

STATEMENT BY
HONORABLE THOMAS W. O'CONNELL
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
SPECIAL OPERATIONS/LOW-INTENSITY CONFLICT
BEFORE THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES SENATE

MARCH 25, 2004

Chairman Warner, Senator Levin, and distinguished members of this Committee, I appreciate your invitation to update you on the progress that special operations forces (SOF) are making on the war on terrorism being fought today. I would also like to thank you for the vision and foresight shown by Congress in 1987 in establishing the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) and creating the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, ASD (SO/LIC) within the Department of Defense (DOD). As a result of your actions, we were not faced on September 12th with the task of recreating a capacity to wage unconventional war against an unconventional adversary. We had in hand the basic building blocks for a global military campaign against terrorism, both relying upon the traditional regional combatant command structure and by establishing USSOCOM as a supported command.

Prior to 1987 the United States had a general practice of only creating SOF after the advent of a crisis and typically disbanded the force once the crisis had passed. Units were created for specific tasks, and dissipated after the conflict had passed. But as was discovered during *Operation Desert One*, the aborted hostage rescue in Iran, humans and their skills are more important than hardware. SOF cannot be mass produced, they cannot be readily created "after the fact," and you need a standing policy voice at the senior level of the Department which can explain effectively to other policy makers what these "silent warriors" can, and cannot, do.

As you know I exercise civilian oversight of special operations and low-intensity conflict activities of the DOD. One of my responsibilities is to ensure that SOF are appropriately employed and senior policy makers understand their capabilities as well as their limitations and also the risk that some missions might entail. Not only am I an advocate and a defender of USSOCOM and SOF, but I am also charged with making sure that SOF continues to be the best trained, best equipped, most flexible and effective fighting force available to our country.

Representatives from my office spend a significant amount of time at USSOCOM headquarters in a joint effort to develop the SOF program and budget. I actively participate in the USSOCOM Board of Director's meetings, the Command's executive resource forum. This joint effort produces a SOF program and budget

that emphasizes force readiness and sustainability, provides sufficient force structure to meet the demands of the geographic warfighting commanders and the Commander, USSOCOM in his role as a supported commander.

My office provides executive program direction and Defense sponsorship of the Technical Support Working Group (TSWG) through SO/LIC's Combating Terrorism Technology Support Office (CTTSO) which addresses the nation's interagency combating terrorism requirements. The TSWG conducts the national interagency research and development (R&D) program for combating terrorism requirements. The TSWG is a unique forum with membership from more than eighty organizations across the Federal government. The Assistant Secretary of Defense, Homeland Defense actively participates. Projects are selected following a coordination process with other US Government agencies and with three countries - the United Kingdom, Canada, and Israel - with whom we conduct cooperative R&D programs. The TSWG has an impressive record of successful projects that have resulted in:

- Specific building design guidelines for protection against blast.
- Countermeasures to defeat improvised explosive and chemical/biological devices.
- Personal protection equipment.

- Equipment for military and civilian response teams for chemical incidents.

Numerous TSWG developed systems are deployed supporting our troops today. We continue to serve the technology needs of the warfighter in eliminating the threat itself. The Secretary of Defense has noted repeatedly that to address any of a myriad of threats we shall be facing, it is necessary to shorten the decision cycle for force definition, equipping, and deployment. Through its numerous requirements-driven successes and by continuing to reflect partnered cooperation across its subgroups and among Federal agencies, the Combating Terror Technology Support Program has shown it can meet that expectation.

I am responsible for the Department's worldwide Antiterrorism policy and oversight of our antiterrorism programs. My office works closely with that of the Assistant Secretary for Homeland Defense on domestic aspects. SO/LIC establishes antiterrorism standards and monitors the DOD Component Antiterrorism programs to reduce vulnerability. My office co-chairs the Antiterrorism Coordination Committee - Senior Steering Group with the Joint Staff Director of Operations. This is the senior corporate body within the Department of Defense charged with the responsibility to foster cooperation and coordination of Antiterrorism activities. The most critical function of the forum is to act as a clearinghouse for policy recommendations to the Secretary of Defense

concerning the protection of DOD personnel and their family members, facilities, critical infrastructure and other material resources from terrorist acts.

Global War on Terrorism

When I appeared before you last year, I identified several priorities I would have as the ASD (SO/LIC). These priorities were not comprehensive but did reflect general areas or issues that require special commitment and attention. The first and the most obvious and of immediate importance - continued execution of the global war on terrorism. I believe that the United States is at a critical moment in this war. We have realized initial successes and achieved a degree of momentum that together support a general assessment that we are making progress in winning this war. But sustaining that momentum and continuing the successes against terrorists and their supporters now and into the future is just as critical.

For the past two-plus years we have examined how the attacks of 9/11 have changed how we define “defense,” and how, as a consequence, the war on terrorism is fundamentally a different type of war than those we have fought before. Prior to then we perceived and responded to the threat of global terrorism in terms of transnational criminal activity, albeit politically or religiously motivated. Today's international terrorist is far different than those of the past, as terrorists now have global reach, infrastructure, and significant resources. While

SOF were always a part of the equation in addressing terrorism, the posture and role of SOF today in combating and defeating global terrorism has changed.

Indeed, that is true of the entire military and the entire concept of national defense. Previously, we were postured to defend against a state projecting force across great distances, and we built extensive capabilities to provide us early warning and tools to deter aggression. But the potential destructiveness of an attack of the type we suffered on 9/11 means that we are no longer afforded an opportunity to determine an “appropriate response,” nor make a clear determination of when decisive action is too little or too late. For reasons we all understand, SOF have become a critical military tool in taking the war to the terrorists before it can be fought on our own soil or that of our allies.

Special operations forces are uniquely qualified for that mission. Because of those qualifications and the demands of the war on terrorism the Department of Defense has been structuring and shaping SOF in different ways. While SOF were originally conceived to be used as forces for supporting or leveraging larger conventional forces in battle, or for undertaking discrete, limited strategic missions, the new reality has given SOF a prominent, front-line, essential role in the defense of our nation. The most important manifestation of this change is the designation of USSOCOM to be the supported (or "lead") command in the war on terrorism. SOCOM will plan and execute key missions as a supported combatant

command. USSOCOM is expanding to directly plan combat missions against terrorist organizations and execute those missions as the supported Command, while maintaining the role of force provider and supporter to the Geographic Combatant Commanders.

This means SOF will continue to support regional commanders, while also at times being supported by other combatant commands. SOF are still the first in and last out in many contingency operations around the globe. SOF must be ready to act at any time, in all environments, overtly or clandestinely; alone or in concert with other U.S. personnel and coordinating foreign forces.

Before I discuss further what has changed and what our new national security imperatives require of SOF, I want to note explicitly that one of the most important factors and essential considerations for us has not changed: the importance of the special operator. In terms of missions performed and in the qualities of the individuals who undertake those missions, the special operations operator is truly unique and requires a different type of mindset on our end in terms of planning and support. These warriors must be capable of conducting strategic operations in all tactical environments with language proficiency, cultural awareness, political sensitivity and the ability to maximize information age technology. Recruiting, training and retaining special operations forces will not be without challenges. The analysis to date indicates that we will have the right

numbers to sustain the forces the nation needs. Training instructors have been added to the staff of the John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and the Naval Special Warfare Center. The number of training slots has increased for Army Special Forces, Civil Affairs, and Psychological Operations. In addition, special pay and bonuses have helped retention in these highly specialized areas and units. We will continue to closely monitor our ability to have the right numbers not only in operational units today but also in the training pipeline that produces the forces we require in the future. In many respects force management is the most critical problem facing SOF. We must never lose sight of what we call the “SOF Truths:”

- Quality is better than quantity.
- SOF cannot be mass produced.
- Competent SOF cannot be created after a crisis occurs.
- Humans are more important than hardware.

These truths have been reaffirmed by the superb performance of our SOF in Afghanistan, Iraq, Colombia, the Philippines and many other countries around the world. I am keenly aware of how very much the dedication and commitment of our special operations professionals are appreciated by every member of this Committee.

One effect of the global war on terrorism has been a significant increase in operational tempo for special operations forces. The Department of Defense has added 3,700 additional personnel during the period FY2004-2009 for USSOCOM.

This additional strength growth supports the manning requirements to wage the global war on terrorism. The increases are focused on fixed and rotary-wing aviation, SEAL Teams, Civil Affairs (CA), Psychological Operations, and Theater Special Operations Commands.

Recently, I had the privilege to visit both SOF and conventional forces in Iraq. These forces make us proud – and should cause potential adversaries to pause before seeking to harm the United States. The commitment of SOF to pursuing terrorists to all corners of the globe is embedded in their mindset. The experience gained in defeating the Taliban and disrupting Al-Qaida in Afghanistan, destroying the brutal regime in Iraq and aiding friends and partners in other corners of the globe, such as Colombia and the Philippines, has matured our war fighters to a keen edge. Our challenge is to maintain that edge.

I also saw that the nature and importance of the new demands on SOF are apparent to the operators in the field, and they are clearly doing more with the additional manpower, funding and materiel we have given them to meet the new challenges to our national security. To meet that challenge, there are necessary increases in support and training. This level of support is required to meet the challenges of the war on terrorism. The change from a regional, reactive posture to a global, proactive posture could not be achieved nor sustained with the levels of funding, materiel, and forces that we had before 9/11.

Transformation

A second area of emphasis is transformation of SOF. USSOCOM is transforming SOF capabilities to meet the formidable challenges associated with waging war against terrorist cells scattered across the globe. The Command is building the capability to maintain sustained operations in areas where terrorist networks are operating. It is investing in critical "low-density/high-demand" aviation assets that provide SOF with the mobility necessary to deploy quickly and to execute their missions quickly. Investments in key command, control, and communications enhance support to the war on terrorism. The Command has added personnel to enhance the ability to sustain worldwide deployments and 24-hour-a-day operations. Any future SOF will be:

- (1) Sized, trained, and equipped to engage in any threat environment against any adversary
- (2) Culturally, linguistically, politically, and regionally focused
- (3) Rapidly deployable
- (4) Capable of conducting exceptionally - precise discriminate strikes against specific targets
- (5) Able to achieve operational and tactical superiority
- (6) Operationally and strategically agile joint forces that can develop and execute unconventional, audacious, and high pay-off courses of action.

The FY2005 President's Budget Submission for USSOCOM is \$6.546 billion.

This funding request will continue the modernization and transformation effort started in FY 2004. It will enable USSOCOM to:

- (1) Transform SOF capabilities to better locate and track individual terrorists across the globe and conduct small surgical operations with minimal risk to the employed force.
- (2) Maintain sustained operations in areas where terrorist networks are operating.
- (3) Continue to invest in critical “low-density/high-demand” aviation assets that provide SOF with the mobility necessary to deploy quickly and to execute their missions quickly.
- (4) Continue to invest in key command, control, and communications to more effectively support the war on terrorism.
- (5) Support the personnel USSOCOM has added to better support worldwide deployments and 24-hour-a-day operations.

This funding is essential to sustaining the necessary operations in the war on terrorism and to ensuring we can meet essential transformation requirements.

The hallmark of SOF is that they are adaptive to change and characterized by creativity. The success of change and transformation is the ability to maximize the ability of the human to think and problem solve while taking advantage of the rapid pace of technology. Transformation of SOF is a journey, not a destination

and there is no mark on the wall that will indicate we are finished transforming. Transformation is a continuing process that not only anticipates the future, but also seeks to create that future.

DoD Counternarcotics Efforts/Counternarcoterrorism

Each year, my office expends a great deal of time, effort, and resources to keep drugs from crossing our borders. This is a complex process that requires coordination and funding from all levels of government agencies, local and state law enforcement, and the foreign countries in which we assist in the eradication of crops and disruption of their transportation to the United States. A large portion of the profits from drug sales indirectly support terrorist organizations – another reason we are working hard to reduce the supply of drugs.

Illegal drug use exacts a heavy toll on American society every year. Illegal drugs account for billions of dollars in direct and indirect costs including health care, lost revenue due to crime, social welfare costs and lost productivity. While cocaine continues to be the single most serious drug threat, heroin, synthetic drugs, methamphetamines, and marijuana are also serious, and in some cases, increasing problems. Additionally, there are clear linkages between international narcotics trafficking and international terrorism. Global and regional terrorists threatening United States interests can finance their activities with the proceeds from narcotics trafficking. Terrorist groups such as the FARC in Colombia, Al Qaida in

Afghanistan, and groups around the world partially finance key operations with drug money. The Department of Defense, with our counterparts in the Department of State and other government agencies, as well as allies such as the United Kingdom seek to systematically dismantle drug trafficking networks, both to halt the flow of drugs into the United States, and to bolster the broader war on terrorism effort.

In accordance with statutory authorities, we use counternarcotics resources as effectively and efficiently as possible to achieve national and Department counternarcotics priorities. We focus on programs that fulfill statutory responsibilities and use military-unique resources and capabilities, and continue to advance the national priorities of the National Drug Control Strategy. Our counternarcotics authorities and funding are an effective combination that supports war on terrorism efforts and the implementation of the Department's Security Cooperation Guidance. Furthermore, they contribute to our efforts to secure the nation's borders and establish full maritime, ground, and air domain awareness of the approaches to our shores. We work closely with Assistant Secretary McHale's staff on these matters.

In the international arena, the Department of Defense provides much of its counternarcotics support through deployments and programs to train and furnish intelligence and operational support for drug detection, monitoring, and provide

equipment to partner counterdrug forces. These countertrafficking methods aim directly at disrupting the terrorist drug trade and finance networks that train partner-nation military forces.

This, of course, includes cooperative military-to-military programs in which countries grant access to our military operators and enable access to target areas. Our authorities permit us to: maintain, repair and upgrade equipment, transport personnel, establish bases of operations or training facilities, assist with detection, monitor and communicate trafficking activities, construct roads, fences, and lighting installations, establish C4 networks, provide intelligence analysis assistance and conduct aerial and ground reconnaissance.

Domestic CN Support

ASD SO/LIC works closely with USNORTHCOM and OASD (HD) on counternarcotics support to domestic law enforcement. The focus of this support is managed through Joint Task Force Six in El Paso, Texas which provides active duty and reserve missions in areas of engineering support, aerial and ground reconnaissance, transportation and logistics support and intelligence. These counternarcotics missions provide excellent training in real world situations and enhance domestic security. In order to alleviate stress on our active duty forces, the Department first turns to the National Guard to provide support to domestic law enforcement. To effectively meet this objective, the Department is

transitioning the National Guard counterdrug effort out of missions that are not militarily unique (cargo-mail inspections, maintenance and logistics, marijuana eradication), to those that are militarily unique (air/ground reconnaissance, intelligence analysis, training for law enforcement agencies), and is enhancing National Guard support to law enforcement along the Southwest Border, and at linguist centers in California and Washington.

Foreign Consequence Management (FCM)

I also oversee Department of Defense policy on support to Foreign Consequence Management (FCM) operations. FCM operations focus on providing specialized assistance in response to use of Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, Chemical, Explosives (CBRNE) against friends or allies, installations, vital interests, or U.S. military forces overseas.

An event overseas involving CBRNE would likely impact not only our friends and allies, but potentially U.S. civilian and military personnel stationed abroad. It is in our interest to be ready to help save lives and reduce suffering in the aftermath of such an event, just as many of our friends assisted us in the aftermath of the 9-11 attack.

The primary responsibility for managing and mitigating the effects of a foreign CBRNE incident resides with the host-nation government. The Department of

State is the lead Federal agency (LFA) for all DoD support to FCM operations. When requested by the LFA, and approved by the Secretary of Defense, the Department of Defense supports the LFA in FCM operations, as appropriate.

The Department of Defense geographic Combatant Commanders command and control all Department support to FCM operations within their respective areas of responsibility (AORs), in coordination with the appropriate U.S. Chief of Mission. We work closely with the Department of State to ensure that our contingency plans for support to an FCM operation are fully coordinated. Our geographic Combatant Commanders have been refining their contingency plans and exercising their capabilities for providing support to an FCM operation, should they be called upon to do so.

In closing, I would like to assure you that I will continue to work closely with my colleagues here with me today to make this nation safe and ensure that US Special Operations Forces continue to be the best trained, best equipped, most flexible and effective force available to our country.