NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION UNTIL RELEASED BY
THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

STATEMENT OF

DR. JAMES N. MILLER
PRINCIPAL DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
FOR POLICY

BEFORE THE SENATE
FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

JUNE 16, 2010

NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION UNTIL RELEASED BY
THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, Senator Lugar, distinguished members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. It is a pleasure to join General Kevin Chilton, Commander of U.S. Strategic Command, and Lieutenant General Patrick O'Reilly, Director of the Missile Defense Agency, in discussing the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) and key military capabilities, including our strategic nuclear force structure, non-nuclear prompt global strike, and ballistic missile defenses.

The New START Treaty will strengthen strategic stability with Russia at reduced nuclear force levels, improve transparency with key data exchange and verification provisions, enable the United States to retain and modernize a robust Triad of strategic delivery systems, allow the freedom to alter our mix of strategic forces over time, and protect our ability to develop and deploy non-nuclear prompt global strike and missile defenses. In short, the New START Treaty will make the United States, and our allies and partners, more secure.

Nuclear Posture Review and New START

An early priority of the year-long 2010 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) was to develop U.S. positions for the New START negotiations, including how many strategic delivery vehicles and deployed warheads were needed to field an effective, credible, and flexible nuclear deterrent for the duration of the Treaty. The Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General Chilton were all deeply involved in the NPR, and in decisions on New START Treaty limits.

The NPR's early, extensive, and continued attention to New START resulted in guidance to negotiators that ensured the treaty would meet key strategic objectives for the United States. In particular:

- The treaty's limit of 1,550 accountable warheads will allow the United States to sustain effective nuclear deterrence, including sufficient survivable nuclear forces for an assured devastating second-strike capability.

- The treaty's limits of 700 deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), and nuclear-capable heavy bombers will support strategic stability by allowing the United States to retain a robust Triad of strategic delivery systems – while downloading all Minuteman III ICBMs to a single warhead.

- The treaty's limit of 800 deployed and non-deployed launchers of ICBMs, launchers of SLBMs, and nuclear-capable heavy bombers will allow the retention of up to 100 ICBM and SLBM launchers, and nuclear-capable bombers, in a non-deployed status. When combined with the New START counting rule that a launcher is deployed only when mated with a missile, and the treaty's provisions on conversion of heavy bombers to a conventional-only configuration, this will allow the U.S. to minimize irreversible changes to nuclear force structure.

- By providing the freedom to mix U.S. strategic nuclear forces as we see fit, the treaty will allow the United States to rebalance its strategic forces as necessary to adapt to any future technical and geopolitical challenges that could affect a given leg of the Triad.

- The treaty allows us to maintain our stockpile of non-deployed warheads and an "upload" capacity for strategic delivery systems, which provide a hedge against adverse technical developments or a serious deterioration in the international security environment. More broadly, the treaty does not in any way constrain the ability of the United States to sustain our nuclear weapons stockpile, and rebuild the nuclear security enterprise that supports it.

- The treaty's data exchange and verification provisions will increase transparency and confidence in the numbers and status of Russia's nuclear forces, without imposing significant burdens on our ability to operate U.S. nuclear forces.

- As I will discuss in more detail, the treaty does not constrain our ability to develop and deploy non-nuclear prompt global strike capabilities.

- As I will also discuss in more detail, the treaty does not constrain the ability of the United States to develop and deploy effective ballistic missile defenses, including the ability to improve these defenses both qualitatively and quantitatively.

U.S. Nuclear Force Structure under New START

The Department of Defense has developed a baseline nuclear force structure that fully supports U.S. security requirements without requiring changes to current or planned basing arrangements. Specifically, under baseline plans, the Administration plans to field a force that meets New START limits by:

- Retaining 14 Ohio-class SSBNs and deploying no more than 240 Trident II D5 SLBMs at any time.

- Retaining up to 420 deployed Minuteman III ICBMs, all with a single warhead.

- Retaining up to 60 nuclear-capable B-2A and B-52H heavy bombers, while converting remaining nuclear-capable B-1B and some B-52H heavy bombers to conventional-only capability.

This force structure – which provides a basis for future planning – affords the flexibility to make appropriate adjustments as necessary.

The Department of Defense plans to sustain and modernize U.S. strategic delivery capabilities, as outlined in detail in the classified report submitted to Congress in response to Section 1251 of the National Defense Authorization Act of 2010. To this end, over the next decade, the United States will invest well over $100 billion to sustain existing strategic delivery systems capabilities and modernize some strategic systems.

Non-Nuclear Prompt Global Strike

DoD is currently studying the appropriate long-term mix of long-range strike capabilities, including heavy bombers as well as non-nuclear prompt global strike systems, in follow-on analysis to the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review and the NPR. The results of this ongoing work will be reflected in the Department's fiscal year 2012 budget submission.

The deployment of a non-nuclear prompt global strike system would provide the United States with a capability that we currently lack: the ability to hit a target anywhere on the earth in less than one hour using a non-nuclear warhead. At the same time, depending on technical and operational details, such systems could raise a number of challenges, including potential over-flight of other countries, and the ability to distinguish the launch of non-nuclear as opposed to nuclear-armed systems.

While our analysis of non-nuclear prompt global strike is still underway, DoD has concluded that any deployment of conventionally-armed ICBMs or SLBMs, which would count under the treaty's limits, should be limited to a niche capability. For example, if the Conventional Trident Modification program were deployed, it would involve two missiles for each of twelve to fourteen submarines, or 24-28 strategic delivery vehicles

total. This number of SDVs could easily be accounted for under the limit of 700 deployed SDVs under the Treaty, while still retaining a robust nuclear Triad.

DoD is also exploring the potential of conventionally-armed, long-range systems not associated with an ICBM or SLBM that fly a non-ballistic trajectory (e.g., boost-glide systems). Such systems would have the advantage that they could "steer around" other countries to avoid over-flight and have flight trajectories distinguishable from an ICBM or SLBM. We would not consider such non-nuclear systems that do not otherwise meet the definitions of the New START Treaty to be accountable as "new kinds of strategic offense arms" for the purposes of the treaty.

Sustaining the Nuclear Weapons Stockpile and Infrastructure

In addition to sustaining U.S. delivery systems, maintaining an adequate stockpile of safe, secure, and reliable nuclear warheads is a core U.S. objective identified in the 2010 NPR, and requires a reinvigoration of our nuclear security enterprise. To this end, the Department of Defense transferred $4.6 billion of its top-line to the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) through Fiscal Year 2015. This transfer will assist in funding critical nuclear weapons life extension programs and efforts to modernize the nuclear weapons infrastructure. The initial applications of this funding, along with an additional $1.1 billion being transferred for naval nuclear reactors, are reflected in the Defense and Energy Departments' FY 2011 budget requests. The NNSA budget request for weapons activities for FY 2011 represents a 10 percent increase over FY 2010, and increased funding levels are planned for the future, as reflected in the Administration's recent Section 1251 report.

Ballistic Missile Defenses

As made clear in the report of the 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review, the ballistic missile threat to our deployed military forces and to our allies and partners is growing rapidly, with significant implications for our ability to project power abroad, to prevent and deter future conflicts, and to prevail should deterrence fail. One of the most significant threats to the U.S. homeland is the continued efforts of Iran and North Korea to develop weapons of mass destruction and long-range ballistic missiles to deliver them. The protection of the United States, our deployed forces, and our allies and partners from the threat of ballistic missile attack is a critical national priority.

A core U.S. aim during the New START negotiations was to protect the U.S. ability to deploy the most effective missile defenses possible. U.S. negotiators achieved this

objective. The New START Treaty does not constrain the United States from deploying the most effective missile defenses possible, nor does it add any additional cost or inconvenience. Rather, the Treaty enables this President and his successors to develop the missile defenses needed to defend the Nation, our deployed forces abroad, and our allies and partners from the threat of ballistic missile attack.

The New START Treaty addresses missile defenses in two places: the Preamble and Article V. First, the Preamble of the Treaty states that there is an interrelationship between strategic offensive and strategic defensive arms, and that current strategic defensive forces do not threaten to undermine the effectiveness of the Parties' strategic offensive arms. Given that the United States has only thirty Ground Based Interceptors and Russia will likely field well over 1,000 ICBM and SLBM warheads under the Treaty, U.S. missile defenses can increase very significantly and the same would remain true. It is also important to note that the treaty's Preamble statement does not require or prohibit either side from doing anything.

Second, Article V of the Treaty prohibits any future conversion of ICBM silos or SLBM launchers to house and launch BMD interceptors – or vice versa. As Lieutenant General O'Reilly will explain further, such conversion would be neither cost-effective nor necessary. For example, converting ten ICBM silos to house GBIs would cost about $550 million, compared to $360 million for building 10 new silos. The placement of midcourse missile defense interceptors in converted SLBM launchers would be operationally impractical and very expensive. Consequently, the Article V limitation on launcher conversion does not constrain U.S. plans or programs.

In addition, Russia made a unilateral statement about missile defense in connection with the Treaty. This statement is not part of the Treaty and is not legally binding.

The United States also made a unilateral statement associated with the New START Treaty, which makes clear that our missile defense systems are not intended to affect the strategic balance with Russia, and that we will continue to improve our missile defense capabilities to provide for effective defense of our homeland against limited missile attacks and of our deployed forces, allies, and partners against growing regional threats. We have also explained that the missile defense capabilities associated with the European Phased Adaptive Approach will not affect the U.S.-Russian strategic balance.

As the 2010 Ballistic Missile Defense Review, our budgetary plans, and the U.S. unilateral statement made in connection with New START all make clear, the United States will continue to expand and improve missile defenses as necessary.

Accountability of Rail Mobile ICBMs and Their Launchers

Before concluding, I would like to address an additional issue that has arisen recently regarding the treaty. Some have asked whether a Russian rail-mobile ICBM system, should Russia again deploy a system such as its former rail-based SS-24, would be accountable under New START. The answer is yes. Such systems were not specifically addressed in the treaty because, unlike the situation when the previous START Treaty was being negotiated, neither party currently deploys rail-mobile ICBMs. Nevertheless, the treaty's terms and definitions cover all ICBMs and ICBM launchers, including rail-mobile systems. Therefore, in the event that Russia deploys rail-mobile ICBMs in the future, the launchers and the ICBMs they carry would be accountable under the New START Treaty.

Conclusion

The New START Treaty promotes stability and transparency in our strategic relationship with the Russian Federation. It allows us to maintain and modernize a robust Triad of strategic delivery systems, and if desired, deploy non-nuclear prompt global strike capabilities. The New START Treaty does not affect our ability to revitalize our nuclear security enterprise or improve our ballistic missile defense capabilities both qualitatively and quantitatively. For these reasons, the Department of Defense fully supports this agreement.

Thank you. I look forward to answering your questions.