



The National Security Working Group
Rep. Trent Franks, Working Group Chairman

New cyber forces to protect computer systems and infrastructure grids (Rep. Franks)

Though the Defense Department is facing debilitating cuts through sequestration, some agencies are making the wise decision to stay focused on their investments to defend national security networks against cyber and electronic warfare attacks.

The Pentagon approved a hefty expansion of its cybersecurity force, which will increase the force fivefold over the next few years, improving the nation's ability to defend critical computer systems and conduct offensive computer operations against foreign adversaries. Cyber Command originated the request asking for their 900-person force to be bolstered to 4900. Their plan calls for creating 3 types of "national mission" forces to protect computer systems that undergird electrical grids, power plants and other infrastructure deemed critical to national and economic security. These "combat mission" teams could conduct operations such as disabling an enemy's command-and-control system before a conventional attack.

While I am proud of our defense teams for having this foresight and vision to defend our networks, this key vulnerability extends far beyond our military community and must be prevented against from every possible angle. It isn't enough to ensure that our defense networks have the ability to secure our military assets. We must also ensure that these improved security measures are protected from attacks on their supporting infrastructure. Cybersecurity professionals rely upon computer networks and energy sources that are inextricably linked to our civilian power grid. One solar flare, or even worse, one compact nuclear weapon detonated at high altitude creating a massive electromagnetic pulse effect could take out all of their capabilities - potentially for weeks or months.

The potential scale of havoc a massive cyber and EMP attack presents is as serious any threat we have faced, and is one our nation has never quite seen or survived before. Such an attack on our nation could have the ability to not only completely and inextricably bring down our critical infrastructure assets, but its effects could bring a civilization breakdown and paralyze our nation. The potential for psychological attacks are massive: consider how 100 Million Americans would have reacted if Sunday's Super Bowl blackout was permanent due to a targeted EMP attack.

Malicious state and non-state actors are out there. Iran and North Korea are hard at work every day expanding their nuclear and cyber capabilities. Advanced technology is so easily accessible to these transnational terrorists that it is very reasonable to assume our enemies may attempt

a significant cyber attack or EMP attack on the United States. The crucial question is whether we will do something about it before an attack happens.

Be Wary of Pending New Defense Secretary's Position on Nukes (Rep. Fleming)

Despite his abysmal performance during Senate confirmation hearings last week that even raised hesitations for some Democrats, former Senator Chuck Hagel will likely be confirmed as President Obama's new Secretary of Defense. Hagel runs the gamut of concerning policy positions from his stance on Israel and Iran to the surge in Iraq, but of particular concern are his attitudes towards U.S. nuclear force posture.

We cannot forget that former Senator Hagel was a contributing author to the Global Zero U.S. Nuclear Policy Commission report. Published in May Of 2012, the report proposed that the United States do the following: eliminate all Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs), eliminate all tactical nuclear weapons, retire the B-2 bomber decades before its service life is reached, and convert all B-52 bombers to carry only conventional munitions. All in all, the Global Zero report suggests that the U.S. should cut its nuclear force to 900 total warheads. While certainly in line with President Obama's view on nuclear weapons, the Administration has upped the ante. According to Associated Press reports last February, the Administration directed the National Security Council to study options for reducing the United States' nuclear force posture by up to 80%, leaving the United States with roughly 300 deployed warheads, an arsenal smaller than China's.

While envisioning a world where the most deadly weapons known to man are no longer needed is a nice thought, a worldview that makes room for ideas to unilaterally dismantle our own strategic inventory fundamentally misunderstands the current global threat environment and the concept of nuclear deterrence. Though the left would like to relegate President Reagan's "Peace through Strength" to a relic of Cold War thinking, the concept could not be more relevant to today's world. As the international system shifts from a bipolar to a multipolar world with mini regional superpowers, it is critical that the United States and its allies be given assurance that rogue states such as Iran and North Korea, that are also pursuing nuclear material with weapons grade capabilities, will not be attacking any time soon.

The fallacy that unilateral nuclear disarmament will somehow magically make current threats disappear simply weakens our ability to deter aggression and impose costs on those who threaten us. This kind of deterrence can only be maintained through a robustly guarded nuclear triad-that is, the three components of the nuclear arsenal: strategic bombers, ICBMs, and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs). Not only has this Administration abandoned its commitment to modernize our nuclear deterrent, a pledge linked to the Senate's support of the New START Treaty with Russia, the Administration continues to signal that it intends to pursue unilateral nuclear disarmament. Don't be surprised that a future Secretary Hagel would bolster the Administration's disarmament goals, making it clear to our allies that the U.S. is not interested in upholding the nuclear assurances that have protected our friends for decades and dissuaded them from advancing their own nuclear programs.

[To the top.](#)

NSWG Contact: Ari Zimmerman, ari.zimmerman@mail.house.gov, 6-5536 (Rep. Franks)
Matthew Silver, matthew.silver@mail.house.gov, 5-2777 (Rep. Fleming)
Joe Murray, joe.murray@mail.house.gov, 6-0678 (RSC)