immune from coercion. And despite a decade of continuous combat operations, our troops and their families remain resilient.

Our U.S. Forces in Iraq completed their mission in December. More than twenty years of military operations in and over Iraq came to a conclusion. The security of Iraq is now the responsibility of the Iraqi people, leaders, and security forces. We have transitioned to a normal military-to-military relationship. Diplomats and civilian advisors are the face of the United States in Baghdad. To be sure, Iraq still faces challenges to its future. But as we look to that future, we will continue to build ties across Iraq to help the people and institutions capitalize on the freedom and opportunity we helped secure.

In Afghanistan, we are seeing the benefits of the surge in combat forces begun in early 2010. The security situation is improving. The Taliban are less capable, physically and psychologically, than they were two years ago. Afghan and International Security Assistance Forces (ISAF) have wrested the initiative

and momentum from them in much of the country. The Taliban, however, remain determined and continue to threaten the population and the government. Combat will continue.

Key to long-term stability in Afghanistan is the development and sustainability of the Afghan National Security Forces (ANSF). In 2011, the Afghan National Army grew by 18 percent. The Afghan National Police grew by 20 percent. These forces, combined with the ever more capable Afghan Local Police, are steadily assuming responsibility for Afghan security. The process of transition began last July, and after nearly completing the second of five “tranches” of transition, Afghan security forces are now responsible for the day-to-day security of almost half of Afghanistan’s population.

Developing the ANSF, degrading insurgent capabilities, and turning over responsibilities have allowed us to begin a measured draw down of our forces in Afghanistan. We withdrew more than 10,000 of the surge troops and will withdraw the remaining 23,000 by the end of this summer. By that time, we expect the ANSF to achieve their initial operating capability and to be responsible for securing nearly 75 percent of the Afghan population. They are on track to meet the goal of assuming lead for security in mid-2013 and full responsibility for security throughout Afghanistan by the end of 2014.

Sustaining progress in Afghanistan requires dealing with some significant challenges. The ANSF and other national and local government institutions require further development. Corruption remains pervasive and continues to undermine the capacity and legitimacy of government at all levels. Insurgent sanctuaries in Pakistan remain largely uncontested. And ultimately, much more work remains to achieve the political solutions necessary to end the fighting in Afghanistan.

The recent NATO Summit in Chicago affirmed an international commitment to dealing with these challenges. Together, we will work to

strengthen Afghan institutions through the end of 2014. And 2015 will mark the beginning of a decade long commitment to solidify our relationship with and support to the Afghan government and people.

Our military has been vigilant and active in other areas and with other missions to keep America and our allies safe. We decimated al Qaeda and pushed this terrorist network decidedly closer to strategic defeat. We supported NATO in its UN mission to protect civilians in Libya, allowing them to end Muammar Qaddafi's tyrannical rule. We responded quickly to the devastating earthquakes and tsunami that struck Japan, saving lives and acting on our commitment to this key ally. We fended off cyber intrusions against our military's computer networks and systems. And we helped counter aggression and provocation from Iran and North Korea.

### **A Time of Transition**

While our military continues to capably and faithfully perform a wide array of missions, we are currently in the midst of several major transitions. Any one of them alone would be difficult. Taken together, all three will test our people and our leadership at every level.

First, we are transitioning from a war-time footing to a readiness footing. With the end of our operations in Iraq and Libya and the ongoing transition of security responsibilities in Afghanistan, our troops are steadily returning home. From a peak of more than 200,000 troops deployed to combat two years ago, we have fewer than 90,000 today. This shift cannot lead us to lose focus on on-going combat operations. But, it does mean we must give attention to restoring our readiness for full spectrum operations. We need to reset and refit, and in many cases replace, our war-torn equipment. We need to modernize systems intentionally passed over for periodic upgrading during the last decade. We must retrain our personnel on skills that may have atrophied. And, we will have to do all of this in the context of a security environment that

is different than the one we faced ten years ago. We cannot simply return to the old way of doing things, and we cannot ignore the lessons we have learned. As described in the Department's recently released strategic guidance, we should adjust our missions, our posture, and our organizational structure in order to adapt to ever evolving challenges and threats.

Second, our military is transitioning to an era of more constrained resources. The days of growing budgets are gone, and as an institution we must become more efficient and transparent. We must carefully and deliberately evaluate trade-offs in force structure, acquisition, and compensation. We must make the hard choices, focus on our priorities, and overcome bureaucratic and parochial tendencies. In sum, we must recommit ourselves to being judicious stewards of the Nation's resources.

Third, tens of thousands of our veterans—and their families—are facing the transition to civilian life. Many enlistments are coming to their normal conclusion, but we are also becoming a leaner force. As we do this, we must help our veterans find education opportunities, meaningful employment, and first-class health care. We must pay particular attention to those bearing the deepest wounds of war, including the unseen wounds. We must help those who have given so much cope with—and where possible, avoid—significant long-term challenges such as substance abuse, divorce, depression, domestic violence, and homelessness. We must reverse the disturbing, continuing trend of increasing suicides. Addressing these issues is not the exclusive responsibility of the Services or veterans organizations. How we respond, as a military community and as a Nation, conveys our commitment to our veterans and their families. It will also directly affect our ability to recruit and retain our Nation's best in the future.

I have outlined several priorities for the Joint Force to help us anticipate and navigate the challenges these transitions present. We will maintain focus on achieving our national objectives in our current conflicts. We will begin

creating the military of our future—the Joint Force of 2020. We will also confront what being in the Profession of Arms means in the aftermath of war. And above all else, we will keep faith with our Military Family. In doing all these things, we will provide an effective defense for the country and strengthen the military’s covenant of trust with the American people.

### **A Responsible Investment**

The President’s Fiscal Year 2013 Department of Defense base budget of \$525 billion and overseas contingency operations (OCO) budget of \$88 billion represent a responsible investment in our Nation’s security. The decisions underlying them flow from the strategic guidance the Department of Defense issued in January. This guidance set priorities for assessing our programs, force structure, and spending in the context of a persistently dangerous and increasingly competitive security environment. With those priorities in mind, the budget proposal strikes an appropriate and necessary balance between succeeding in today’s conflicts and preparing for tomorrow’s challenges. It accounts for real risks and real fiscal constraints, marrying versatility with affordability.

The tradeoffs were complex, and the choices were tough. They will produce \$259 billion in savings over the next five years and a total of \$487 billion over the next ten years. This savings does not portend a military in decline. Rather, this budget will maintain our military’s decisive edge and help sustain America’s global leadership. It will preserve our ability to protect our vital national interests and to execute our most important missions. Moreover, it will keep faith with the true source of our military’s strength—our people.

The merits of this budget should be viewed in the context of an evolving global security environment and a longer term plan for the Joint Force. Coming on the heels of a decade of war, this budget begins the process of rebalancing our force structure and our modernization efforts and aligns them

with our strategy. Essentially, we are developing today the Joint Force the Nation will need in 2020, and our plans to build this force will unfold over the course of several budget cycles. This budget is the first step—a down payment. If we fail to step off properly, our recovery will be difficult, and our ability to provide the Nation with broad and decisive military options will diminish.

It is worth addressing head-on some of the major changes we are planning. These changes must be viewed in the context of our evolving force. They represent a comprehensive package of decisions that strike a careful balance. They are not, and cannot be viewed as, individual, isolated measures. In all cases, needed capabilities are preserved or, when necessary, generated, through one or several programs.

This budget makes critical investments in our future force. Certain specialized capabilities, once on the margins, will move to the forefront. Networked special operations, cyber, and Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance will become increasingly central.

Of these, cyber represents both a potent capability and real vulnerability. The threats emanating from cyberspace have evolved faster than many could have imagined. This budget allows for us to expand many of our nascent cyber capabilities and to better protect our defense networks. Similarly, bipartisan cyber legislation under consideration in the Senate is a good first step in developing protection for our Nation's critical infrastructure. With much work to be done, we look forward to working on cyber with agencies across the government and with our allies and partners.

While some additional capabilities for our Joint Force will be needed, others will not. The budget divests some outdated ships, planes, and equipment, particularly single-function systems. Each year that we delay retiring unneeded systems adds several years of additional costs. And, it hampers our ability to achieve the desired mix of military capabilities.



Moreover, we will no longer be sized for large scale, prolonged stability operations. As a result, we expect to draw down the Army from 562,000 to 490,000 by the end of fiscal year 2017, and the Marine Corps from over 202,100 to 182,100 by the end of fiscal year 2016. Some of this reduction was planned several years ago when Congress authorized temporary end strength increases to support our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

In making ourselves leaner, we will not make the mistakes of previous draw downs. We will not retain organizational structures that lack the people, training, and equipment necessary to perform the assigned mission. We will be realistic about the organizations we keep, while also maintaining our ability to reconstitute and mobilize forces. This means retaining capacity in our reserve components and our industrial base. We will maintain the Army Reserve end-strength at 205,000 and reduce the Army National Guard by only 5,000 down to 353,200. The Marine Corps reserves will be retain their current strength.

Another major concern among our troops, their families, retirees, and with the American public is military compensation and benefits. I want to make it clear that cuts in spending will not fall on the shoulders of our troops. There are no proposed freezes or reductions in pay. There is no change to the quality of health care our active duty members and medically retired Wounded Warriors receive. But we cannot ignore some hard realities. Pay and benefits are now roughly one third of defense spending. Pay will need to grow more slowly in the future. We are also proposing a commission to review of military retirement.

To control the growth of healthcare costs, we are also recommending changes to TRICARE. These adjustments include modest, new or phased-in increases in health care fees, co-pays, and deductibles largely for our retirees—but not our active duty service members. These increases would help ensure TRICARE remains one of the finest medical benefits in the country. Each year

we delay addressing rising healthcare costs puts further strain on readiness and modernization which are critical to the health of the future force.

The result of these changes will be a Joint Force that is global and networked, that is versatile and innovative, and that is ably led and always ready. This force will be prepared to secure global access—even where it is contested—and to respond to global contingencies. We will be a military that is able to do more than one thing at a time—to win any conflict, anywhere.

Overall, these changes value both the demands of military service and our duty to be good stewards of the Nation's fiscal resources. They will sustain the recruitment, retention, and readiness of the talented personnel we need. Most importantly, they will sustain our enduring commitment to our troops and their families—we must never break faith with them. I want to note, however, that keeping faith with our service men and women is not just about pay and benefits. It is also about ensuring we remain the best trained, best equipped, and best led force in the world.

The last, and perhaps most critical issue, is risk. This budget and the strategy it supports allow us to apply decisive force simultaneously across a range of missions and activities around the globe. But like all strategies, it also accepts some risk. The primary risks lie not in what we can do, but in how much we can do and how fast we can do it. The risks are in time and capacity. We have fully considered these risks, and I believe they are acceptable. In fact, we will face greater risk if we do not change from our previous approaches. I am convinced we can properly manage this risk by ensuring we keep the force in balance, invest in new capabilities, and preserve strong reserve components.

Our ability to manage this risk would be undermined by changes to the budget that disrupt its carefully crafted balance. Sequestration would do this. It could have serious effects on our readiness and disrupt essential programs and contracts. We cannot predict precisely how bad the damage would be, but

it is clear that sequestration would reduce the military options available to the Nation.

## **Conclusion**

In the upcoming year, our Armed Forces will build on the past year's achievements, adapt to emergent challenges, seize new opportunities, and provide for our common defense. We will continue to face threats to our security, whether from aggressive states or violent non-state actors. Our Joint Force will be ready, and our response will be a source of pride for the American people. In all of our efforts, we will aim to maintain strength of character and professionalism—at the individual and institutional level—that is beyond reproach.

As we embark on this critical new course, we will need Congress' support to help us build the Joint Force the Nation needs and to strengthen our relationship with the American people. As I stated before, this budget and the choices that underlie it should be understood in the context of the comprehensive, carefully balanced, multi-year plan they support. We ask Congress to support this budget while working to avoid the deep cuts that sequestration would impose.

I thank this Committee, and the entire Congress, for all you have done to support our men and women under arms and their families. Your resolute attention to their needs and to our security has been both invaluable and greatly appreciated.