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Introduction

Chairman Saxton, Representative Meehan, distinguished members, thank you for inviting us here today to present you with additional information on the direction the Department of Defense is pursuing regarding Irregular Warfare.

For most of the 20th Century, we knew who our enemies were and where they lived. They had armies, navies, and air forces to attack, with recognized capitals and populations to put at risk. However in the 21st Century, we face a different enemy, an enemy defined by a complex network of ideologically driven extremists who will attempt to engage us not only far from U.S. shores, but also here at home. Future efforts in the long war against terrorist networks include many operations characterized by Irregular Warfare – operations in which the enemy is not a regular military force of a nation-state. We are engaged in a global conflict, and our efforts confronting the enemy must also be global in nature. These operations will occur on multiple fronts and cannot be limited to primarily military activities. We submit the long war effort must aggressively use all elements of America’s power, including diplomatic, informational, economic, intelligence, and law enforcement activities.

The Quadrennial Defense Review and Irregular Warfare

The Department of Defense’s 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) highlighted that success in Irregular Warfare will often require an indirect approach. The indirect approach focuses on building partnership capacity, working through, by or with partner nations. Through this approach, we are assisting in building new capabilities and seeking to affect the enemy both physically and psychologically. It also describes the Department’s efforts to shift emphasis from a focus on major conventional combat operations to multiple, irregular operations. At the same time, Secretary Rumsfeld emphasized the QDR was not itself an end-state – particular emphasis would continue in
several critical areas through the development of follow-on “roadmaps.” These execution roadmaps include the subject of today’s hearing – Irregular Warfare – as well as related roadmaps on building partnership capacity and strategic communications.

The purpose of the Irregular Warfare Roadmap is to facilitate implementation of the 2006 QDR decisions regarding DoD capabilities and capacity to conduct and support protracted Irregular Warfare. The Irregular Warfare Execution Roadmap converts the broad policy objectives established during the QDR into actionable tasks. It also provides the Department’s senior leadership with a mechanism to advance high priority Irregular Warfare issues for programmatic decision through the Fiscal Year 2008-2013 Future Years Defense Program, as well as establishing an oversight and management process for implementing Irregular Warfare initiatives.

The Irregular Warfare Roadmap does not exist in a vacuum. It complements the Strategic Planning Guidance efforts identifying joint force capabilities required to operationalize Global War on Terror campaign plans and other related activities within the Department. In particular, the relationship between the Irregular Warfare and Building Partnership Capacity Roadmaps merit attention as they are essentially opposing sides of the same coin. The Irregular Warfare Roadmap focuses internally on DoD’s Irregular Warfare capabilities and capacity, while the companion Building Partnership Capacity Roadmap addresses the Department’s efforts with interagency and international partners. Another QDR developed initiative, the Strategic Communications Roadmap, addresses strengthening the Department’s abilities to counter ideological support for terrorism through the use of strategic communications thus providing additional support for Irregular Warfare actions.

The Irregular Warfare Problem

Increasingly sophisticated irregular methods, including terrorism and insurgency, challenge U.S. security interests. Adversaries employing irregular methods aim to erode U.S. influence and political will. These adversaries are often non-state actors who are
transnationally connected and globally networked, using modern technologies to raise money, transmit their ideology, and train new recruits. Irregular opponents often take a long-term approach, attempting to impose prohibitive human, material, financial, and political costs on the United States. Irregular warfare will likely be the dominant form of conflict we face over the coming decades. Defeating terrorist extremist networks, in addition to their state and non-state supporters, requires long-duration complex operations that synchronize the application of all instruments of national power.

**Irregular Warfare Defined**

The QDR described Irregular Warfare as operations in which the enemy is not a regular military force of a nation-state. The Irregular Warfare Roadmap includes the following working definition:

> “a form of warfare that has as its objective the credibility and or legitimacy of the relevant political authority with the goal of undermining or supporting that authority. Irregular warfare favors indirect approaches, though it may employ the full range of military and other capabilities to seek asymmetric approaches, in order to erode an adversary’s power, influence, and will.”

While the precise definition continues to be refined, there is broad agreement within the Department on the nature and scope of Irregular Warfare. What differentiates Irregular Warfare from other forms of warfare is its emphasis on the use of irregular forces and indirect methods and means to subvert, attrit and exhaust an enemy, or render him irrelevant rather than to defeat him through direct, conventional military confrontation. Unlike conventional warfare, which focuses on defeating an adversary’s military forces or seizing key physical terrain, the focus of Irregular Warfare is on eroding an enemy’s power, influence, and will to exercise political authority over an indigenous population. Common characteristics of irregular wars include protraction, intertwining of military and non-military methods, participation by individuals and groups not belonging to the regular armed forces or police of any state, and efforts to gain control of or influence the host population. Irregular Warfare operations may occur as part of traditional warfare or independently.
Irregular warfare includes a wide variety of operations and activities, both offensive and defensive. Examples include, but are not limited to: insurgency and counterinsurgency; terrorism and counterterrorism; unconventional warfare; foreign internal defense; stability, security, transition, and reconstruction operations; transnational criminal activities; information operations (including psychological operations); and intelligence and counterintelligence operations. Obviously, U.S. Government agencies do not conduct Irregular Warfare activities such as terrorism or transnational criminal activities that violate U.S. and international law, but we must be prepared to defend against such activities.

At times, the term Irregular Warfare has been used interchangeably with unconventional warfare. Unconventional warfare (UW) is an established DoD term that is defined as:

“**A broad spectrum of military and paramilitary operations, normally of long duration, predominately conducted through, with, and by indigenous or surrogate forces who are organized, trained, equipped, supported and directed in varying degrees by an external source. It includes, but is not limited to, guerrilla warfare, subversion, intelligence activities, and unconventional assisted recovery. (JP 1-02)**”

The term unconventional warfare is more appropriate to describe certain types of operations and activities that comprise Irregular Warfare. Unconventional Warfare could be viewed as a subset of Irregular Warfare, encompassing its offensive aspects. Irregular Warfare extends beyond the military domain to include political, psychological, informational, diplomatic and economic methods that are enabled and supported by the actions of military, security, or irregular forces.

In the months ahead, we will develop a final Irregular Warfare definition that facilitates additional doctrinal development as a Department priority.
The Irregular Warfare Roadmap Lines of Operation

The Irregular Warfare Execution Roadmap addresses the need to develop and increase Irregular Warfare capabilities and capacity throughout the Department by grouping tasks in five broad subject areas or Lines of Operations. The areas include:

- Transforming the way DoD manages people;
- Rebalancing General Purpose Forces (GPF);
- Increasing Special Operations Forces (SOF) capability and capacity;
- Increasing DoD’s capability and capacity to conduct counter-network operations; and
- Redesigning Joint and Service education and training.

The Irregular Warfare Roadmap details specific tasks that address these five lines of operation. These tasks stretch across the entire Department of Defense and are scheduled to be completed within the next 12 months. Let me present a brief synopsis of each area:

- Transforming the way DoD manages people necessary to support Irregular Warfare is the first priority of the Irregular Warfare Roadmap. The current Service personnel management systems are designed to produce, develop, and promote traditional warfare specialists. DoD must take the necessary steps to produce new generations of senior Irregular Warfare specialists. This can occur only if the Military Services change the way they identify, access, educate, train, develop, utilize, and retain Irregular Warfare specialists.

- Rebalancing General Purpose Forces capabilities and capacity to better support Irregular Warfare requires the Military Departments and Services to increase their abilities for conducting long duration counterinsurgency and counterterrorism operations. These activities include increased frequency of operations with host nation security forces and improving on General Purpose Force’s ability to train, equip, and advise large numbers of these foreign forces.
• Increasing Special Operations Forces capabilities and capacity to support Irregular Warfare is essential to defeating terrorist extremism in the Long War. Beyond defeating terrorist extremism and other irregular challenges to U.S. interests, increasing Special Operations Forces capability and capacity broadens and deepens U.S. strategic options for dealing with hostile states and occupying powers through the support of friendly insurgent groups, surrogate warfare, and other uses of Irregular Warfare practices.

• DoD must also increase its capability and capacity to conduct Counter-Network Operations. These operations entail the ability to identify, find, locate, characterize, and perturb and disrupt extremist cells, networks, and individuals; and to predict their operational behavior on a global scale. This effort includes enhancing our ability to integrate valuable social science research and expertise including increased use of anthropologists, sociologists, and geographers.

• Operations ENDURING FREEDOM and IRAQI FREEDOM remind us that tactical and operational competence in conventional warfighting does not equate to tactical, operational, or strategic success in operations and activities associated with Irregular Warfare. Until recently, DoD educational and training institutions have not placed a priority on the importance of preparing DoD personnel to operate, thrive and succeed in Irregular Warfare environments. The Irregular Warfare Roadmap’s final area of emphasis is thus on redesigning Joint and Service education and training to conduct Irregular Warfare.
Conclusion

Throughout our history, U.S. military forces – Active Duty, Reserves, and National Guard -- have defended our nation against its enemies on land, at sea, and in the air, while adapting continuously to engage new to our nation. Today we must cope not only with the threats produced by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and missile technology among nation-states, but also with threats posed by individual terrorists and terrorist networks with global reach. The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review was a crucial step forward in addressing the challenges posed by these new threats. By providing a means for continuous assessment and refinement, the Irregular Warfare Execution Roadmap serves as a primary catalyst for the Department’s efforts in shifting emphasis from major conventional warfare to a focus on Irregular Warfare.

Chairman Saxton, Representative Meehan, distinguished members: thank you for your interest in, and support of the Department’s Irregular Warfare initiatives and for allowing us to talk today about the Department’s Irregular Warfare Execution Roadmap. The citizens of this nation, its institutions, and our brave men and women in uniform have repeatedly demonstrated the patriotism, innovation, determination, and resiliency necessary to defeat our enemies while retaining our freedoms. There is no doubt in my mind that those capabilities will be tested against this newest enemy threat – nor is there any doubt that we will prevail. Once again, I am honored to appear here before this distinguished committee.