

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASED BY THE HOUSE
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

STATEMENT OF

ADMIRAL JONATHAN GREENERT

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

BEFORE THE

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

ON

THE FUTURE OF THE MILITARY SERVICES AND CONSEQUENCES

OF DEFENSE SEQUESTRATION

2 NOVEMBER 2011

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Chairman McKeon, Ranking Member Smith, and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify on the future of the military services and consequences of defense sequestration. This is my first time testifying before you as Chief of Naval Operations, and I am proud to represent more than 625,000 Sailors and Civilians serving their country in the United States Navy. It is through their courage and commitment to country that the Navy continues to be at the front line of our nation's efforts in war and peace. I look forward to working with you to ensure our Navy remains the world's preeminent maritime force - providing America offshore options to advance our national interests in an era of uncertainty. Through innovation, adaptation and judiciousness, I believe we can sustain our contribution to defense and be good stewards of our nation's resources.

As it has for more than 200 years, our Navy continues to deliver credible capability for deterrence, sea control and power projection to contain conflict and to fight and win our nation's wars. We remain forward at the maritime crossroads to protect the interconnected systems of trade, information and security that enable our nation's economic prosperity while ensuring operational access for the Joint force to the maritime domain and the littorals.

Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the Navy has been an integral part of our nation's combat, counter-terrorism and crisis response operations. Currently, Navy's aircraft carriers and air wings account for about 30 percent of the close air support for our troops on the ground in Iraq and Afghanistan, and an even larger share of the electronic support missions that ensure the safety of our troops against IED attack. Navy SEALs led a joint force to capture Osama bin Laden and also rescued the M/V ALABAMA's crew. USS FLORIDA, a guided missile submarine, and the USS SCRANTON and USS PROVIDENCE, two attack submarines, launched over 100 Tomahawk land attack missiles at military targets in Libya at the outset of

Operation ODYSSEY DAWN. Earlier this year, our aircraft carrier USS GEORGE WASHINGTON and several of our cruisers and destroyers aided the Japanese after a Tsunami decimated portions of Honshu Island. To conduct warfighting and be ready to respond to such crises, on any given day more than 40,000 sailors are at sea and about 40 percent of our ships are deployed away from home.

Over the past 10 years we stretched our ships, aircraft and people to meet the growing needs of Combatant Commanders for Navy forces with a smaller Fleet. Since 2000, the number of ships in the Fleet decreased by about 10 percent. Yet, in the last four years alone, demand for carrier strike groups doubled, and requests for amphibious ready groups grew by 70 percent. As a result, each ship is underway about 15 percent more per year than in 2000, lengthening deployments and making deployments more frequent. Because deployments now cut into the time available to conduct maintenance on ships and aircraft and to train our crews, we have to tailor the readiness of some units to only those missions they will likely be tasked to do instead of the whole (design) range of missions they might be tasked to do. Less time for maintenance decreases the service lives of our ships and aircraft and makes maintenance more expensive because it is now less efficient and more emergent. In turn, growing maintenance costs offset the funds available for procurement and modernization, making it that much more difficult to recapitalize the Fleet.

Going forward, I expect the importance of Navy forces will grow as compared to today as we draw down ground forces in the Middle East and reset them. Nations like Iran and North Korea continue to pursue nuclear capabilities, while rising powers are rapidly modernizing their militaries and investing in capabilities to deny our forces freedom of action in vital regions such as the Asia-Pacific. To ensure we are prepared to meet our missions, I will continue to focus on

my three priorities: 1) Be ready to fight and win today; 2) Build the future force to fight and win tomorrow; and 3) Take care of our people and create a motivated, relevant and diverse force. Most importantly, I will work to ensure we do not create a “hollow force” that is unable to do the mission due to shortfalls in maintenance, personnel, enablers or training. We will not erode the support we provide to our Sailors, Civilians, and their families that sustains our all-volunteer force.

To pursue these priorities in a constrained fiscal environment, we will have to be effective and efficient. We will maintain our warfighting advantage against new threats using new technologies and operating concepts. We will use innovative ways to affordably operate forward, where we are most effective and can provide our nation options for influence and response. Additionally, we will be judicious with our resources (people, money and time) by more efficiently scheduling maintenance and adapting our Fleet Response Plan.

We must remain the world’s preeminent maritime fighting force. In particular, our Navy will continue to dominate the undersea domain with sustained investment and effort in a network of platforms and sensors. The Joint force relies on us for assured access to deter conflict, fight wars, protect our allies and partners and advance our interests. We will sustain access below, on and above the water with new maritime and joint operational concepts such as Air-Sea Battle, and by operationalizing the electromagnetic spectrum and cyber domain.

The budget reductions we are currently addressing as part of the 2011 Budget Control Act will introduce additional risk in our ability to meet the future needs of Combatant Commanders, but we believe this risk is manageable. Some strategic changes will be required in the Department of Defense to posture our forces, prepare for conflicts, and conduct combat and

stability operations. We are currently working through an emerging strategy as we complete the fiscal year 13 budget submission.

However, if the efforts of the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction do not result in agreement and sequestration occurs, the Department of Defense and the Navy will have to rethink some fundamental aspects of what our military does. The current law does not allow the military to manage these reductions, but rather applies the cuts uniformly to each program, project and activity. Our readiness and procurement accounts would face a reduction of about 18 percent, rising to approximately 25 percent in the event military personnel funding is exempted from full sequestration. The size of these cuts would substantially impact our ability to resource the Combatant Commander's operational plans and maintain our forward presence around the globe.

Some of the actions we would need to take under sequestration could have a severe and irreversible impact on the Navy's future. For instance, we may need to end procurement programs and begin laying off civilian personnel in fiscal year 2012 to ensure we are within control levels for January of 2013. As a capital-intensive force, we depend on consistent and reliable production from the shipbuilding and aviation industries to sustain our fleet capacity. If we end programs abruptly and some of these companies shut down, we will be hard-pressed to reconstitute them. And each ship we don't build impacts the fleet for 20-50 years.

I look forward to working in partnership with the Committee to ensure our Navy will remain able to deter aggression by operating forward and being ready to fight and win our nation's wars. By maintaining our current course and judiciously applying our resources, I am

confident we can come through this challenge and remain the world's most lethal, flexible and capable maritime force. Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you on the Navy's behalf.

Not public until released by the
House Armed Services Committee

STATEMENT OF
GENERAL JAMES F. AMOS
COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS
BEFORE THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
ON
THE FUTURE OF THE MILITARY SERVICES AND THE CONSEQUENCES
OF SEQUESTRATION
2 NOVEMBER 2011

Not public until released by the
House Armed Services Committee

In an increasingly dangerous and uncertain world, the Marine Corps continues to provide capabilities our Nation needs to retain its status as the only credible remaining super power. As we face inevitable difficult resource decisions, we must also consider how we can best mitigate the inherent risk of a reduced defense capacity. Like an affordable insurance policy, the Marine Corps and the Navy's amphibious forces represent a very efficient and effective hedge against the Nation's most likely risks.

1. The current fight. We will continue to provide the best trained and equipped Marine units to Afghanistan. This will not change. This will remain the top priority for as long as we have Marines in harm's way. We have made great progress in Afghanistan; our fellow citizens expect no less of us for the duration of the war. We remain committed to achieving success. We will ensure that we draw down in Afghanistan in a way that responsibly transfers authority to our Afghan partners, and maintains pressure on the enemy. Our forward-deployed Marines have all that they need with regard to training, equipment, and leadership to accomplish the mission. The cost of ensuring that they have all that they need has been felt by those units back at home station. This fact impacts our ability to deal with another large scale contingency.

2. Future Security Environment. Our Nation and world face an uncertain future; we cannot predict where and when events may occur that might require us to respond on short notice to protect our citizens and our interests. In the past, there have always been times when events have compelled the United States to become involved, even when such involvement wasn't desired; there is no doubt that we will have to do this again as we face an uncertain future. As we look ahead, we see a world of increasing instability and conflict, characterized by poverty, competition for resources, urbanization, overpopulation and extremism. Failed states, or those that cannot adequately govern their own territory can become safe havens for terrorist, insurgent and criminal groups that threaten the U.S. and our allies.

Already pressurized by a lack of education and job opportunities, the marked increase of young men in underdeveloped countries are swelling the ranks of disaffected groups, providing a more pronounced distinction between the "haves" and "have-nots." Over the last year we watched as the momentum of the Arab Spring toppled long-established governments, and re-shaped the political and military dynamics of an already troubled region.

Increasing competition for scarce natural resources like fossil fuels, food and clean water continue to lead to tension, crisis and conflict. The rise of new powers and shifting geopolitical relationships will create greater potential for competition and friction. The rapid proliferation of new technologies, cyber warfare and advanced precision weaponry will amplify the risks, thus empowering state and non-state actors as never before. These trends will exert a significant influence on the future security environment and, in turn, the ever-changing character of warfare. In the words of one of our former general officers, "two parallel worlds exist on this planet- a stable progressively growing, developing world and an unstable, disintegrating chaotic world. The two worlds are colliding." This is the world in which your Marine Corps must

operate. If we are to do our part to forestall future wars and conflicts we must remain engaged and involved.

3. Crisis response. Like it or not, America must maintain the ability to respond to crises- especially in unexpected places at unexpected times. History has shown that crises usually come with little or no warning, and often in conditions of uncertainty, complexity, and chaos. A full understanding of what is occurring, and what the best response should be, takes time. There remains an imperative for a force that can respond to crisis situations immediately and create options and decision space for our Nation's leaders. An on-scene force that can respond immediately reduces the risk that a situation will spin out of control as our nation's leaders attempt to determine a way ahead. America's ability to respond in the manner required is increasingly complicated by the fact that since the 1990s our nation has significantly reduced the number and size of our bases and stations around the world.

Crisis response must sometimes be measured in hours, if not minutes. When Marine forces rescued the downed Air Force F-15 pilot in Libya earlier this year, they did so from amphibious shipping in the Mediterranean, arriving and completing the rescue within 90 minutes of notification. Imagine how the dynamic in Libya might have changed if Quadafi had captured a US air crew. Within 20 hours of notification forward deployed Marine forces arrived in tsunami-devastated Japan and began to conduct search and rescue and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief missions- at times within the radioactive plume. Crisis response can't be done from the United States. It takes too much time to get there. Even if adequate infrastructure is available near the crisis site to support deployment of a crisis response force by air, maintaining and sustaining such a force by air is extraordinarily difficult.

It is imperative that our Nation retain a credible means of mitigating risk while we draw down both the capabilities and capacities of our forces. This is best done by forward deployed and positioned forces, trained to a high state of readiness, and on the scene. The Marine Corps was specifically directed by the 82nd Congress as the force intended to be "the most ready when the Nation is least ready." This expectation exists because of the costly lessons our nation learned during the Korean War when a lack of preparedness in the beginning stages of the conflict very nearly resulted in defeat. Because our Nation cannot afford to hold the entire joint force at such a high state of readiness, it has chosen to keep the Marines ready, and has often used them to plug the gaps during international crises, to respond when no other options were available.

4. Forward presence. Although the world is continuing to change and budgets continue to fluctuate, America's requirement to maintain a forward based force-in-readiness remains. Physical presence matters. It shows our economic and our military commitment to a particular region. It deters potential adversaries. It assures our friends. It permits response in a timely manner to crises.

Our nation has already significantly reduced the number and size of our force presence, our bases and stations around the world. U.S. Forces based in the continental

United States are challenged to respond quickly due to the tyranny of distance. The national blessing of being located between two great oceans bears the expense of having to traverse those oceans in order to respond to crisis in other parts of the world. If we are to maintain our status as a global power, we have a responsibility to respond to crises quickly.

Speed enables swift and certain projection of power and influence. When we respond from a forward posture, our response time is almost immediate—often before an adversary can position its forces optimally, or accomplish his objectives. Only when we are positioned forward can we provide the backing to diplomatic efforts that give our nation’s leaders time to develop options and build coalitions. Often, U.S. citizens in other lands are put at risk if we are slow to respond or to evacuate them.

Maintaining a presence-helps provide stability to areas of strategic importance. We can build partner capacity through direct contact; increase our own awareness of dynamic developments and potential response options; control key objectives like ports, airfields, and chokepoints to ensure their safe and continued use should they become threatened; demonstrate resolve; assure our allies and partners; and provide relief and assistance quickly in the case of natural or man-made disasters.

Your Marine Corps remains forward deployed- particularly in the critical Pacific region. It is widely acknowledged that the Pacific is the future of our country from both an economic and a military perspective. We also recognize that for many years to come we will have security challenges in the Central Command area of operations. But even as we agree on the importance of these two critical regions, we can’t ignore the rest of the world. History has shown that crises, conflicts, and challenges never occur where we want them to. . . we’re not very good at predicting the future. Right now, Marines are engaged in multiple regions around the world such as Eastern Europe, Latin and South America, Africa and the Pacific Rim, conducting theater security cooperation activities and building partner capacity with our allies and partners. The goal of our engagement activities is to minimize the conditions for conflict and enable host nation forces to effectively address instability as it occurs. Engagement activities also provide our Nation with a stance for crisis response and quick footing for action when the need arises. As we look ahead to times of reduced manning and restricted access to overseas basing, Marines must be forward deployed and engaged on a day-to-day basis, working closely with our joint and allied partners. When crises arise, these same Marines will respond — locally, regionally or globally — to accomplish whatever mission our Nation asks of us.

5. Our maritime role and amphibious and expeditionary operations. As we consider the future, we do so with the sure knowledge that America is first and foremost a maritime nation. Like so much of the world, we rely on the maritime commons for the exchange of commerce and ideas. The sea dominates the surface of our globe (70% of earth’s surface). 95% of the world’s commerce travels by ship. 49% of the world’s oil travels through six major choke points; on any given day 23,000 ships are underway around the world.

Many depend on us to maintain freedom of movement on those commons; we continue to take that responsibility seriously. The world's littoral regions—where the land and sea (and air) meet—are equally critical when securing freedom of movement. The littorals are where seaborne trade originates and enters its markets. The littorals include straits, most of the world's population centers, and the areas of maximum growth.

The Navy and Marine Corps team remain the solution set to fulfilling our global maritime responsibilities in these critical areas. Naval forces are not reliant on host nation support or permission; in the conduct of operations, they step lightly on our allies and host countries. With the increasing concentration of the world's population in littoral areas, the ability to operate simultaneously on the sea, ashore, in the air, and to move seamlessly between these three domains is critical. The Marine Corps' requirement to deploy and respond globally, engage regionally, and train locally necessitates that we leverage every form of strategic mobility- a combination of amphibious ships, high speed vessels, maritime preposition shipping, organic tactical aviation and strategic airlift.

Amphibious forces, a combination of Marine air ground task forces and Navy amphibious ships, remain a uniquely critical and capable component of both crisis response and meeting our maritime responsibilities. Operating as a team, amphibious forces provide operational reach and agility, they "buy time" and decision space for our national leaders in time of crisis. They bolster diplomatic initiatives by means of their credible forward presence. Amphibious forces also provide the Nation with assured access for the joint force in a major contingency operation. That same force can quickly be reinforced to assure access anywhere in the world in the event of a major contingency; it can be dialed up or down like a rheostat to be relevant across the range of military operations. *No other force possesses the flexibility to provide these capabilities and yet sustain itself logistically for significant periods of time, at a time and place of its choosing.* There is a reason why every Combatant Commander wants the presence of forward deployed amphibious forces on a routine basis, and each of them ask for that. They know that such forces mitigate risk, and give them the capability to deal with the unknown.

The inherent usefulness, capability, and flexibility of amphibious forces is not widely understood, as evidenced by the frequent, and incorrect, assumption that forcible entry capabilities alone define the requirement for amphibious forces. The same capabilities that allow an amphibious task force to deliver and support a landing force on a hostile shore enable it to support forward engagement and crisis response. *In fact, the most frequent employment of amphibious forces is for engagement and crisis response.* The geographic Combatant Commanders have increased their demand for forward-postured amphibious forces capable of conducting security cooperation, regional deterrence and crisis response. In an era of declining access, this trend will likely markedly increase. Over the past year, amphibious forces have conducted humanitarian assistance and disaster relief efforts in Pakistan, they have supported combat operations in Afghanistan with ground forces and fixed wing aviation, they have responded to the piracy crisis on M.V. Magellan Star, they have supported operations in Libya, and assisted our allies in the Philippines and Japan. Modern amphibious assaults, when necessary, seek to avoid enemy strengths by exploiting gaps and weaknesses. An

example is the TF-58 assault that seized key terrain south of Kandahar 450 miles inland in 2001 shortly after the 9/11 attacks.

The Marine Corps defines itself as an “expeditionary” force. “Expeditionary” means that we're capable of operating in austere environments. When we deploy we bring the water, the fuel, the supplies that our Marines and sailors need to accomplish the mission. “Expeditionary” is not a bumper sticker to us, or a concept, it is a state of conditioning that Marines work hard to maintain.

6. Right-sizing in the face of new fiscal realities. The Marine Corps is fully aware of the fiscal challenges facing our Nation, and stands ready to further critically examine and streamline its force needs for the future. *We continually strive to be good stewards of the public trust by maintaining the very best financial management practices.* The Marine Corps remains the first and only military service whose financial statements have been deemed audit-ready. We are proud of our reputation for frugality, and we remain one of the best values for the defense dollar. During these times of constrained resources, we remain committed to refining operations, identifying efficiencies, and reinvesting savings to conserve scarce public funds. When the Nation pays the 'sticker price' for its Marines, it buys the ability to remain forward deployed and forward engaged, to assure our partners, reinforce alliances, and build partner capacity. For 7.8% of the total DoD budget, our Nation gains the ability to respond to unexpected crises, from humanitarian disaster relief efforts, to non-combatant evacuation operations, to conduct counter-piracy operations, or full scale combat.

As Congress, and this Committee, work hard to account for every dollar, the Marine Corps is working to make sure that every dollar is well spent. In the end we know we're going to have to make cuts. As we provide our input we need to address three critical considerations -- strategy, balance, and keeping faith.

In an effort to ensure the Marine Corps was best organized for a challenging and dangerous future security environment, last fall we conducted a comprehensive and detailed force structure review to identify all dimensions of rebalance and posture for the future. The results of this effort have been shared with this Committee in the past. This effort incorporated the lessons learned from ten years of combat. We affirm the results of that strategy-driven initial effort, but we have also begun to readjust certain parameters of it based on the realities of spending cuts outlined in the Budget Control Act of 2011.

When we went through the force structure review effort, we built a force that can respond to only one major contingency at a time. It has been opined that one effect of sequestration might be to put a Marine Corps below the end strength level that's necessary to support even one major contingency. At the potential end strength level resulting from the sequestration, we're going to have to make some tough decisions and assume significantly more risk. We will not be able to do the things the Nation needs us to do to mitigate risk, or to meet the requirements of the Combatant Commanders. We won't be there to reassure our potential friends, or to assure our allies. And we certainly won't be there to contain small crises before they become major conflagrations. A

Marine Corps end strength level that could result from the sequestration presents significant risk institutionally and for the Nation. Responsiveness to Combatant Commander requirements such as contingencies and crisis response will be significantly degraded.

With regard to strategy, the Marine Corps is participating in the ongoing rewrite of national security strategy. Once this effort is concluded, we'll evaluate the resources available against the mission, then build the most capable force possible. We'll use what we learned during the force structure review effort as our point of departure, and make recommendations on how to best reshape the Marine Corps.

We cannot make cuts in a manner that would “hollow” the force. We have learned this lesson before during previous draw downs. The term “hollow force” refers primarily to the lack of readiness of U.S. forces to accomplish their missions. Readiness is the aggregate of the investment in personnel, training, and equipment to ensure that units that are prepared to perform missions at any given time. The Services have varying approaches to readiness. In order to manage investment and O&M costs, some Services judiciously reduce the readiness status of selected units during interim periods between scheduled deployments. This concept is referred to as “tiered readiness.” In this concept, resources are limited and non-deployed units pay the costs to ensure that deployed and next-to-deploy units have sufficient personnel, equipment, and training. Over time, non-deploying, or rarely-deploying units, may be held at reduced readiness levels for indeterminate periods of time. Given our mission to be America's Expeditionary Force in Readiness, a tiered readiness concept is not compatible with the Marine Corps' missions because its non-deployed units are often called upon to respond to unanticipated and varied crises on a moment's notice.

The Marine Corps strives to maintain a high state of unit readiness and logistical self-sustainment capability. Even when not deployed, Marine units maintain higher levels of readiness, so they can deploy on short notice. This readiness posture allows the Corps to:

- maintain most of its operating force ready to respond quickly to crises and contingencies
- cycle battalions, squadrons and other units through rotations rapidly
- routinely build and deploy coherent, effective task forces without extensive work-ups
- maintain significant amounts of equipment in theater vice rotating most of it with each unit, thus reducing the costs of doing our Nation's bidding.

Organic logistics capabilities are vital to this practice. Too often, service logistics units fall prey to cuts that forfeit their ability to respond to crises. Naval forces—in particular, amphibious ships—are also essential to readiness. We must continue to invest in this highly utilized capability.

Finally, lower budget levels, end strength, and investment accounts will significantly affect contingency plans over time. Many of these plans depend on concurrent and/or sequential operations. Less capacity removes the capability for such operations. Operational plans, will necessarily be adjusted to accommodate the longer

timelines required to achieve desired objectives. Longer time to accomplish objectives in war can easily translate into increased loss of personnel and materiel, and ultimately places mission accomplishment at risk.

My promise to this Committee is that at the end of the day, we will build “the best Marine Corps” that our Nation is willing to afford. I intend to “keep faith” with our people. This term has deep meaning to the leadership of the Marine Corps. We expect much from those we recruit, and we remind them constantly of their obligations of honorable and faithful service. In return we must be faithful to the obligations we make to those who serve honorably. We must not break the chain of trust that exists. Precipitous personnel reductions are among the worst measures that can be employed to save money. Our all-volunteer system is built upon a reasonable opportunity for retention and advancement; wholesale cuts undermine the faith and confidence in service leadership and create long-term experience deficits with negative operational impacts. Such an approach cannot be quickly recovered from.

7. Redundancy. In the interest of austerity, there are many who try to argue that the Marines provide capabilities that are redundant when compared with other Services. This is not the case. "Redundant" means that no replacement is required if something is discarded. This is not true of the Marine Corps capabilities sets or of the way we have adapted to the future security environment and modern warfare. If the Nation lost its amphibious capability, it would have to pay for another Service to provide it. In short order the Nation would require a sustainable air-ground force able to operate from the sea- to respond to crisis's and contingencies. A force that comes from the sea requires specialized equipment and training. No savings would be gained because there is no redundancy. The nation would have to pay- and likely pay a higher price-to gain back what had been given away.

In any future defense strategy, the Marine Corps will fill a unique lane in the capability range of America's armed forces. A *Middleweight Force*, we are lighter than the Army, and heavier than SOF. The Corps is not a second land army. The Army is purpose-built for land campaigns and carries a heavier punch when it arrives, whereas the Marine Corps is an expeditionary force focused on coming from the sea with integrated aviation and logistics capabilities. The Marine Corps maintains the ability to contribute to land campaigns by leveraging or rapidly aggregating its capabilities and capacities. Similarly, Marine Corps and SOF roles are complementary, rather than redundant. Special Operation Forces contribute to the counter-insurgency and counter-terrorism efforts of the Combatant Commanders in numerous and specialized ways, but they are not a substitute for conventional forces with a broader range of capability and sustainability.

Marine air is similarly not redundant. The US Air Force cannot come from the sea; nor are most of its aircraft suitable for expeditionary missions. The Navy currently does not invest in sufficient capability to operate their aircraft ashore once deployed—a requirement that has risen often in the past in support of both naval and land campaigns. If Navy aviation were to buy the capability to deploy effectively to austere ashore bases

from their ships, they would find it would cost as much, or more, than it costs them currently to do so on behalf of the Marine Corps.

8. Reset and modernization. Reset is distinguishable from modernization. There will be a cost when the Marine Corps comes out of Afghanistan. It is necessary to reset the force by addressing equipment shortfalls, and to refresh equipment worn out or degraded by years of combat. We currently estimate that bill to be about \$3 billion. A few years ago that bill was in excess of \$15 billion. With the help of Congress we have been able to reset the force for some years now, even as we continued to support operations both in Iraq, and Afghanistan. As we look to the future, we must address our deficiencies and replace the equipment that is worn out from operations in Afghanistan. Secondly, we must continue to modernize to keep pace with the evolving world.

The Marine Corps is currently undertaking several initiatives to modernize the Total Force. The programmatic priority for our ground forces is the seamless transition of Marines from the sea to conduct sustained operations ashore whether for training, humanitarian assistance, or for combat. Our ground combat and tactical vehicle strategy is focused on the right mix of assets, balancing performance, payload, survivability, fuel efficiency, transportability and cost. In particular, the Amphibious Combat Vehicle is important to our ability to conduct surface littoral maneuver and seamlessly project Marine units from sea to land in permissive, uncertain and hostile environments. We remain firmly partnered with the U.S. Army in fielding a Joint Light Tactical Vehicle that lives up to its name while also being affordable.

Marine Corps Aviation, which is on the cusp of its centennial of service to our Nation, continues its modernization that began over a decade ago. The continued development and fielding of the short take-off and vertical landing (STOVL) F-35B Joint Strike Fighter remains the centerpiece of this effort. The capability inherent in a STOVL jet allows the Marine Corps to operate in harsh conditions and from remote locations where there often are few airfields available for conventional aircraft. It is also specifically designed to operate from amphibious ships — a capability that no other tactical aircraft possesses. The ability to employ a fifth-generation aircraft from amphibious shipping doubles the number of “carrier” platforms from which the United States can employ fixed wing aviation. Once fully fielded, the F-35B replaces three legacy aircraft — F/A-18, EA-6B and AV-8B — saving the DoD approximately \$1 billion per year in operations and maintenance costs.

This program has been performing notably since January with more than 260 vertical landings completed and 98% of its key performance parameters met. It is ahead of schedule in most areas. The F-35B also recently completed a highly successful three-week, sea trial period aboard the amphibious assault warship USS Wasp (LHD-1). DoD has already purchased 32 of these aircraft. Delivery is on track, and we look forward to receiving them at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma just ten months from now.

The MV-22B Osprey continues to be a success story for the Marine Corps and the Joint Force. To date, this revolutionary tilt-rotor aircraft has changed the way Marines operate on the battlefield, giving American and Coalition forces the maneuver advantage

and operational reach unmatched by any other tactical aircraft. Over the past four years since achieving Initial Operational Capability, the MV-22B has flown more than 18,000 hours in combat, carried more than 129,000 personnel, and 5.7 million pounds of cargo. The MV-22B has made multiple deployments to Iraq, four with MEUs at sea, and it is currently on its fourth deployment to Afghanistan. The unprecedented operational reach of an MV-22B, embarked aboard amphibious shipping in the Mediterranean, was the sole reason for the rescue of a downed American aviator in Libya. Our squadron fielding plan is well under way as we continue to replace our 44 year old, Vietnam-era CH-46 helicopters. We must procure all required quantities of the MV-22B in accordance with the program of record. Calls by some to reduce MV-22B procurement as a DoD cost savings measure are puzzling. Their arguments are ill-informed and rooted in anachronisms when measured against the proven record of performance and safety this force multiplier brings to today's battlefields in support of Marines and the Joint Force.

9. Conclusions. The American people continue to believe that when a crisis emerges Marines will be present and "invariably turn in a performance that is dramatically and decisively successful - not most of the time, but always." They possess a heart-felt belief that the Marine Corps is good for the young men and women of our country. In their view, the Marines are extraordinarily adept at converting "un-oriented youths into proud, self-reliant stable citizens - citizens into whose hands the nation's affairs may be safely entrusted." An investment in the Marine Corps continues to be an investment in the character of the young people of our country.

The Marine Corps will only ask for what it needs, not what it wants. As Congress and DoD move forward with tough decisions on the future of our Armed Forces relative to the Budget Control Act of 2011, the crisis response capabilities the Marine Corps affords our Nation must serve as the compass in determining its ultimate end strength, equipping and training needs. Through it all, the Marine Corps will make the hard decisions and redouble its commitment to its traditional culture of frugality.

The Marine Corps has evolved over many years, many conflicts, and at a significant price in terms of both blood and treasure; we have served the Nation well time and time again. For a comparably small investment, the Marine Corps continues to provide the protection our Nation needs in an increasingly dangerous and uncertain world, and to preserve our Nation's ability to do what we must as the world's only credible remaining super power.

STATEMENT BY

GENERAL RAYMOND T. ODIERNO
CHIEF OF STAFF
UNITED STATES ARMY

BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FIRST SESSION, 112TH CONGRESS

ON

THE FUTURE OF THE MILITARY SERVICES
AND
CONSEQUENCES OF DEFENSE SEQUESTRATION

November 2, 2011

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Smith, and members of the committee.

Since this is my first time to appear before you as the Chief of Staff of the Army, I want to start by telling you how much I appreciate your unwavering commitment to the Army and the Joint Force. I look forward to discussing the future of the Army and the potential impact of budget cuts on our future capabilities, readiness, and depth. Because of the sustained support of Congress and this committee, we are the best trained, best equipped, and best led land force in the world today. As we face an uncertain security environment and fiscal challenges, we know we will get smaller, but we must maintain our capabilities to be a decisive force – a force trusted by the American people to meet our future security needs.

Over the past 10 years our Army – Active, Guard, and Reserve – has deployed over 1.1 million Soldiers to combat. Over 4,500 Soldiers have made the ultimate sacrifice. Over 32,000 Soldiers have been wounded – 9,000 requiring long term care. In that time, our Soldiers have earned over 14,000 awards for valor to include 6 Medals of Honor and 22 Distinguished Service Crosses.

Our Army is and always will be about Soldiers and Families. Throughout it all, our Soldiers and leaders have displayed unparalleled ingenuity, mental and physical toughness, and courage under fire. I am proud to be part of this Army – to lead our Nation's most precious treasure – our magnificent men and women.

Today we face an estimated \$450 billion plus in DOD budget cuts. We cannot afford to repeat the mistakes of previous reductions. I respectfully suggest that we make these decisions strategically, keeping in mind the realities of the risk they pose, and that we make these decisions together, unified, to ensure that when the plan is finally decided upon, all effort has been made to provide the Nation the best level of security and safety.

Our Army must remain a key enabler in the Joint Force across a broad range of missions, responsive to the Combatant Commanders, and maintain trust with the American People. It is my challenge to balance the fundamental tension between maintaining security in an increasingly complicated and unpredictable world, and the

requirements of a fiscally austere environment. The U.S. Army is committed to being a part of the solution in this very important effort.

Accordingly, we must balance our force structure with appropriate modernization and sufficient readiness to sustain a smaller, but ready force.

We will apply the lessons of ten years of war to ensure we have the right mix of forces. The right mix of heavy, medium, light, and Airborne forces; the right mix between the Active and Reserve Components; the right mix of combat, combat support, and combat service support forces; the right mix of operating and generating forces; and the right mix of Soldiers, Civilians, and contractors. We must ensure that the forces we employ to meet our operational commitments are maintained, trained, and equipped to the appropriate level of readiness.

As the Army gets smaller, it is the “*How we reduce*” that will be critical. While we downsize, we must do it at a pace that allows us to retain a high quality All-Volunteer Force that is lethal, agile, adaptable, versatile, and ready to deploy with the ability to expand as required. I am committed to this, as I am also committed to fostering continued commitment to the Army Profession, and adapting leader development to meet future challenges.

Although Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding will be reduced, I cannot overstate how critical it is in ensuring our Soldiers have what they need while serving in harm’s way, as well as the vital role OCO funding plays in resetting our formations and equipment, a key aspect of our current and future readiness. Failing to sufficiently reset now would certainly incur higher future costs, potentially in lives.

Along with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Army, I share concern about the potential of sequestration, which would bring a total reduction of over a trillion dollars for DOD. Cuts of this magnitude would be catastrophic to the military and – in the case of the Army – would significantly reduce our capability and capacity to assure our partners abroad, respond to crises, and deter our potential adversaries, while threatening the readiness of our All-Volunteer Force.

Sequestration would cause significant reductions in both Active and Reserve Component end strengths, impact the industrial base, and almost eliminate our modernization programs, denying the military superiority our Nation requires in today

and tomorrow's uncertain and challenging security environment. We would have to consider additional infrastructure efficiencies, including consolidations and closures, commensurate with force structure reductions, to maintain the Army's critical capacity to train Soldiers and units, maintain equipment, and prepare the force to meet Combatant Commander requirements now and into the future.

It would require us to completely revamp our National Security Strategy and reassess our ability to shape the global environment in order to protect the United States.

With sequestration, my assessment is that the Nation would incur an unacceptable level of strategic and operational risk.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I thank you again for allowing me the opportunity to appear before you. I also thank you for the support that you provide each and every day to our outstanding men and women of the United States Army, our Army Civilians and their Families. The strength of our Nation is our Army. The strength of our Army is our Soldiers. The strength of our Soldiers is our Families. This is what makes us Army Strong. I look forward to your questions.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
PRESENTATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**SUBJECT: THE FUTURE OF THE MILITARY SERVICES AND
CONSEQUENCES OF DEFENSE SEQUESTRATION**

**STATEMENT OF: GENERAL NORTON A. SCHWARTZ
CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE**

NOVEMBER 2, 2010

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED
BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Ten years after 9/11, Airmen and their Army, Navy, Marine, and Coast Guard teammates continue to serve the Nation with distinction, performing admirably across a broad spectrum of operations. In particular, our service members have honed their skills to a fine edge after more than a decade of effectively conducting counterterrorism and counterinsurgency operations.

As we evaluate our strategy for the future, we must protect the progress that we have made by addressing the undeniable stresses and strains on our service members and their families, as well as the tremendous toll on our battle-worn equipment, resulting from more than a decade of sustained global operations. This is particularly true for the Air Force, which has been in sustained combat operations for more than two decades, dating back to Operation DESERT STORM.

We also must recognize and prepare for the ongoing evolution of a highly dynamic, increasingly complex geostrategic environment in which the proliferation of technology is allowing more and more actors to exert influence and effect desired outcomes. In order to attain a full-spectrum portfolio of capabilities that is prepared to address wide-ranging security threats, we must internalize the hard-fought, hard-learned lessons of the past decade of operations against primarily terrorist and insurgent elements, as we judiciously prepare for the possibility of future higher-end contingencies involving potential near-peer actors.

Because our Nation's debt crisis has a direct bearing on our national security, the U.S. military will also tighten its fiscal belt, and be a part of the solution to find our way back to a vibrant national economy. To this end, the Department of Defense began by identifying more than \$100 billion in efficiencies, shifting the savings from overhead to operational and modernization requirements. In the Air Force alone, nearly \$33 billion were reallocated to support required capabilities more directly. Moreover, we found an additional \$10 billion in savings to contribute to deficit reduction as we completed work on the 2012 budget. The Air Force continues to review all areas of the budget—including force structure, operations and investment, and personnel—for further savings.

But to sustain the military's ability to protect the Nation against wide-ranging threats in a very dynamic strategic and fiscal environment, we will have to make extremely difficult decisions—for example, reducing investment in many areas, but also enhancing capabilities in others in order to compensate. These choices must be based on strategic considerations, not compelled solely by budget targets. A non-strategy-based approach that proposes cuts without

correlation to national security priorities or core defense capabilities will lead to a hollowed-out force, similar to those that followed every major conflict since World War I—a U.S. military with aging equipment, extremely stressed human resources, less-than-adequate training, and ultimately, declining readiness and effectiveness. We must avoid repeating this scenario by steering clear of ill-conceived, across-the-board cuts, which do not allow us to deliberately accept risks, to devise strategies to mitigate those risks, and to maintain a capable, if smaller, effective force. Instead, sweeping cuts of the sort in the Budget Control Act’s sequester provision would slash our investment accounts; raid our operations and maintenance accounts, forcing the curtailment of important daily operations and sustainment efforts; and inflict real damage to the effectiveness and well-being of our Airmen and their families. Ultimately, such a scenario gravely undermines our ability to protect the Nation.

But beyond the manner in which potential budget cuts are executed, even the most thoroughly-deliberated strategy may not be able to overcome dire consequences if cuts go far beyond the \$450 billion-plus in anticipated national security budget reductions over the next 10 years. This is true whether the cuts are directed by sequestration or by Joint Select Committee proposal, and whether they are deliberately targeted or across-the-board. From the ongoing budget review, the Department is confident that further spending reductions beyond the more than \$450 billion that are needed to comply with the Budget Control Act’s first round of cuts cannot be done without damaging our core military capabilities and therefore our national security.

From the perspective of the Air Force, whose “real” total obligation authority is already only 20 percent of the Department of Defense top-line—the lowest of any military service since World War II—further cuts will amount to:

- further reductions to our end strength, both civilian and military, despite the fact that the Air Force already is substantially smaller than it was ten years ago;
- continued aging and reductions in the Air Force’s fleet of fighters, strategic bombers, airlifters, and tankers, as well as to associated bases and infrastructure;
- adverse effects on training and readiness, which has seen a decline since 2003; and
- diminished capacity to execute concurrent missions across the spectrum of operations and over vast distances on the globe.

A smaller Air Force, as a result of anticipated budget cuts, still will remain an unmatched, superbly capable force, but as a matter of simple physical limitations, it will be able to

accomplish fewer tasks in fewer places in any given period of time. Therefore, while the Nation has become accustomed to effective execution of wide-ranging operations in rapid succession or even simultaneously—for example, the Air Force’s concurrent response to crisis situations in Japan and Libya, which ranged more than 5,500 miles in distance and the operational spectrum from humanitarian relief to combat airpower, all the while maintaining operations in Afghanistan and Iraq—it will have to accept reduced coverage in future similar, concurrent scenarios if further large cuts to the national security budget are allowed to take effect. Also, our Airmen and their families, throughout the Total Force, would face intensified deployment schedules, and our equipment would become aged and worn more quickly, because fewer resources would be available to commit to the Nation’s emerging needs.

As part of our strategy to mitigate the effects of decreased capacity, we will continue to strengthen our international partnerships, especially where common interests and shared security responsibilities are involved. More importantly, we will continue to promote efforts toward advancing Joint interdependence, as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified before this committee last week. This will require each military service “to maintain and be the masters of their core competencies and their unique service cultures, but...[to] operate as a single cohesive team.” To meet the Chairman’s intent, the Air Force will continue to make vital contributions to the Joint team’s portfolio, integrating airpower’s four unique, enduring qualities: (1) domain control; (2) intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; (3) air mobility; and (4) global strike. These four core contributions—plus our unparalleled ability to command and control air, space, and cyber systems—will sustain the Joint team’s advantage, and inform our analysis as we prioritize our efforts in each of the most critical dimensions: materiel, personnel, training, and readiness.

Reducing any of these core contributions, in addition to potential diminished capacities as discussed earlier, will fundamentally alter the complexion of your Air Force. We therefore are focused on sustaining and strengthening these core functions. Moreover, specific systems such as the F-35A, the centerpiece of our future tactical air combat capability; KC-46A, the backbone of our worldwide power projection capability and thus our Nation’s global expeditionary posture; and the Long-Range Strike “family of systems,” all represent substantial elements of our overall suite of capabilities and thus must all be pursued through disciplined—and certainly efficient—modernization efforts. Even though we are responsibly drawing down in Afghanistan

and Iraq, we know that historically, as U.S. forces withdraw from active combat, the relative requirement for airpower typically increases. By focusing on our core contributions, we are preserving the character of your Air Force—ready to continue responding effectively to the Nation’s airpower and global power projection needs.

In short, Airmen remain fully committed to executing current missions effectively while building a future force according to operational risk, capability and capacity requirements, personnel and materiel needs, and prudent, if frugal, strategies for investment in modernization, recapitalization, and readiness. We do not have to forsake national security to achieve fiscal stability. If we undertake a strategy-based approach to necessary budget cuts, and keep those cuts to a reasonable level, we can assure our full-spectrum preparedness in providing our unique capabilities, affording a wider range of options for rapid, tailorable, and flexible power projection—*Global Vigilance, Reach, and Power*—on which our Nation’s security and strategic interests rely.