

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASED BY THE COMMITTEE**

Prepared Statement
of
The Honorable Donald H. Rumsfeld
Secretary of Defense
On the
Crusader Recommendation
Before the
Senate Committee on Armed Services
May 16, 2002

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASED BY THE COMMITTEE**

Introduction

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for this opportunity to discuss the Department's recommendation to terminate the Crusader program, continue some of the Crusader technology, and move the funds to technology and programs to better serve our country.

President Bush has said:

"I expect the military's . . . priorities to match our strategic vision -- not the particular visions of the services -- but a joint vision for change . . . I will direct the Secretary of Defense to allocate these funds to . . . new programs that do so. I intend to force new thinking and hard choices."

That statement was not made in the context of the decision on Crusader. It was made by then-Governor Bush, in remarks to cadets at the Citadel back in September 1999. He told the American people what he planned, and we are purposefully pursuing that goal.

On that day in 1999, the President warned, "We are witnessing a revolution in the technology of war. Power is increasingly defined not by size," he said, "but by mobility and swiftness. Influence is measured in information; safety is gained in stealth; and forces are projected on the long arc of precision-guided weapons."

So, one might ask, why now? What took so long to put structure behind the President's vision -- a vision he laid out plainly for all to see? And a vision I discussed with this Committee at my confirmation hearing in January 2001.

I remember, as I'm sure you do, the clamor throughout 2001, and into early this year, to get on with the tough decisions -- as though the transformation of our armed forces could be measured in terms of which programs were killed, and how fast it was done.

That is not how we saw it. In testimony before this Committee, I said we would engage our brains before engaging the taxpayer's pocketbooks. We said we would be deliberate, not rushed; that we preferred to get it right.

The decision to recommend termination of the Crusader program was not reached precipitously—as some recent commentary has suggested—but after months of careful review, wide-ranging discussion, and in-depth planning and analysis—a review of not just the Crusader program, but of future capabilities, of the strategy to guide us, and of a framework for assessing and balancing risks.

The senior leaders of the Department – military and civilian – Service chiefs, Service Secretaries, the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, the Under Secretaries—and I, spent countless hours discussing strategies, capabilities, threats and risks.

That process of review, discussion, planning and analysis started well before September 11th. Tragically, September 11th confirmed many of our conclusions. I will recount that process, so that the proper context for the Crusader decision can be understood.

President Bush's Transformation Vision

President Bush shaped the context, the direction, of that process in his Citadel remarks.

He talked about an era of proliferation of “missile technology and weapons of mass destruction ... an era of car bombers and plutonium merchants ... of cyber terrorists ... and dictators. He cautioned of “barbarism emboldened by technology.”

“These challenges,” he said in 1999, “can be overcome, but they can't be ignored.”

“The best way to keep the peace,” he said, “is to redefine war on our terms. We must shape the future with new concepts, new strategies, and new resolve.”

If elected, he said he would initiate a “comprehensive review of our military, the state of its strategy, the priorities of procurement.” He talked about the opportunities “to skip a generation of technology.” In the future, he said, “We may not have months to transport massive divisions to waiting bases, or to build new infrastructure on site.”

He said, “Our forces in the next century must be agile, lethal, readily deployable, and require a minimum of logistical support. We must be able to project . . . power over long distances, in days or weeks rather than months. Our military must be able to identify targets by a variety of means, from a Marine patrol to a satellite -- Then be able to destroy those targets almost instantly, with an array of weapons . . .”

“On land, our heavy forces must be lighter. Our light forces must be more lethal. All must be easier to deploy. And these forces must be organized in smaller, more agile formations . . .”

Still later, the President spoke of emerging threats and reinforced the need to prepare for the future. “Keeping America safe,” he said, “is a challenge that's well within our reach --*if* we work together to shape the budgets, programs, strategies, and force structure necessary to meet the threats we face and those that are emerging.”

It was a direction and an urgency that I underscored in testimony before this Committee on June 21 of last year, warning that the new technology of war is advancing – not in decades – but in months and years, and that we must take advantage of the time we have to prepare for the challenges we are sure to face in the years ahead.

Last year, Mr. Chairman, we began to put that thinking into action.

Transformation and the 2001 QDR

In May of 2001, the Department’s senior leaders—civilian and military—began intensive discussions about where America’s military should go in the years ahead. We agreed on the need for real changes in U.S. defense strategy. The outline of those changes is reflected in the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR).

Among the new directions set in the QDR, the following four are perhaps the most important:

First, we decided to move away from the two Major Theater War (MTW) force planning construct, which called for maintaining forces capable of, nearly simultaneously, marching on and occupying the capitals of two regional adversaries and changing their regimes.

Today’s new approach emphasizes deterrence in four critical theaters, backed by the ability to swiftly defeat two aggressors in the same timeframe, while preserving the option for one major offensive to occupy an aggressor’s capital and replace the regime. And it calls for the ability to execute several lesser contingencies as well.

By making this adjustment, we gain more flexibility in planning for a wider array of contingencies, and we gain more flexibility in investing for the future.

Second, during the QDR, the senior civilian and military leaders agreed on a new framework for assessing risk. We agreed that we couldn’t judge a program simply on how it addressed near-term warfighting risks. A new framework was required, one that would put other types of risk up on the table as well.

We identified four specific categories of risk:

- Force management risks – which concern how we sustain our people, equipment, and infrastructure;
- Operational risks – which concern the ability of our forces to accomplish the missions called for in near-term military plans;

- Future challenges risks – which address the investments and changes needed today to permit us to meet the military challenges of the mid- to more-distant future; and last, the
- Institutional risk – which involves inefficient processes and excessive support requirements that hinder our ability to use resources efficiently.

The approach we adopted sought to balance the various risks in all of these categories, and avoid extreme solutions that would lower risks in some areas while raising other risks to unacceptable levels.

While it is understandable and expected that reasonable people may differ on specific decisions regarding a given investment or budgetary decision, it is important to understand the need to balance among the different categories of risks that we confront today on this issue of the Crusader.

Third, to contend with a world of surprise and uncertainty, we are shifting our planning from the “threat-based” model that has guided DoD thinking in the past to a “capabilities-based” model for the future. What does this mean? In short, it means that we can’t know precisely who may threaten us or when or where. But, we can know what sort of capabilities we may be threatened with, and how. We can also determine which capabilities are most likely to provide us with important new advantages.

Fourth, to support this capabilities-based approach to force planning, we worked to focus transformation efforts by defining goals. Historically, successful cases of transformation have occurred in the face of compelling strategic and operational challenges. What then are the challenges of the 21st century, and how can we best meet them?

Six Transformational Goals—Taking Care of Today while Investing in Tomorrow

Setting specific transformation goals has helped focus transformation efforts. The six goals identified in the QDR are:

- First, to defend the U.S. homeland and other bases of operations, and deter and defeat nuclear, biological and chemical weapons and their means of delivery;
- Second, to deny enemies sanctuary
- Third, to project and sustain forces in distant theaters in the face of access denial threats;
- Fourth, to conduct effective operations in space;
- Fifth, to conduct effective information operations; and,

- Sixth, to leverage information technology to give our joint forces a common operational picture.

Taken together, these goals will guide and inform the military's transformation efforts and improvements in U.S. joint forces.

As the President foresaw, U.S. ground forces must be lighter, more lethal, and highly mobile; they must be capable of insertion far from traditional ports and air bases. They must be networked to leverage the synergy that comes from combining ground maneuver forces with long-range precision fires.

Naval and amphibious forces must be able to assure U.S. access even in area-denial environments, operate close to enemy shores, and project power deep inland. Air forces -- manned and unmanned -- must be able to locate and track mobile targets persistently over vast areas and strike rapidly at long-ranges without warning.

The point is not to substitute air power for ground power – as some critics have demanded. Instead, it is the asymmetric opportunity that comes from integrating ground, air, maritime and space capabilities in a networked web of forces.

Today, forces are now operating jointly in ways that were unimaginable before the information and telecommunications revolutions.

Providing Capabilities to Meet the Transformational Goals

The Fiscal Year 2003 budget request before you now draws from many of the things we learned in developing the QDR. The budget request set the signposts for the transformation of US defense capabilities. It included important increases for:

- Developing defense systems against asymmetric threats including chemical and biological weapons, cruise and ballistic missiles, as well as for strengthening intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities;
- Accelerating the fielding of unmanned aerial vehicles, like Predator and Global Hawk, and Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicles;
- Converting Trident submarines to conduct new missions, including high-volume, conventional land-attack and special operations;
- Developing advanced communications, including laser communications to deliver fiber-optics quality broadband to U.S. forces anywhere in the world;
- Accelerating the introduction of near real-time, secure, and joint data links; and for

- Accelerating the fielding of a variety of new precision munitions.

These leveraging investments in intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, integration, networking and precision strike are signposts of the future transformed force.

There are many new transformation starts in this budget -- most of which will not reach fruition within our programming horizon. As new transformation initiatives mature, we must be prepared to make adjustments in programs to take advantage of success and move beyond those that fail. In doing so, we need to balance between the need to be ready for war tomorrow and the need to be prepared for future wars.

As part of this transformation effort, we are taking steps to shift the balance of the weapons inventory to emphasize precision weapons—weapons that are precise in time, space, and in their effects. In that regard, the Department is developing a range of new conventional precision and miniature munitions for attacking deep underground facilities, mobile targets, targets in dense urban areas, and for defeating chemical and biological weapons.

Resources are always finite. Tough choices have to be made – Such choices are generally not made between the good and bad, the needed or not needed, or between what is wanted and not wanted. Tough choices are made at the margin, most often between programs that are both desirable, both needed, and both wanted—but, nonetheless, choices have to be made.

Although this year’s defense budget increase is the largest in a long time, virtually the entire increase was “spoken for”:

- to cover inflation (\$6.7 billion);
- “must-pay” bills for health care and pay raises (\$14.1 billion);
- unrealistic costing of readiness and procurement in the past (\$7.4 billion); and
- funding the global war on terror (\$19.4 billion).

Approximately \$9.3 billion in resources has been shifted by terminating a number of programs. Major terminations include the DD-21 Destroyer program, which has been replaced by a restructured DD (X) program that will develop a new family of surface combatants with revolutionary improvements in stealth, propulsion, and other technologies. Some 18 Army legacy systems have been terminated.

As we put together the FY 2003 budget that is now before you, many major programs – including Crusader -- required further review. As I’ve described, most of last year was spent developing the strategic framework within which to consider individual programs against required capabilities. There was a considerable amount of pressure from some quarters to get on

with the tough decisions. We decided it would be best to defer them until we had completed the new defense strategy and had the time to study our future circumstance. The decisions we have made and will make are against that backdrop.

In February of this year, we began developing the Defense Planning Guidance for the Fiscal Year 2004 budget and the Fiscal Years 2004-2009 program. The senior civilian and military leadership team had to focus on the looming problem of a sizable procurement “bow wave” beyond fiscal year 2007—shorthand for describing the procurement of systems that would be ready for fielding late in this decade that, if funded, would crowd out other areas of investment and thereby cause a repetition of many of the same headaches we suffer today as a result of the procurement holiday in the 1990s. The time to address that “bow wave” is now—earlier, not later.

To deal with the bow wave we face requires decisions now about major defense acquisition programs – which brings us to Crusader.

But before I get to that, Mr. Chairman, I would like to mention some of the lessons learned from Operation Enduring Freedom that I believe have a bearing on this issue as well.

Lessons Learned From Operation Enduring Freedom

Since fall of last year, the Department has been compiling insights from the war in Afghanistan. Five lessons in particular stand out, especially in the context of evaluating Crusader.

- o **Flexibility.** The war in Afghanistan was not a war that U.S. forces had planned to fight. There was no war plan on the shelf. There were no pre-positioned stockpiles of equipment or basing agreements with neighboring countries. The United States went to war on the fly. It speaks to the skill of the U.S. Armed Services that in less than a month from the terrorist attacks of September 11, a plan had been developed and the war was joined. The flexibility of the men and women of the armed forces to shift from the familiar to confront the unknown is a key advantage. U.S. forces will be confronted with future surprises, for which they will also require flexibility. U.S. forces must not only have a flexible mindset, they will also need capabilities that are more flexible and capable of adapting to a wide variety of circumstances.
- o **Speed of Deployment and Employment.** Rapidly deployable and employable forces served as the vanguard force in Afghanistan. Air, ground, and maritime forces that could enter the theater quickly proved most valuable in the initial phase of the war. Future wars are also likely to require a swift U.S. response to defeat aggression. As in this case, U.S. forces may not have the luxury in future contingencies of long lead times for deployments. They may well also have less time to acclimatize and stage once they enter an overseas theater. They will have to be able to hit the ground fighting.
- o **Restricted Access.** Given the limited access to basing in the region, especially adjacent to and within Afghanistan, systems that can only enter the fight through large ports and airfields were of limited utility. The infrastructure in many areas of the world will not permit

oversized systems to be inserted. Moreover, as more and more adversaries acquire the means to deny U.S. forces traditional access – through man-portable air defenses, ballistic missiles, mines, and chemical and biological weapons – U.S. forces will likely have to enter theaters through non-traditional avenues, such as over beaches, through mountains, and smaller landing areas and airfields.

- o Integration of Ground and Air Power. One of the most powerful lessons from the war has been the power that comes from the combination of forces on the ground and long-range air power. Having U.S. forces on the ground early in Afghanistan contributed directly to success. We saw soldiers armed with rifles, maneuvering on horseback, using advanced communications to direct strikes by 50-year-old bombers. The integration of ground and air power can, in some circumstances, allow small teams on the ground to achieve effects far beyond their numbers. At the same time, ground forces providing “eyes” for pilots in the air dramatically increased the effectiveness of air power.
- o Precision. A final lesson is that precision matters. In many cases, U.S. Special Forces on the ground were calling in long-range bombers to provide tactical close air support. This had never been done before. Precision allowed forces on the ground, in the heat of battle, to call in air strikes close to their own positions. It reduced the number of friendly fire incidents, as well as incidents of civilian collateral damage. At the same time, precision meant that fewer weapons needed to be fired. Precision munitions accounted for roughly two-thirds of the total number of munitions used in the war, compared with only 30% in Kosovo and 7% in Desert Storm. The trend is clear. Increasingly, the munitions all U.S. forces – air, sea and ground forces – employ will need to be precision-guided.
- o In light of these lessons learned, the tenets of the new defense strategy, and analysis of the future budgetary situation, the senior leadership considered the case of Crusader.

The Crusader Decision

The decision to recommend termination of the Crusader program is not about killing a bad system. It is potentially a good system. It is not about a system that could not be used. It could. And it is a system that is wanted by many. But that is not the issue. The issue is how do we balance the risks. In short, it is about foregoing a system originally designed for a different strategic context, to make room for more promising technologies that can accelerate transformation.

Let there be no doubt, when fielded, early in the next decade, Crusader would have represented a measurable improvement over the existing Paladin howitzer in both rate of fire and speed of maneuver. (Both Paladin and Crusader are indirect fire systems. Indirect fire systems include howitzers as well as rocket systems.) But we are concerned that it is better to invest that money where it can be used to prove the truly transformational capabilities – capabilities such as increased accuracy, more-rapid deployability, and the ability to network fires -- that will make Army indirect fire systems effective and relevant on the battlefields of the 21st century.

Fundamentally, the debate over Crusader is about whether to spend roughly \$9 billion more to procure some 480 Crusader howitzers or, instead, use funds to accelerate a variety of precision munitions, including GPS-guided rounds for all U.S. 155mm cannons, as well as adding GPS guidance and accuracy to upgraded Multiple Launch Rocket System vehicles and the more mobile, wheeled versions of this system, the High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS).

Transforming to give our country the capabilities that revolutionary changes in technology offer and to enable us to fight and win the nation's wars in the 21st century as effectively as we did in the last century, requires hard choices and tough decisions. The hardest choices are those about balancing risks between the challenges we face in the near and mid-term and those less certain, but possibly more formidable, challenges that we will face in the longer term. That was the choice we have made in recommending terminating Crusader and shifting the funding into programs that are more appropriate to the future.

It is not, of course, an indication that the U.S. can do without ground forces. That is nonsense. To the contrary, it is a decision that reflects confidence that the Army has set a course over the longer term that is a good course and, indeed, needs to be accelerated. Nor is it a decision that the future Army can manage without indirect fires and rely solely on air support. Rather, it is a decision that precision in artillery and rocket fires can be as revolutionary as it has already proven in air-delivered weapons, and that mobility and rapid deployability will be crucial in the future, not only in getting to the battlefield, but in maneuvering over potentially vast battle areas.

In short, Mr. Chairman, it was a decision about balancing risks, a decision that was made after long and careful consideration of what those risks are and what capabilities this nation will require in the coming decades.

The defense strategy established last year in the Report of the Quadrennial Defense Review emphasized the need for U.S. forces to demonstrate an ability to swiftly and surely defeat adversaries in distant theaters, and by doing so, deter them. In particular, the strategy confirmed the need for ground forces that are lighter, more lethal, and more readily deployable than today's force.

Throughout the conflict in Afghanistan, we have seen the remarkable synergy between ground, air and naval forces. If nothing else, Operation Enduring Freedom has demonstrated some of the advantages that can be achieved with joint, integrated approaches to warfare. Not only is the safety and effectiveness of our troops improved, the result is the rapid and precise destruction of enemy forces. We know that ground operations will continue to be a critical dimension of warfare, and that accurate indirect fires will continue to play an important role in deterring and defeating a range of potential adversaries.

In light of the new defense strategy and initial insights from the war, DoD senior leadership weighed the relative merits of Crusader against other alternatives to meet the Army's need for organic indirect fires – both cannon and rocket. Following extensive discussion and

evaluation, it became apparent that, on balance, alternatives to Crusader would be more consistent with both the new defense strategy and with the Army's overall transformation effort.

Today, revolutionary improvements in indirect fire systems appear to be within reach and offer reasonable alternatives to Crusader – alternatives that should provide greater precision, more rapid deployability, greater range, and the ability to integrate fires. We are working to determine precisely where Crusader funding should be reallocated.

Specifically, precision fire is proving to be one of the most transformational improvements in modern warfare, as we have seen already with the Tomahawk cruise missile and GPS-guided bombs.

Precision can have a transformational effect on indirect fire systems. Precision means that fires are more lethal and able to attack targets more rapidly, before they can attack or disappear. Precision also means fewer rounds expended to defeat a given target, and, therefore, less logistical burden. Because logistics are vital, this provides greater ability to deploy an effective force quickly. And, of critical importance, precision can enable us to reduce collateral damage and make it considerably more difficult for enemies to hide in concentrated population centers.

Accelerating the development of satellite-guided artillery shells, such as the Excalibur munition, and the Guided Multiple Launch System, would bring the precision revolution we have witnessed in airpower to the Army.

We are also considering the possible acceleration of highly mobile and more readily deployable indirect fire systems, such as the High Mobility Artillery Rocket System. This system could easily be transported in smaller C-130 aircraft and that mobility means it could keep pace with other vehicles in the Army's Planned Objective Force – an important consideration.

In short, the decision to recommend that we skip Crusader is one that emphasizes accelerating the shift to precision munitions of all indirect fire systems—cannon as well as rocket, Marine Corps as well as Army. Our recommendation is not to abandon the technologies already developed by the Crusader program. In fact, it would ensure that the key pieces of Crusader technology are maintained for use in both the Army's Future Combat System, and possibly in the advanced gun system the Navy is developing for its future surface combatants.

In the near- to mid-term, however, our conclusion is that accelerating precision rounds for indirect fire systems will increase the overall capability of our forces more than procuring 480 Crusader platforms.

This recommendation also reflects the contribution that rocket systems already make for indirect fires. Following the 1991 Gulf War, an Iraqi artillery battalion commander said, "after a

month of bombing, I had 17 of 18 tubes left. After one day of ground war—with the US using Multiple-Launch Rocket System (MLRS) fires—I had one tube left.”

Skipping Crusader to emphasize precision munitions and rocket systems does not put US forces at risk as some have suggested. Rather it will reduce future risk and speed the introduction of critical capabilities.

This decision also invests in the future army, in integrated combined arms, greater deployability and lethality. While technology influences transformation significantly, substantial and lasting change generally requires changes in operational concepts and military culture. The Army’s objective force will represent not only a technological, but also a conceptual and cultural change. The Crusader, by contrast, would have represented a way station in that change process. While a technological advancement over the Paladin howitzer, it was conceived for a traditional, mass force counterattack role. In short, it was not critical to the Army’s overall transformation effort, or to our broader defense strategy.

By implementing this recommendation, we ensure that the U.S. Armed Forces will continue to overmatch the capabilities of any potential adversary now and in the future – not tank for tank, aircraft for aircraft, or cannon for cannon, as in the past, but asymmetrically. Rather than any single element alone, the combination of US joint forces and precision can ensure that the US maintains the advantage on the battlefield.

Some have raised concerns that these technologies are not far enough along. To be sure, there is much work to be done and I am not here to oversell any one of them. But the C-130 transportable rocket system – HIMARS -- for example, is further along than Crusader. Furthermore, we have growing expertise in precision guidance systems – we are using them to great effect in Operation Enduring Freedom – and very little expertise in some of the more unproved aspects of the Crusader. For example, the system is designed to be heavily automated, but automated systems fail and the manual back-ups we would need pose are a challenging dimension that is relatively immature and unproved.

Taken together, the systems we are examining can offer greater improvements in precision, range, and deployability. By foregoing the Crusader, we have the opportunity to produce revolutionary capabilities and ensure their earlier integration into the Army. The question that must be asked and answered is: are the interim capabilities Crusader would have provided worth the delay in acquiring indirect fire systems that are truly transformational?

There are certainly honorable, knowledgeable Army generals who will say yes – And I respect that. But there are also honorable Army Generals who will advise you that we should press ahead with new technologies. It has always been so.

Conclusion

Mr. Chairman, for most of the last 50 years, the US military faced a fairly predictable set of threats. During the Cold War, we had one primary adversary, the Soviet Union. We came to know a great deal about that adversary, its strategies and its capabilities, and we fashioned our strategies and capabilities accordingly. The resulting mix of U.S. weapons and forces allowed us to keep the peace and defend freedom for these many decades.

Preparing for the future, however, requires a different strategy, different forces and capabilities, and most important, a different way of thinking. Rather than static adversaries and threats, we face a new security environment in which surprise and uncertainty are the defining characteristics. Thus, we must be prepared to adapt to an ever-evolving set of challenges and circumstances.

In short, we have entered a new age, and we must transform to meet it. To do so, we must prepare our forces to deter and defeat threats and adversaries that may have not yet even emerged.

I recognize that the decision to recommend cancellation comes at a time when the Congress is considering the President's fiscal year 2003 budget request. Certainly, had it been possible, it would have been preferable to make this recommendation last year. However, as I've described, at that time our focus was on developing the proper framework for the important program decisions.

Nevertheless, having reached the conclusions we did, it is clear that continuing to fund a program we know will not best meet the mission would be irresponsible and a misuse of taxpayers' dollars. If there is one thing that September 11th has taught us, it is that we can no longer ignore the warnings of the past or delay preparation for the future.

Mr. Chairman, in that 1999 speech to the Citadel, President Bush told new cadets, "I will not command the new military we create. That will be left to a president who comes after me ... The outcome of great battles," he said, "is often determined by decisions on funding and technology made decades before, in the quiet days of peace.

And, Mr. Chairman, he also said to the Congress: "Join me in creating a new strategic vision for our military.

"Moments of national opportunity," he said, "are either seized or lost, and the consequences reach across decades. ... Now comes the time of testing. Our measure is taken, not only by what we have and use, but also by what we build and leave behind. And nothing this generation could ever build will matter more than the means to defend our nation and extend our peace."

Mr. Chairman, like the President, I look forward to working with Congress, and with this Committee, to ensure that the taxpayers' funds we invest and the systems we select will give the Nation the joint capabilities we will need—and, to be sure, that includes the Army and artillery. But, more important, we must work together to provide not simply what any one Service may want, but rather the joint warfighting capability that will be necessary for our Combatant Commanders and our Armed Forces to deter and defend and contribute to the peace and stability that is so essential to our nation's security in the next decade and beyond.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.