

Statement by
The Honorable James R. Clapper, Jr.

Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence
Before the 110th Congress

Committee on Armed Services
And
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

United States House of Representatives
July 25, 2007

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Skelton, Chairman Reyes, Congressman Hunter, Congressman Hoekstra, distinguished members of the Committees: Thank you for your strong support for the brave men and women in uniform of the Department of Defense who so courageously serve the nation. And thank you for the opportunity to meet with you this morning to discuss the implications of the National Intelligence Estimate on the Terrorist Threat to the Homeland.

On September 20, 2001, the President, in his joint address to Congress and the American people, said, “We will direct every resource at our command -- every means of diplomacy, every tool of intelligence, every instrument of law enforcement, every financial influence, and every necessary weapon of war -- to the disruption and to the defeat of the global terror network...Americans should not expect one battle, but a lengthy campaign, unlike any other we have ever seen. It may include dramatic strikes, visible on TV, and covert operations, secret even in success.”

Today, nearly six years later, there hasn't been a successful attack on our homeland. This is not for a lack of will on the part of our enemy. While al Qaeda and those inspired by its extremist ideology have carried out terrorist attacks in more than two dozen nations since 9/11, they have thus far not succeeded in attacking us in spite of their continued plotting. As the NIE states, our countermeasures “have helped disrupt known plots against the United States since 9/11.” In addition, our offensive measures have deprived al Qaeda of its comfortable safe haven in Afghanistan in which it could train and indoctrinate large numbers of recruits and plan operations.

However, al Qaeda has, and will continue to, attempt visually dramatic mass casualty attacks here at home, and they will continue to attempt to acquire chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear materials, which they will not

hesitate to use. As the NIE makes clear, we face a resilient and resourceful enemy who will make every effort to protect and regenerate key elements of its capability to attack us and others. There can be no guarantee that he will not from time to time succeed in attacking us; indeed, over the course of a long war the potential is there.

The President's *National Strategy for Combating Terrorism* is clear on the need to fight our terrorist enemies on the battlefield and to promote freedom and human dignity as alternatives to the terrorists' perverse vision of oppression and totalitarian rule. We are applying all elements of our national power and influence -- military, diplomatic, financial, intelligence and law enforcement -- to destroy terrorist networks and confront radical ideology. As the President has said, the best long-term answer to violent extremism is to advance effective democracies. The National Military Strategic Plan for the War on Terrorism spells out DoD's roles and objectives in this war. For the purpose of this hearing, I want to briefly describe implications of the NIE in three broad areas that are encompassed in this plan:

- Fighting the War on Terror;
- Defending the homeland; and
- Preparing to assist civil authorities in the response to a terrorist attack on the homeland.

FIGHTING THE GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR

Since al Qaeda attacked America nearly six years ago, the U.S. military has been continuously at war, but fighting a conflict that has many characteristics that are markedly different from wars of the past. In this war, our nation's armed forces have been tasked with removing hostile regimes in Iraq and Afghanistan that were sponsors of terrorism. In Afghanistan, a regime that gave sanctuary and support to al Qaeda as they planned the 9/11 attacks has come to an end. And in Iraq, we removed a cruel dictator who harbored terrorists, paid the families of Palestinian suicide bombers, invaded his neighbors, defied the UN Security Council, and pursued and used weapons of mass destruction. Initially quick military successes in both countries has led to protracted stability and reconstruction campaigns against brutal and adaptive insurgencies.

In other parts of the war, however, the enemies we face are not nation-states but rather dispersed non-state networks. In many cases, actions must occur on many continents in countries with which the United States is not at war. Unlike the image many have of war, this struggle cannot be won by military force alone, or even principally. And it is a struggle that will likely last for years to come. In this war, like in any other major conflict, we have to expect that there will be reverses as well as successes. The enemy will react and adapt to what we do and search out new opportunities, tactics, methods and weapons. A war is not an engineering project, in which all the tasks and challenges can be laid out ahead of time and accomplished according to a pre-determined schedule. As the troops

say, “the enemy gets a vote.”

The NIE highlights one such way in which the enemy has adapted: in response to its loss of Afghanistan: it has reconstituted some of its command and support network in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) along the Pakistan-Afghanistan border.

This is a wild and remote area over which the government of Pakistan (and the British before them) has never fully gained control. President Musharraf has tried various approaches to dealing with this problem, and has lost about 500 personnel in the process of trying to establish law and order in the FATA. Musharraf has also tried political measures to eliminate al Qaeda and the Taliban from the FATA, including making a deal with the local tribal leaders in one of the agencies under which they prevent the use of their territory as a launching pad for attacks into Afghanistan. This agreement, the North Waziristan Agreement, has not been successful, as the Pakistani government admits. While one could debate the wisdom of trying to conclude such agreements, I don't think it is fair to charge Musharraf with being ignorant of the problem or being unwilling to deal with it. If only because of their various attempts to assassinate him, and the loss of hundreds of his soldiers, he clearly understands the extremist threat.

Because of recent events, we expect President Musharraf to become much more active in addressing this problem. We have taken, and continue to take, a number of steps to help him, including:

- Funding, through the useful vehicle of Coalition Support Funds, much of the operating costs of Pakistani security forces conducting counterterrorist operations in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas and elsewhere on the Pakistani border with Afghanistan,
- Providing 24 Bell helicopters and air assault training to Pakistani security forces so they can operate rapidly and effectively in the FATA and other remote regions,
- Providing key night vision capability, including equipment and training, to enable helicopter pilots of the Pakistani Army to pursue terrorists around the clock,
- Transferring \$110 million to the Department of State to support economic development in the FATA. This effort will help strike at the root causes of terrorism.
- Congress was instrumental in providing support for all of these measures, and its support for the authorization to transfer funds to the State Department was particularly helpful.

The recent Red Mosque crisis has heightened the extremist Islamist threat in Pakistan, and brought the struggle between extremists and the mainstream to the fore. The behavior of the extremists who had been holed up in the mosque highlighted the threat, and extremists based in the border areas have taken both the stepped up Pakistani Army presence in the FATA and along the border as well as

the storming of the mosque as a pretext for resuming terrorist attacks on the Pakistani security forces.

At the same time, there are signs of a reaction against the extremists. On April 17, 2007, a convention attended by over 2,000 Pakistani religious figures in Peshawar, the capital of Pakistan's ethnically Pashtun North-West Frontier Province (which includes the FATA), proclaimed that suicide bombings were against Islam and condemned the forcible implementation and enforcement of Shari'a (Islamic Law). Also, internal disputes in Pakistan's tribal agency of South Waziristan recently erupted into conflict between Taliban-allied local tribes and al Qaeda-allied Central Asian groups, mostly Uzbeks. Uzbek forces offended local Pashtun groups by their criminal activity and insensitivity to local tribal customs, resulting in open warfare between locals and Central Asian fighters.

I've noted that the NIE describes a resilient and resourceful enemy who will adapt to circumstances. Yet a full assessment should also look at the enemy's weaknesses and vulnerabilities. At the strategic level, I think his greatest weakness is his tendency to overreach; perhaps not surprisingly, a movement that fosters a cult of violence and death has difficulty restraining itself when violence is not in its best interests.

In Iraq, for example, al Qaeda in Iraq's excessive violence – directed not only against Shi'a civilians but against fellow Sunnis, including insurgents, who failed to toe the al Qaeda line -- has resulted in a backlash. Iraqis in Anbar province made common cause with U.S. and Iraqi security forces against al Qaeda's attempt to convince Iraq's Sunni Arabs that its objective of an Islamic State of Iraq (ISI) is the only alternative to the Shia-dominated Iraqi Government. Even insurgent groups such as the Islamic Army in Iraq openly rejected the ISI and criticized them as a foreign terrorist group that has divided Iraqi society. Inspired by successes in the Anbar province, other provinces such as Diyala, northeast of Baghdad, mobilized against the ISI, who by then were on the run in Anbar.

Similarly, in Saudi Arabia, terrorist attacks in May 2003 energized the government, which has cracked down on salafi-jihadis and "deviants" who pervert Islam to preach violence. To confront extremist ideology within the Kingdom, the Saudis have been working with religious leaders to eliminate hatred-filled sermons, have passed new regulations in the charitable sector, increased vigilance in the financial sector, and have joined regional initiatives on anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing. Some wealthy Saudi donors still fund violent extremists around the world, but steps taken by the ruling family to tackle extremism and terrorism are an important success in the global war on terror.

In Jordan, to take another example, the November 2005 attack on a wedding in Amman turned public opinion against Islamist extremists in a dramatic fashion.

These al Qaeda missteps provide us with a strategic opportunity. In the Department of Defense, our main task in this regard is to help foreign

governments counter extremist terrorism and to assist, where appropriate, in their efforts to build up their governmental, as well as security, capacity.

More generally, these missteps provide us an opportunity to wage what has been called the “battle of ideas.” Most Muslims do not embrace extremist views of an Osama bin Laden, but, for a long time, the debate within the Muslim world was rather one-sided. The challenge to the U.S. government is not to enter this debate directly, but to support mainstream voices within the Muslim world and to resist the extremists’ attempts to intimidate them. This aspect of the overall struggle has just begun.

Despite its resilience, al Qaeda is weaker today than it would have been if we had not taken strong action against them over the last five-and-a-half years. And we ourselves have become stronger and more capable. Because of the President's commitment to our homeland security, we have more and better intelligence, military and law enforcement resources, and the capability to confront an enemy who is weaker now than it would have been absent our aggressive effort to confront and defeat them.

DEFENDING THE HOMELAND

Here at home, it is the primary mission of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, including stopping terrorists from coming across our borders, coming through our ports, or hijacking aircraft inside or outside the United States. The Attorney General leads our Nation’s law enforcement effort to detect, prevent, and investigate terrorist activity within the United States. DoD’s responsibility is to employ our warfighting capabilities, subject to constitutional and statutory authority, in a military defense of U.S. lives, property, and individual freedom.

To meet emerging threats to the homeland, the Department of Defense is postured to deter, defend against, and defeat threats to the United States in the air, maritime, and land domains.

In the air domain, DoD defends U.S. airspace and protects the nation’s air approaches. The air domain is guarded, patrolled, and monitored by the binational U.S.-Canada North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD). Since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, more than 42,000 fighter, aerial refueling, and airborne early warning sorties have been flown, while more than 2,000 air patrols have responded to actual incidents and suspicious flight operations. We also have air defense alert fighters positioned throughout the United States and Canada that are capable of reaching major population centers and high-value infrastructure within minutes. The number of alert fighters can be increased or decreased according to emerging threat levels.

We continually adjust our posture in order to protect the National Capitol Region (NCR), the seat of the U.S. Government. The Department conducts irregular air patrols, maintains a dedicated 24-hours-a-day/7-days-a-week alert fighter response based at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, and has a dedicated

ground missile defense system located to provide around-the-clock coverage for the National Capitol Region. In addition, in 2005, DoD provided the Visual Warning System (VWS) to warn wayward pilots to contact the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) air traffic controllers immediately and to depart from restricted airspace. We also detailed DoD liaison officers to serve at the Transportation Security Administration-hosted NCR Coordination Center (NCRCC) on a full-time basis and provided key interagency operations centers and the NCRCC access to DoD's classified conferencing capability, which is used for DoD coordination and decision making during the response to hostile domestic air threats.

In addition, DoD has deployed missile interceptors at Fort Greeley, Alaska, and Vandenberg Air Force Base, California, to protect the U.S. homeland from ballistic missile attack even as system development, testing, and fielding continue. The maritime domain – including international waters, the maritime approaches to the United States, our territorial seas, and other U.S. navigable waters – is guarded by a highly effective partnership between the U.S. Navy and the U.S. Coast Guard. The U.S. Navy defends the sea approaches to the United States and works with the U.S. Coast Guard to patrol international waters and our territorial seas.

Additionally, in multiple theaters in the global war on terror, forward deployed U.S. Navy assets work with other agencies to identify, track, and intercept threats before they threaten the United States.

On the land domain, in addition to general purpose forces, which can be called upon at any time, DoD has numerous assets ready to directly defend the U.S. homeland and to assist civil authorities:

- Quick Reaction Forces and Rapid Reaction Forces, highly trained U.S. Army and U.S. Marine Corps units, are postured to respond to a wide range of potential threats to the U.S. homeland, including critical infrastructure protection.
- Joint Force Headquarters National Capital Region, based at Fort McNair in Washington, DC, is responsible for land homeland defense, civil support, and consequence management in the National Capital Region.
- Joint Task Force North (JTF-N), headquartered at Fort Bliss, Texas, supports counterdrug, counterterrorism, and other operations to counter transnational threats.
- Joint Task Force Alaska, based at Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, is responsible for land homeland defense and civil support operations in Alaska, and Joint Task Force Homeland Defense, based at Fort Shafter, Hawaii, has these responsibilities in Hawaii and U.S. territories, possessions, and protectorates in the Pacific.

PREPARING TO ASSIST CIVIL AUTHORITIES IN THE RESPONSE TO A TERRORIST ATTACK

Despite all of this, we realize that the enemy only has to be right once, while we must be right every day, all the time. The dark talent of the extremists today is, as President Bush has said, to combine “new technologies and old hatreds.” Their ability to tap into global communications systems turns modern advances against us and turns local conflicts into problems potentially of much wider concern. The interest they have shown in weapons of mass destruction is real and needs to be taken seriously. While the most likely al Qaeda attack method is the use of conventional explosives, intelligence reports and public pronouncements continue to indicate that al Qaeda and other groups are attempting to acquire weapons of mass destruction. And, unlike our enemies during the Cold War, rational nation-states who considered weapons of mass destruction “weapons of last resort,” our terrorist enemy today considers such weapons “weapons of first choice.” Whether al Qaeda or other transnational terrorists develop weapons of mass destruction or acquire them from rogue nationstates, we can be certain that they will use such weapons against the United States at their first opportunity, especially, if they can, on American soil to kill our citizens, destroy our property, disrupt our economy, and attempt to break our national will to resist their extremist objectives.

The first line of defense against a terrorist weapon of mass destruction attack is the War on Terror, which I have already addressed, and international efforts such as the Proliferation Security Initiative, 80 nations working together to stop shipments of materials related to weapons of mass destruction on land, at sea, and in the air. Still, we must be prepared for the unthinkable even if such an event would be unacceptable.

Here at home, the Department of Homeland Security is responsible for the coordinated U.S. national effort to prepare for, prevent, protect against, respond to, and recover from terrorist weapons of mass destruction attacks. If a weapons of mass destruction attack should occur within the United States, the Department of Defense (DoD), at the direction of the President or the Secretary of Defense, as appropriate and consistent with the law and the imperative to maintain military readiness, will provide critical weapons of mass destruction consequence management support to civil authorities as part of the comprehensive national response to a weapons of mass destruction attack.

With few exceptions, DoD’s consequence management capabilities are designed for the wartime protection of DoD’s personnel and facilities. With the exception of a dedicated command and control element (Joint Task Force Civil Support) and National Guard Weapons of Mass Destruction-Civil Support Teams, DoD relies on dual-capability forces to support civil authorities in domestic CBRNE consequence management. In accordance with the 2005 Strategy for Homeland Defense and Civil Support, DoD “will be prepared to provide forces and capabilities in support of domestic CBRNE consequence management, with

an emphasis on preparing for multiple, simultaneous mass casualty incidents.”

Military response forces include:

- National Guard Weapons of Mass Destruction - Civil Support Teams (WMD-CSTs). Consisting of 22 high-skilled, full-time members of the Army and Air National Guard who are federally resourced, trained, and certified, and operate under the command and control of a State governor (Title 32, U.S. Code), the WMD-CSTs support civil authorities at a CBRNE incident site by identifying WMD agents/substances, assessing current and projected consequences, advising on effective response measures, and assisting with appropriate requests for State and Federal support. Section 1403 of the Bob Stump National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107-314) authorized 55 WMD-CSTs and required DoD to ensure that of these 55 teams there is at least one team established in each State and territory. Currently, 52 of the authorized 55 WMD-CSTs have been certified by the Secretary of Defense. The remaining three teams, in Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, are expected to be certified in Fiscal Year 2008.
- National Guard Chemical, Biological, Radiological, Nuclear, and High-Yield Explosive (CBRNE) Enhanced Response Force Packages (CERFPs). The CERFPs are task-organized units with combat support and service support mission essential tasks that, in conjunction with WMD-CSTs, assist local, State, and Federal authorities in CBRNE consequence management (e.g., casualty search and extraction, medical triage, casualty decontamination, and emergency medical treatment). CERFPs are designed to fill the 6-72 hour gap in capabilities between the first response and the Federal response following a CBRNE incident. There are currently 17 CERFPs (California, Colorado, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, Virginia, and West Virginia), of which 12 are trained and ready to respond to CBRNE incidents in each of the 10 FEMA regions.
- Joint Task Force Civil Support (JTF-CS). JTF-CS, headquartered at Fort Monroe, Virginia, and its components, Joint Task Force Consequence Management East (headquartered at Fort Gillem, Georgia) and Joint Task Force Consequence Management West (headquartered at Fort Sam Houston, Texas), is a deployable, standing task force of 160 assigned military personnel led by a twostar Army National Guard general officer serving on active duty, who is under the command of the U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) commander. The mission of JTF-CS is to

deploy, when directed, to a CBRNE incident site to exercise command and control of assigned Federal military forces to support civil authorities.

- U.S. Marine Corps Chemical-Biological Incident Response Force (CBIRF). The CBIRF, which consists of 117 personnel, 21 vehicles and necessary equipment, and follow-on forces of 200 additional personnel and 22 additional vehicles and equipment, is a deployable force capable of responding to a CBRNE incident in support of local, State, or Federal authorities and designated combatant commanders' consequence management operations by providing capabilities for agent detection and identification; casualty search and rescue; personnel decontamination; emergency medical care; and stabilization of contaminated personnel.
- DoD Explosive Ordnance Disposal Teams, which can provide assistance to detect, identify, render safe, and dispose of unexploded ordnance such as improvised explosive devices and CBRNE weapons.
- U.S. Army Technical Escort Units (TEUs). The TEUs' mission is to provide a worldwide response for escorting, rendering safe, disposing, sampling, verifying, mitigating, and identifying weaponized and non-weaponized chemical, biological, and other hazardous materials. One TEU company supports the National Capital Response Force.
- CBRNE Consequence Management Response Forces (CCMRF). The CCMRF includes elements of all of these capabilities and can be quickly tailored to provide a coordinated response to specific CBRNE incidents. The CCMRF are Title 10, U.S. Code, joint forces capable of responding to a wide range of CBRNE attacks against the American people with a wide range of services, including decontamination and security of a contaminated site or area; medical triage, treatment, and care; and transportation and logistical support. DoD's CBRNE consequence management capabilities include specialized agent detection, identification, and dispersion modeling systems as well as casualty extraction and mass decontamination abilities. DoD also can provide emergency medical support such as equipment, mobile hospitals, aeromedical evacuation, medical personnel, engineering support, and mortuary services. To ensure the readiness of these forces and to identify gaps and potential weaknesses within each agency and across agencies in terrorist attacks, particularly multiple, simultaneous attacks, DoD holds or participates in at least four major interagency exercises per year. These exercises support the DHS National Homeland Security Exercise Program established by Homeland Security Presidential Directive-8 (HSPD-8), "National Preparedness" (December 17, 2003). In the past these have included UNIFIED DEFENSE (2003, 2004), DETERMINED PROMISE (2003, 2004), ARDENT SENTRY (2005, 2006, and

2007), DILIGENT ENDEAVOR (2003), DINGO KING (2005), DILIGENT WARRIOR (2004), NORTHERN EDGE (2003), SCARLET SHIELD (2004), DARK PORTAL (2004), CYBER STORM (2006), and TOP OFFICIALS (TOPOFF) II and III (2003, 2005). All recent scenarios for DoD and interagency exercises have included the challenge of countering and responding to CBRNE threats such as radiological dispersion devices in the northeast and western United States, improvised nuclear device attacks in the western US, nuclear weapon and recovery in the western and mid-western United States, chemical and improvised explosive device attacks on the East Coast, and biological attacks in the Northeast, Midwest, and Pacific Northwest.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, to those responsible for protecting the homeland from al Qaeda and the threat of terrorism, the information in the National Intelligence Estimate is not new; it reinforces the seriousness of the terrorist threat against the homeland and confirms much of what the President has been saying since 9/11. We are facing a persistent terrorist enemy led by al Qaeda that remains driven and intent on attacking the homeland, and that continues to adapt and improve its capabilities.

Our greatly increased worldwide counterterrorism efforts since 9/11 have constrained the ability of al Qaeda to attack the U.S. again and have led terrorist groups to view the homeland as a harder target to strike than it was on 9/11. We must remember terrorism is not a threat we face alone. It is a threat faced by our allies around the world -- in London, in Bali, Madrid, Riyadh and Islamabad. We cannot win this war alone; we need our allies to win. They fight the threat just as we do. And just as our heroes on the battlefields around the world are injured and die in the fight, our allies fight and die, as well.

As President Roosevelt stated in his Pearl Harbor Speech on December 8, 1941, "There is no blinking at the fact that our people, our territory and our interests are in grave danger. With confidence in our armed forces - with the unbounding determination of our people - we will gain the inevitable triumph."