

Testimony of Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice
Before the House Armed Services Committee
With Secretary of Defense Robert Gates
April 15, 2008

Chairman Skelton, Ranking Member Hunter, Members of the Committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today with my friend and colleague Bob Gates. Our joint testimony is both symbolic and practical: symbolically, it reflects our deep commitment to addressing jointly the unprecedented challenges to national security and foreign policy we face today; practically, it recognizes the contributions that the Department of State and the Department of Defense each make to our security partnership. Our ability to defend American interests and to project American values depends on the resources we receive, the authorities we have to use these resources, and the success with which our two departments cooperate in sharing those resources and authorities. In our view, this is a successful and growing partnership.

Since 2001, this Administration has begun the long-term effort of rebuilding and transforming American diplomacy for the challenges of a new era. This transformation can be seen in various ways. On the one hand, globalization – the growing interdependence among peoples and governments and the rapid international movement of information, of capital, of technology and of people -- is empowering those states that can seize its benefits. At the same time, globalization is revealing the weaknesses of many states, their inability to govern effectively and to create opportunities for their people. Many of these states are falling behind. Others are simply failing. And when they do they create holes in the fabric of the international system where terrorists can arm and train to kill the innocent, where criminal networks can traffic in drugs and people and weapons of mass destruction, and where civil conflict can fester and spread and spill over to affect entire regions. Just think of the Afghanistan of 2001.

Perhaps our greatest foreign policy challenge, now and in decades to come, then, stems from the many states that are simply too weak, too corrupt, or too poorly governed to perform even basic sovereign responsibilities, like policing their territory, governing justly, enabling the potential of their people, and preventing the threats that gather within their countries from destabilizing their neighbors and, ultimately, the international system.

In response to these unprecedented challenges, our foreign policy and national security strategy must be guided by the objective to work with our many international partners to build and sustain a world of democratic, well-governed states that respond to the needs of their people, that reduce widespread poverty, and that conduct themselves responsibly in the international system.

We will not meet the challenges of the 21st century through military or any other means alone. Our national security requires the integration of our universal principles with all elements of our national power: our defense, our diplomacy, our development assistance, our democracy promotion efforts, free trade, and the good work of our private sector and society. And it is the State Department, more than any other agency of government, that is called to lead this work.

President Bush has designated the State Department as a national security agency. And to fulfill this mandate, transformational diplomacy requires a civilian-led, whole-of-government approach to the challenges of our time. Already, our diplomats are showing and have shown that with adequate funding and support, they can lead this kind of effort.

That is the essence of transformational diplomacy, and we measure our success in the progress countries make in moving from war to peace, despotism to democracy, poverty and inequality to prosperity and social justice. This mission will require our diplomats to be active in new places far beyond the walls of foreign chancelleries and American embassies. It will also require them to work with new partners, not only with a nation's government but also its local leaders and civil society, its entrepreneurs and its NGOs.

To address these challenges, we have redeployed diplomats from European posts and from Washington to countries of greater need and in response to conflict and opportunity. In our FY 2009 budget request, we have sought to increase the size of our diplomatic corps to address significant reductions experienced in the 1990s, requesting 1100 new positions for the Department of State and 300 new positions at the U.S. Agency for International Development. We are training our diplomats for non-traditional roles, especially in stabilization and reconstruction activities and in outreach to underserved areas in countries of growing importance and influence. These changes have made the Department more capable and ready to handle reconstruction and development tasks linked to security concerns and undertaken in concert with the Department of Defense.

Transformational Diplomacy refers not only to the reallocation of our resources, but also to a new approach to addressing the foreign policy challenges posed by unstable states and regions that are too weak or too poorly governed to meet the needs of their populations. Some states are failing, or have already failed, due to internal political, economic, or social dysfunction. The challenge we have faced since 2001, and that we will face going forward, is to find the appropriate means to assist these states in ending conflict, in establishing stable civil societies, and in developing the means to care for their citizens and participate in the community of nations.

In this vein, consider for a moment the importance of Colombia. This is a country that many feared was very near being a failed state at the beginning of this decade. It was a country where bombings in the capital were routine, where the government was unable to control large areas of its territory due to the FARC or the paramilitaries, and where the foreign minister was held six years in captivity by the FARC and where three United States citizens and others are held hostage under deplorable conditions. Colombia has come a long way under President Uribe and his program for democratic security. We have supported him and his predecessor in doing this through Plan Colombia and its follow-on programs, a coordinated set of political and security initiatives that has had bipartisan support. As a result, President Uribe is a very popular leader in Colombia, because he has brought his people security and he is devoted to human rights and to

furthering the democratic enterprise. I was in Medellin in January with a Congressional delegation. Medellin used to be synonymous with Pablo Escobar and trouble. It is now a thriving city in which Colombian citizens believe they can be secure. Our continued assistance to Colombia through the benefits of a free trade agreement will continue this progress. I urge you to take up and pass the Colombia Free Trade Agreement implementing legislation.

In the State of the Union address in January 2007, the President also outlined his vision for a Civilian Response Corps, which would shoulder the responsibility to work with states recovering from conflict and instability. We envision the State Department in the 21st century working with our many partners, at home and abroad, to build and sustain a world of democratic, well-governed states that respond to the needs of their people, reduce widespread poverty, and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system.

This is a considerable challenge to our agencies. We will not always be able to pursue these goals in stable places; absent security, our objectives will remain elusive. But neither can we meet these challenges through military means alone. In order to fulfill the State Department's national security responsibilities, transformational diplomacy requires a civilian-led, comprehensive approach to the challenges we face, and effective civil-military partnerships where U.S. forces are on the ground in places like Iraq and Afghanistan and in other places where we will undoubtedly have to operate in the future.

The President's National Security Strategy requires a balance of diplomacy, development, and defense. If we are to succeed in combining the efforts of our civilian and military agencies, we will have to confront the problems presented by the enormous disparity in our respective resources. To this end, we agree on the need for greater capacity in the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development to allow for effective civilian response and civilian-military partnership.

Our civilian response resources and mechanisms will be ineffective if they remain underfunded. Secretary Gates spoke eloquently in a speech several months ago in Kansas, when he called for a dramatic increase in spending on the civilian elements of foreign policy that underpin our national security. If we are to coordinate the tools of our national power and align our civilian and military response capabilities, the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development will need significantly more resources for transitional short term foreign assistance, long-term development, targeted strategic communications, and effective stabilization and reconstruction programs. Funding is also needed for sustainable economic and security assistance programs designed to promote economic growth and political stability in viable democratic states. The President's FY2009 request is directed at these very needs.

To realize the vision of transformational diplomacy, America will also need to continue to forge a partnership between our civilians and our military. Our goal of fostering country progress will not always occur in peaceful places. Without security there can be no development, and without development there can be no democracy. Indeed, one of our most urgent national security challenges will remain the work that we do to support nations that are trying to lift themselves out of conflict, as we have done in Bosnia and Kosovo, Haiti and Liberia, and now in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

Further, America will remain engaged for many years in a new global confrontation unlike anything that we've ever faced. Leading security experts are increasingly thinking about the war on terrorism as a kind of global counterinsurgency. What that means is that the center of gravity in this conflict is not just the terrorists themselves, but the populations they seek to influence, and radicalize, and in many cases, terrorize. So our success will depend on unity of effort between our civilian and military agencies. Our fighting men and women can create opportunities for progress and buy time and space. But it is our diplomats and development professionals who must seize this opportunity to support communities that are striving for democratic values, economic advancement, social justice, and educational opportunity. It is by nurturing the prospect of hope that we defeat the purveyors of hate.

Civilian Stabilization Initiative

Among the means we are developing to respond to these challenges in general, and in particular, to failed and unstable states is the Civilian Stabilization Initiative. This initiative will create a rapid civilian response capability for use in Stabilization and Reconstruction environments that could be deployed alongside of our military, with international partners, or on their own. The Civilian Stabilization Initiative will consist of three kinds of civilian responders: an Active Response Corps of diplomats and interagency federal employees selected and trained for this capability; a Standby Response Corps of federal employees; and a Civilian Reserve Corps of private sector, local government and civil society experts with specialized skill sets. Following a decision to take action, we aim to deploy trained and equipped Active Response Corps members to a conflict zone within 48-72 hours of notification. The larger force of Standby and Civilian Reserve Corps members could be mobilized within two months. These civilians would operate under the Interagency Management System for Reconstruction and Stabilization, which provides a structure to unify U.S. Government efforts in a stabilization crisis. The President's budget includes \$248.6 million in FY09 to launch this capability.

We are also urging Congress to fund our Civilian Stabilization Initiative, an idea that finds its greatest supporters among our men and women in uniform. In recent years, we have tried two different approaches to post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction missions. Both have had their strengths and many weaknesses. One was in Afghanistan, where many countries adopted elements of the effort to build Afghan capacity. These were welcome efforts, but I have to tell you that we are still living with the incoherence of the effort. We see another approach was taken in Iraq where a single U.S. Government department, the Defense Department, found it difficult to harness the full range of our capabilities to conduct development and reconstruction in a counterinsurgency environment. The truth is that there was no single department, no institution in the U.S. Government, capable of doing these tasks.

The answer is the Civilian Response Corps. This expeditionary group will be led by a core team of diplomats that could, say, deploy with the 82nd Airborne within 48 hours of a country falling into conflict. These first responders would be able to summon the skills of hundreds of civilian experts across our federal government, as well as thousands of private volunteers – doctors and lawyers, engineers and agricultural experts, police officers and public administrators. Not only would a Civilian Response Corps take the burden of post-conflict reconstruction off the backs of our fighting men and women, where it was never supposed to be in the first place; this civilian organization could be deployed in times of peace, to strengthen weak states and prevent their collapse in the future.

Section 1206 Authority

The Department of State's security assistance authorities are remarkably flexible. They provide an excellent means to carry out foreign assistance priorities with allies and friendly, like-minded nations with whom we work in bilateral and multilateral efforts to advance international peace and security. The additional military assistance that has become available under Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) has proven to be an invaluable complement to State's existing authorities. I fully support this and other complementary foreign assistance authorities within the jurisdiction of this committee, most notably, the extension and expansion of Section 1206 and 1207 authorities. These two complementary authorities serve common purposes. In Section 1206, we have a new, "dual-key" approach to delivering resources for emergent short term military assistance needs and for counterterrorism activities. While not a substitute for more robust funding for our security assistance accounts, I strongly advocate continuing these important contingency authorities, which represent a new approach and additional tools for responding to foreign policy and national security challenges.

Secretary Gates has just spoken about Section 1206 of the 2006 NDAA, which created a unique three-year authority permitting DoD and State jointly to plan, execute, and oversee up to \$300 million annually in bilateral and regional military-to-military

programs. These programs support opportunities to develop foreign military forces' capacity to conduct counterterrorism operations or to support stability operations. Embassy country teams and regional combatant commands jointly formulate projects. As a "dual-key" program, the Secretaries of State and Defense must both approve the proposed projects. In FY 2006 and FY 2007, Section 1206 funding was reprogrammed from DoD's Operations and Maintenance account. In FY 2008, DoD will be funding this program at \$300 million.

In FY2006, Secretary Gates and I jointly approved 8 programs in 11 countries totaling approximately \$100M. In 2007, we approved 39 programs in 47 countries totaling \$280M. Our staffs are currently reviewing project proposals for FY 2008 that total more than \$900 million. The growth in the use of this program clearly indicates the value placed on this collaboration by Washington and by our commanders and chiefs of mission in the field. The program offers a means to respond to ongoing needs as they arise outside of our foreign assistance budgetary process.

Section 1207 Authority

Section 1207 of the FY 2006 NDAA has been a particularly welcome addition to the USG arsenal of supplemental foreign assistance authorities. It permits the Secretary of Defense to transfer up to \$100M per year to the State Department for furnishing timely infusions of critical reconstruction, security, and stabilization assistance. This program serves as a crucial emergency tool, tiding us over until longer term assistance can be provided. Working with the Defense Department, we have used this wisely, cooperatively, and quickly, for essential reconstruction and stabilization programs designed to enhance recipient countries' capacity for maintaining stability, and minimizing risks of lapsing into conflict and crisis.

A key focus of the 1207 program has been stabilization assistance, which has required strong interagency coordination. The State Department's Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, Ambassador John Herbst, is responsible for all coordination of reconstruction and stabilization activities, and for the Civilian Stabilization Initiative of

which I spoke earlier. He is also responsible for managing, on my behalf, the 1207 process, in close coordination with DoD and USAID. The 1207 mechanism calls for the type of interagency coordination that is part and parcel of an enhanced U.S. civilian response capability to imminent and actual crises – a capability made possible in part by the Coordinator and his supporting staff and by State, USAID, and Defense’s renewed commitment to strengthened coordination in this and other realms.

For FY 2006, we undertook a \$10 million pilot project for the transfer authority, reacting quickly to the crisis in Lebanon to train and equip police forces and to increase emergency demining. With DoD’s cooperation, we built on that experience in FY 2007, and transferred \$99 million in funding for projects in Haiti, Somalia, Colombia, Yemen, Mauritania, Mali, Niger, Malaysia, Indonesia, and the Philippines.

Let me mention a few uses of 1207 which were particularly timely and effective in responding to urgent needs for building civilian capacity within foreign governments -- an important counterpart to building military capacity under State military assistance and Section 1206 authorities.

In Colombia, the Initial Governance Response Plan (IGRP) under the Center for Coordination of Integrated Action received \$4 million to enable the government to strengthen its credibility and legitimacy in recently recovered areas through small, community driven projects. These activities increase the willingness and capacity of communities to cooperate with the government, and increase the capacity of the government to exercise timely, credible, and responsive civil functions in areas brought under civilian authority.

In Haiti, \$20 million in 1207 funds are being used to support the Haiti Stability Initiative (HSI). HSI focuses on Cité Soleil, Port au Prince’s most dangerous slum and a constant source of instability, where violent gangs had driven out governmental institutions, including local officials and the National Police, following the departure of President Aristide in 2004. By the end of 2006, joint UN peacekeeping (MINUSTAH)/Haitian

government anti-gang operations reestablished control over Cité Soleil and created a growing sense of stability. The gangs, however, continue to have a diminished but potentially destabilizing presence there. HSI is working to address the sources of conflict and violence in Cité Soleil through an interdisciplinary, multi-agency project closely combining aspects of security and development. It has been a catalyst for increased participation by other Donor nations.

We are currently in the process of assessing FY 2008 proposals from embassies around the world. In doing so, we are looking to maximize the impact of these resources by meeting the most critical short term reconstruction and stabilization needs.

Both Secretary Gates and I view the continuation and expansion of the 1207 program as a wise and essential investment. We strongly urge that the program be authorized for FY 2009 and beyond.

CT Collaboration

Interagency counterterrorism collaboration is extensive and effective. Our departments co-lead the Technical Support Working Group of the National Counterterrorism Research and Development Program. Through this program we develop cooperative CT technology agreements with friendly nations. From its inception two years ago, the Department's Regional Strategic Initiatives (RSI) bring together Chiefs of Mission and senior representatives from the Department of Defense and other agencies in key theaters of terrorist operations abroad to develop and implement coordinated counterterrorism strategies that use all elements of U.S. national power. Operating through the State Department's Coordinator for Counterterrorism, the RSIs and the strategies they produce are fully integrated into the National Counterterrorism Center's strategic planning efforts. The Department is also directing CT public diplomacy efforts through the Counterterrorism Communications Center (CTCC), an innovative interagency body that coordinates strategic communications in the War of Ideas. Operating under the auspices of my Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs, the CTCC is staffed by communications professionals in public affairs, public diplomacy, and

psychological operations, from State, DoD, and the intelligence community, to insure synchronized communications efforts.

Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism

We remain deeply concerned by the growing risk of nuclear terrorism and are determined to combat this threat. The Department is working closely with DoD and other Departments and Agencies in implementing the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism launched by Presidents Bush and Putin in July 2006. The expanded participation of over 66 partner nations in the Global Initiative demonstrates the strong desire of the international community to combat nuclear terrorism and the readiness to strengthen our capacity to prevent the acquisition of nuclear materials and know-how by terrorists.

Interagency Counterinsurgency Initiative

The Interagency Counterinsurgency Initiative, a joint State-Defense-USAID effort, provides a policy focus on insurgency and counterinsurgency. Based on experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Initiative develops policies and capabilities to enable the USG and our allies to deal more effectively with destructive and increasingly transnational armed insurgencies that threaten regional stability and international security.

Interagency Policy Coordination

The State Department provides foreign policy input into military planning processes through regional and functional expertise offered to Defense and military planners. These inputs help inform a range of strategic DoD guidance documents, contingency plans, and force planning scenarios, benefiting both military and diplomatic goals. We are actively participating in DoD's new Global Posture Executive Council, which will manage the global defense posture, and senior State officials now routinely attend high-level military planning conferences. In addition, State initiated and is collaborating closely with DoD on Project Horizon – an innovative alternative futures project that has convened 13 agencies to explore ways to improve long-term, whole-of-government strategic planning. State and DoD now co-lead the derivative Project Horizon

Interagency Strategic Planning Group, a grassroots network of strategic planners working to improve alignment of interagency planning processes, lexicons, and goals.

Likewise, we increasingly include DoD in foreign assistance and diplomatic planning, both in Washington and in our embassy country teams, to ensure that our diplomatic, development, and military activities are coherent and effective. We conduct annual security assistance roundtables with DoD to ensure that our out-year budget requests take full account of DoD priorities. The Office of the Director of Foreign Assistance and its staff regularly engage DoD as we develop foreign assistance budgets.

We are working closely with DoD on a number of strategic policy issues. The Gulf Security Dialogue integrates foreign policy and military dimensions with our allies and partners in the Gulf. Likewise, our recent diplomatic advances in Europe with regard to Missile Defense are a key example of successful State-Defense collaboration. We maintain a regular schedule of bilateral political-military talks across the globe that guide Status of Forces Agreements and basing negotiations that are key to our national interests and national security. We also have a very close working relationship with the Defense Department to ensure that key American defense technology shared with our allies is properly protected.

Global Peace Operations Initiative

The President's Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI) was developed jointly by State and DoD, and is now carried out at State using our authorities and resources, with the goal to train 75,000 new non-U.S. peacekeepers worldwide. To date, GPOI has trained over 36,000 military personnel from 40 countries, over 31,000 of whom have deployed to 18 peacekeeping operations around the world. An important component of GPOI is the international Transportation and Logistics Support Arrangement, designed to assist countries to deploy and sustain their peacekeepers. Within GPOI, the Center for Excellence for Stability Police Units (COESPU), headquartered in Italy, has a "train the trainer" approach which aims to improve the quality and participation of stability police

units in international peacekeeping. Over 1,000 trainers from 26 nations have been trained in the Center's three years of operation.

Combatant Commanders

State is also working closely with Defense on the stand-up of the new U.S. Africa Command, where senior State officials have leadership positions. We likewise work with each of the other combatant commands to support and augment the many diplomatic and development initiatives underway in critical regions of the world.

POLAD Program

One of the best examples of close State-Defense cooperation is our long-standing Foreign Policy Advisor (POLAD) program, with senior diplomats serving as personal advisors to top commanders. POLADs amplify our ability to deal with challenges overseas and gain international support for our national security goals. Over the last two years we have doubled the number of POLADs, and are now assigning POLADs to forward-based and operational commands, including Iraq and Afghanistan. With DoD's strong support, we are requesting in FY 2009 an additional 50 POLAD positions. We are also assigning officers to POLAD positions earlier in their careers and at lower levels in the military hierarchy to maximize the exposure of young officers from both State and Defense to each others' cultures and missions. The Department is also taking significant steps, through the new POLAD Reserve Corps, to provide responsive short-term regional and functional expertise to DoD operational missions, exercises, wargames, experiments, and training engagements. We recognize the importance of interagency cooperation at all levels and the tangible benefits of working together early and often with our military counterparts. In that vein, we employ roughly 50 military officers in key positions at State as part of the State-Defense Exchange program. Our collaboration includes participation in a variety of joint training and education programs at both military and civilian institutions, including the Foreign Service Institute.

Nonproliferation

The Departments of State and Defense have also worked cooperatively in the area of nonproliferation. Through programs using the authorities and resources of each agency, we have successfully collaborated on State Department Nonproliferation, Antiterrorism, Demining and related programs. These have been key to our national efforts to enhance export controls and border security, improve biological and chemical security, engage scientists with dual-use expertise, assist nations to fill gaps in their ability to prevent nuclear smuggling, and respond to other fast-breaking non-proliferation opportunities. The Administration's Global Threat Reduction programs, on which the State and Defense Departments collaborate, help to reduce the threat of terrorist or proliferant state acquisition of weapons of mass destruction.

Conclusion

The programs I have outlined reflect the close cooperation that exists between the Departments of State and Defense. We will continue to review these programs to ensure that they serve our security purposes. We will also seek to develop new opportunities to work cooperatively to meet emerging challenges.

Thank you. I would be pleased to respond to your questions.