

**HEARING TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATION OF  
GENERAL MARTIN E. DEMPSEY, USA, FOR  
REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GEN-  
ERAL AND TO BE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED  
STATES ARMY**

---

**THURSDAY, MARCH 3, 2011**

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m. in room SD-106, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Carl Levin (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Nelson, Udall, Hagan, Begich, Manchin, Blumenthal, McCain, Inhofe, Chambliss, Brown, and Ayotte.

Committee staff members present: Richard D. DeBobes, staff director; and Leah C. Brewer, nominations and hearings clerk.

Majority staff members present: Jonathan D. Clark, counsel; Gabriella E. Fahrner, counsel; Jessica L. Kingston, research assistant; Gerald J. Leeling, counsel; Jason W. Maroney, counsel; Michael J. Noblet, professional staff member; and William K. Sutey, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: David M. Morriss, minority staff director; Adam J. Barker, professional staff member; John W. Heath, Jr., minority investigative counsel; Daniel A. Lerner, professional staff member; and Richard F. Walsh, minority counsel.

Staff assistants present: Jennifer R. Knowles and Christine G. Lang.

Committee members' assistants present: Christopher Griffin, assistant to Senator Lieberman; Carolyn Chuhta, assistant to Senator Reed; Gordon Peterson, assistant to Senator Webb; Jennifer Barrett and Casey Howard, assistants to Senator Udall; Lindsay Kavanaugh, assistant to Senator Begich; Joanne McLaughlin, assistant to Senator Manchin; Chad Kreikemeier, assistant to Senator Shaheen; Jeremy Bratt, assistant to Senator Blumenthal; Anthony Lazarski, assistant to Senator Inhofe; Lenwood Landrum, assistant to Senator Sessions; Clyde Taylor IV, assistant to Senator Chambliss; Charles Prosch, assistant to Senator Brown; Pam Thiessen, assistant to Senator Portman; and Grace Smitham, assistant to Senator Cornyn.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN, CHAIRMAN**

Chairman LEVIN. Good morning, everybody. The committee meets today to consider the nomination of General Martin Dempsey to be Chief of Staff of the Army.

General Dempsey, we welcome you here today, members of your family. We look forward to your testimony and to your continuing service.

America's Army today is as great as it has ever been in its 235 years of service to our Nation. And, as we are reminded every day, this service continues to come with great sacrifice.

Our Army remains globally committed and overstretched by nearly 10 years of continuous combat. The Army has met the challenges of the last decade with courage, determination, and professionalism for which they and all of us are justifiably proud and profoundly grateful.

The challenges of the decade ahead, however, will be no less daunting. Over the next 4 years, under General Dempsey's leadership, the Army must deal with many enduring and new challenges. First and foremost, the Army must continue to meet the demand for trained and ready forces in support of operations in Afghanistan and, for a short while, longer in Iraq.

Thankfully, the U.S. drawdown of forces in Iraq has begun. But, nearly 40,000 American soldiers remain there, contributing to the continued strain on our troops and their families.

At the same time, over 60,000 Army troops are committed to operations in Afghanistan. Hard fighting will continue, even as we and our allies continue to build the Afghan security forces so that they may take more and more responsibility for their security.

As adaptable and well prepared as our soldiers are today to support missions in Afghanistan and Iraq, the future beyond these operations holds real questions about what we will need the Army to do and how it will be structured to do it. In a speech to cadets at the U.S. Military Academy last week, Secretary of Defense Gates outlined what he considers the greatest challenges facing the Army as it takes on board the lessons of the last decade and prepares for the uncertain and dangerous world that lies ahead. Secretary Gates argued that it is unlikely that the Nation will commit large land forces to future conflicts and that the Army must, quote, "confront the reality that the most plausible high-end scenarios for the U.S. military will be primarily naval and air engagements," close quote. He cautioned that in a strategic environment where we are unlikely to fight an enemy employing large armored formations the Army will find it difficult to justify the number, size, and cost of its heavy armored brigades.

In a press interview last week, General George Casey, the Army's current Chief of Staff, seemed to go in a different direction when he said that he expects that over the next 10 years we will still have 50,000 to 100,000 soldiers deployed in combat.

We look forward to hearing General Dempsey's views on these perspectives and how they may shape the Army's plans and priorities in the coming years.

In his speech at West Point, General—Secretary Gates also said that his first concern is how the Army will structure itself—that is, its size and the number and composition of its deployable units,

such as combat brigades—how it will structure itself for the missions it is most likely to perform. In restructuring itself, the Army must find ways, he said, to maintain its hard-won combat-proven current capabilities and invest in the right future capabilities within a fiscally constrained environment.

Budget pressures are already being felt throughout the Defense Department. The Department's sufficiency initiative is intended to take funds away from less important or inefficient programs or activities and give them to higher, more relevant current and future modernization priorities.

As the next Chief of Staff of the Army, General Dempsey will need to find ways to deal with the spiraling growth of personnel costs. In the face of these challenges, additional budget reductions, although still being debated, are more likely than not. We are interested to hear General Dempsey's assessment of the efficiency initiative and any ideas that he may already have for improving processes and systems to ensure that we get the most out of every dollar the Army spends.

More directly related to its force structure, the Army needs to begin planning for the end-strength reductions announced by Secretary Gates in January. The Army intends to begin drawing down 22,000 soldiers of temporary excess end strength, which was approved by Secretary Gates in the summer of 2009, and needs to do that between now and 2013. This reduction should not impact Army force structure, as this additional end strength was always temporary and intended to allow the Army to fill its deploying units and to end the use of stop loss that is holding soldiers beyond their enlistment. However, the Army also plans to reduce permanent end strength by another 27,000 people between 2015 and 2017, assuming security conditions are on track with current strategic plans.

This second part of the drawdown plan should result in some reduction of the Army's force structure, likely including the elimination of some combat brigades. Although this reduction is not planned to begin until after 2014, which would be at the back end of General Dempsey's tenure as Army Chief of Staff, he will nonetheless be responsible, at a minimum, for the analysis, planning, and the initial implementation of these end-strength and force-structure changes.

The Army needs to rebuild its strategic depth—that is, the desired readiness in the nondeployed force—such that it is capable of responding to any unforeseen contingency. Strategic depth has been sacrificed over the last 10 years by the consuming force requirements of operations in Afghanistan and in Iraq. In order to gain and maintain the necessary higher readiness levels in our deployed forces, the readiness of our nondeployed forces has been at historic lows. Although the Army continues to meet the demand for counterinsurgency and support operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and around the world, and despite the amazing resilience of our troops and their families, the Army remains stressed in many ways. Given the planned Army drawdown, budget pressures, and force demands for operations in Afghanistan, we continue to face substantial risk, should we need the Army to respond to another contingency.

As the next Chief of Staff, General Dempsey will have the opportunity, as commitments in Iraq are concluded, to rebuild some degree of strategic depth. We're interested to hear General Dempsey's assessment of Army readiness and his views on the prospects for its improvements over time.

The Army needs to continue to rationalize and stabilize its near- and long-range modernization strategies and programs. In general, major Army modernization efforts have not been successful over the last decade or more. But, over the last 2 years, under the leadership of Vice Chief of Staff for the Army, General Peter Chiarelli, and the Under Secretary of the Army, Dr. Joseph Westphal, the Army has worked diligently, through an objective and detailed series of capability portfolio reviews that has started it on a path towards achieving rational, stable, and affordable Army modernization strategies and programs. As a result of this analytical process, the Army has terminated over-ambitious, redundant, or unaffordable weapons systems. And we're interested to hear General Dempsey's assessment of this review process and to share with the committee what role he might play in sustaining the momentum achieved over the last 2 years.

Finally, the Army must work as long and as hard as possible to deal with the human cost to soldiers and their families of the pressures and consequences of an Army in continuous combat for 10 years. A high priority of the Army's leadership over the last 4 years has been dealing with the stress of multiple combat rotations and long separations, the stress on soldiers and their families.

The Department of Defense and the Army set a goal that soldiers in units would have twice as much time at home as they would deployed, and that Army families would enjoy greater stability and less stress. Also, the Army has instituted significant programs for the improved care of our wounded soldiers and their families. And, despite the efforts of the Army and leaders throughout the chain of command, heartbreaking incidents of suicide continue in the active-duty force, as well as the Reserve Forces, and are now increasing, as I mentioned, in the National Guard and Reserves, as well. The committee's interested to hear General Dempsey's assessment of the Army's efforts in these areas.

General Dempsey, the Nation could not be more proud of our Army, its soldiers, and their families. We are grateful for your leadership and for your willingness to assume responsibility for the readiness and the care of our magnificent Army. You are extraordinarily well qualified to undertake the position to which you have been nominated.

We are also grateful for the service and sacrifices of your family in supporting you over the years. And when we call upon you for your opening statement, we would be delighted if you would introduce your family who are with you here today.

Senator McCain.

#### **STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN McCAIN**

Senator McCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General, welcome, and congratulations on your nomination. I'm grateful for your extraordinary service and personal sacrifices

throughout your career. I'm very appreciative of your family and the support they've given to you.

Since the attacks of September 11, soldiers and their families have served under the stressful conditions of active combat for nearly 10 years as the Army has transformed itself into a modular expeditionary force while simultaneously meeting the demands of two wars. We're enormously grateful for the sacrifices soldiers and their families have made for their Nation, for their units, and for one another. The human costs of combat have been great. But, I applaud the efforts of senior military leaders in the DOD and the Army to provide the best medical care possible to respond to the needs of wounded soldiers and to assist the families of all soldiers. If you're confirmed, there will be no higher priority than continuing this work.

While the cost of defeating al Qaeda and Taliban, and those who would attack us again if they could, has been great, Army leaders at every level can take pride in their accomplishments. Four years ago, how different the situation was in Iraq. I described it then as dire and deteriorating, and there were those who declared that the war was lost and we should accept defeat. I shudder to think of how the Middle East would look today and what condition the Armed Forces would be in today if the Army had not surged troops to Iraq and not been so decisive in providing the security needed to turn the tide there.

Winning the current fights in Iraq and Afghanistan must continue to be the Army's priority, and the next Chief of Staff must ensure that soldiers have what they need to succeed. As Chief of Staff, you will have to develop and justify your vision of what the Army should look like in the future.

In his speech last week to the cadets at the U.S. Military Academy, Secretary Gates expressed his predictions about what their future service in the Army would look like. He discounted the likelihood of another land campaign like Operations Iraqi Freedom or Enduring Freedom, and forecast an Army, in coming years, that would most likely engage in short-duration, low-intensity operations engaged in counterterrorism, rapid reactions, disaster response, and stability security-force assistance missions. I'm interested in how much you share Secretary Gates' views.

The budget plan for the Future Years Defense Plan through 2016 also calls for reducing Active-Duty strength by 47,000 soldiers. I'd like your views on whether such manpower reductions are consistent with the Army's focus on full-spectrum operations and readiness to conduct all kinds of missions at—any kind.

Debate about the future missions of the Army is a necessary predicate for the weaponry the Army will need to succeed. I am deeply concerned by the Army's inability to manage successfully its major defense acquisition programs; most prominently, the Future Combat System. With the arguable exception of Stryker, the Army has not successfully brought to—a major system from research and development, through full production since the so-called "big five," the Abrams tank, Bradley fighting vehicle, Patriot missile, and Black Hawk and Apache Helicopters, the late 1970s and early 1980s. To my knowledge, the Army has yet to negotiate the termination cost for the FCS contract. As such, the total cost of FCS has

yet to be fully determined. Unfortunately, this failed 11-year investment in a, quote, “modernization program” has served only to set the Army and the American taxpayer back. I’d be interest to hear from you how we intend to improve the management and oversight of major Army acquisition programs so that something like FCS doesn’t happen again.

On balance, the Army can take great pride in its record of accomplishment, particularly those of its troops and its transformation from a garrison force to an expeditionary, mobile, and highly adaptable fighting force. But, many challenges lie ahead, and the fiscal environment we are in will be very unforgiving if we repeat the mistakes of the recent past.

I thank you for your willingness to take this assignment on, and look forward to your testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.

We’re delighted that Senator Reed is going to be introducing our nominee.

And you couldn’t have anyone better to be introducing you. I want you to know that, General. You’re very well served by the person we’re going to hear from next.

Senator Reed.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE  
STATE OF RHODE ISLAND**

Senator REED. Thank you very much, Senator Levin, Senator McCain, my colleagues on the committee.

It is a pleasure and a privilege to have the opportunity to formally introduce General Martin Dempsey to this committee as we consider his nomination as the 37th Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

I recognize many, if not all, of you have had the opportunity to meet and to work with General Dempsey in the various challenging assignments he’s held in recent years in our Army, particularly his command of the 1st Armored Division in Operation Iraqi Freedom, taking a force into the country and then being suddenly told to stay longer than expected, and doing it with superb professionalism; and then his succeeding command as the leader of the Multi-national Security Transition Command in Iraq, responsible for the training, support, and establishment of the Iraqi security forces.

Throughout his more than 36 years of active service, General Dempsey has demonstrated the professional skill and personal character to lead our Army in challenging times. Our soldiers are engaged in two major operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Army has been engaged, since 2003, in the longest sustained combat operations in this history of our country. General Dempsey recognizes this. He also recognizes that his first priority is to support our soldiers in the fight. This support requires the continued training, equipment, and leadership that has made our Army the superb force that it is today.

Support for our soldiers also means support for their families, and General Dempsey knows about Army families. Throughout his career, his lovely wife, Deanie, has been serving with him, by his side, and together they have raised Major Christopher Dempsey,

who's currently assigned to the Department of History at the United States Military Academy at West Point, and daughters, Megan and Caitlin, both veterans of the United States Army. The Army is indeed a family affair with the Dempsey family.

But, General Dempsey also has the daunting challenge of shaping a force for the future in a time of increasingly constrained budgets. Dynamic change in technology, in international economic forces, in international institutions—indeed, even the notion of national sovereignty—all of these forces, and more, will shape the future and must, indeed, shape the Army. They must be responded to with innovative and creative proposals, and I am absolutely confident that General Dempsey will meet these challenges as we go forward.

He is superbly prepared to provide this critical leadership at this challenging moment. And I would urge my colleagues to confirm him speedily so he can assume these responsibilities.

Thank you very much.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Reed.

General Dempsey, the committee has a series of standard questions that we ask all of our nominees, and I will ask them to you now.

Have you adhered to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

General DEMPSEY. I have, Senator.

Chairman LEVIN. Do agree, when asked to give your personal views, even if those views differ from the administration in power?

General DEMPSEY. I do.

Chairman LEVIN. Have you assumed any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

General DEMPSEY. I have not.

Chairman LEVIN. Will you ensure your staff complies with deadlines established for requested communications, including questions for the record in hearings?

General DEMPSEY. I will, Senator.

Chairman LEVIN. Will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to congressional requests?

General DEMPSEY. I will.

Chairman LEVIN. Will those witnesses be protected from reprisal for their testimony or briefings?

General DEMPSEY. They will.

Chairman LEVIN. Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify, upon request, before this committee?

General DEMPSEY. I do, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly-constituted committee, or to consult with the committee regarding the basis for any good-faith delay or denial in providing such document?

General DEMPSEY. I do.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, General Dempsey.  
And now we're ready for your statement.

**STATEMENT OF GEN MARTIN E. DEMPSEY, USA, FOR RE-APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL AND TO BE CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY**

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, Chairman Levin.

I'd like to stray from—this is—I do this at my great peril, but I'd like to stray from my prepared remarks, just at the beginning here, because I was struck by the, I hope, intended symbolism of having Senator Reed sit next to me during his introduction, because I've always felt as though this body, in particular, was a wingman of the Army's. And Senator Reed has always been a great wingman; that is to say, someone who watches out for you and who helps you see yourself in ways that perhaps you're unable to see. And I'd like to have that relationship with this committee and with the Congress of the United States, because, chairman, I think you've—and so has the Ranking Member—mentioned the challenges we've got before us, and articulated them very well, and we're going to have to work together to settle those.

Chairman LEVIN. We look forward to working with you, General, on that basis, as a matter of fact. Very eloquently and aptly put.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, Chairman.

And thank you for the opportunity to appear before this committee today in support of my nomination as the 37th Chief of Staff for the United States Army.

Senator Reed, thank you again, and the members of this committee, for allowing my to be part of this process. And thank you for your unwavering support and commitment to the soldiers of the United States Army and their families.

I've known some of you for a decade or more, and I've met some of you only recently, in the last few days. I always welcome the chance to discuss our National security challenges with you, and I sincerely admire what the members of this committee and your professional staffs have done to support those who courageously serve and are resilient in the service of their Nation.

I'd like to take a moment, as you suggested, Chairman Levin, to introduce my wife, Deanie, to you. I know she appreciates your kind words about her, too. We've been married, as you noted, for almost 35 years. She has joined me in commissioning all three of our children as officers in the Army, and she's sent two of them off to war. One of them, our son, Major Chris Dempsey, is here today.

Deanie and I have built our lives both within and around the Army, and I can report to you that there is no greater champion for soldiers and their families than Deanie. If I am confirmed, the Army will receive the great gift of her continued service with, I must be honest, the occasional break to care for our three grandchildren, and soon-to-be five grandchildren. She is my hero, and I love her for many reasons, not least of which is her shared commitment to the United States Army.

I'd also like to congratulate my predecessor, General George Casey, who will soon complete 41 years of distinguished service to our Nation.

I've always considered service in the Army to be a privilege. And that privilege is even more apparent when our way of life is challenged as it has been over these past 10 years. I sit before you today with confidence that whatever challenges confront us in the

future, your Army will respond with the same courage and resolve that has characterized it for the past 235 years.

You have seen firsthand the superb performance of our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan. Less visible, but equally important, are the contributions of soldiers currently deployed in over 150 nations around the globe. These men and women are fulfilling tasks assigned to us in the National security strategy to seek to prevent conflict by representing our Nation and its values and by increasing the capabilities of our international military partners. They are Active, Guard, and Reserve. We are truly one Army, and we serve America proudly.

Here at home, we partner with local communities, schools, and colleges. Each year, 75,000 of America's sons and daughters make a commitment to leave their homes and serve their Nation in the uniform of the United States Army. And, in return, we make a commitment to develop them as soldiers and as leaders. As commanding general of U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, I've met with soldiers serving in the very center and at the very edges of freedom. I've met with their families, living both at home and abroad. I've met with our wounded and with their families.

They are inspirational. They understand the challenges we have—that we face as an Army and as a Nation. Their expectations of us are as simple as they are profound. They trust that we will provide the resources necessary for them to succeed in the fights in which we are currently engaged, and they trust that we will have the wisdom and resolve necessary to prepare them for the missions unknown to us today, but which surely await us.

If you confirm me as the Army's 37th Chief of Staff, you can be sure that I will act to earn their trust every day. I will work to match their drive, their sacrifice, and their resolve. I will partner with the Congress of the United States, and this committee in particular, to ensure we remain worthy of the title "America's Army."

Mr. Chairman, I want to assure you and the members of this committee that I understand the gravity of the task at hand. The position to which I have been nominated carries daunting responsibilities. I embrace the challenge.

I want to thank President Obama, Secretary Gates, and Secretary McHugh for their trust and their confidence in nominating me. And I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Dempsey follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, General.

And let's try a 7-minute first round, if that works.

I made reference to Secretary Gates' West Point speech, and quoted from it. I wonder if you could give us your reaction to his remarks, both the ones that I quoted and any other part of that speech that you might like to refer to.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, Chairman.

Secretary Gates, in his speech at West Point, pulled together themes that he's been discussing with us for some time. It's an aggregate, if you will, of the professional conversations we've had about the current state and the future state of our Armed Forces.

And, as you know, it's not a conversation he's had uniquely with the Army. He's challenged the other services, as well.

And it seems to me that, in terms of the reference you made to his discussions about the heavy force, in particular, what he's challenging us to do is to reconsider the way we've proportioned our force—the force mix, if you will—and determine if that's the force mix that best suits our needs today. I don't think he's predisposed to the answer to that question. I think he's encouraging us to confront it. And as we confront it, I think he is challenging us equally to look at the institution that supports it and the leaders that we develop. And my personal, professional judgment, where I sit today, in Training and Doctrine Command, is that we have to become an institution that accepts adaptation as an imperative. It has to be part of our fabric. And where that takes you is, we might develop an Army suitable for 2020 that, consciously, we know will not be exactly the Army we need in 2020, because the current and future operating environments, as we anticipate them, will require an institution that provides what the Nation needs when it needs it. And I think that the key to that, actually, is the development of leaders; so, leader development is job one. Systems and processes have to become more responsive to change and allow for the introduction, laterally, of changes to technology, for example. And organizations, which always change in our Army, have to be prepared and embrace change. And I think we can—I think we understand the signal we're receiving, and I think we can find the answer.

Chairman LEVIN. One of the points that he made at West Point was his identification of, quote, “ongoing and prospective requirements to train, equip, and advise foreign armies and police.” And that raised the question, he said, as to how the Army should, quote, “institutionalize security force assistance into the Army's regular force structure and make the related experience and skill set a career-enhancing pursuit.” He flagged the importance of the Army's doctrine on this new advise-and-assist brigades, which he said have played the role that they've played in the last couple years, which is a, quote, “key role in the successful transition to full Iraqi security responsibility.”

Now, building the security forces of foreign forces has traditionally been a Special Operation Forces mission. But, in both Iraq and Afghanistan, our general-purpose forces have been performing that mission for some time, in the form of those AABs. And I'm wondering what your reaction is to the possibility of adding that as a required fundamental capability for general-purpose forces, which would require additional education, training, and readiness challenges for the Army to meet.

General DEMPSEY. Yeah, thank you, Chairman.

I do think it's—it becomes a core competency for our force in the future, as part of our effort to prevent conflict. I think that we've made some dramatic and very successful adaptations at the tactical level in understanding what it takes to partner with indigenous forces and partners. I think where we probably have room to grow and room to learn is in how we partner with institutions, how we accomplish what we formerly called security sector reform at ministerial level, because it's not simply enough to partner with international partners at the tactical level; we have to ensure that they

have the systems and the institutions that support them so they become viable partners into the future. And I do think, if confirmed, that will be an area that I would pay particular attention to.

Chairman LEVIN. There were plans, some years ago—when Secretary Gates became Secretary, there had been plans to restation two Army brigades currently in Europe back to the United States. Those plans were put on hold when Secretary Gates came into office. And the Department has now started a global posture review to reexamine the purposes, locations, and costs of U.S. forces stationed around the world, including the Army's combat brigades in Europe.

Can you give us your understanding of the status of that review—I believe you're a part of that review, maybe a major part of it—and give us the status of the review and whether or not that will include an assessment of Army forces stationed in Europe, as to whether we should continue them in the current numbers and configurations that they're at.

General DEMPSEY. Yes, sir. The study that you refer to, of which Training and Doctrine Command is part, is essentially the force mix and force design—how many types of each brigade and what are the internal capabilities of them. And we are involved in that.

We haven't made any decisions, because, as you know, the recent announcement of the additional 27,000 has put us back to the drawing board, if you will, on trying to understand the implications of that and the assumptions we're making about the demand on us into the future.

But, to your point, if I could knit your previous question and this one together, the issue at hand for us will be, whenever we decide our force structure and its location, is, What purpose does it serve, where it sits? And I'm a product of 12 years of the United States Army- Europe, and found great benefit in being immersed into that culture. I think that there will always be reason for us to have a forward-deployed force, both for the benefit of our partners, but also for our own benefit. But, I think that the size of that forward presence will be reexamined as we determine what our future force structure will look like.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Senator McCain.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, congratulations, General Dempsey.

During the—prior to the Iraq war, there was a no-fly zone imposed as a result of the agreement—the cease-fire. And that went on for, I believe, a decade. Isn't that correct?

General DEMPSEY. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. And we did not take out the Iraqi air defense—air defenses, did we?

General DEMPSEY. Actually, we did, Senator.

Senator MCCAIN. The—from the—all parts of Iraq?

General DEMPSEY. Well, again, this is—this predates my time at CENTCOM. I was back in Germany, as it turns out—

Senator MCCAIN. Yes.

General DEMPSEY.—during those years. But, I do recall working on the Joint Staff. And when there would be issues with Iraqis po-

sitioning air defense elements south of the latitude that we had established, we would attack them.

Senator MCCAIN. But, we didn't take out all Iraqi air defenses.

General DEMPSEY. No, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. And our aircraft were within range of those defenses.

General DEMPSEY. When they moved into a position—

Senator MCCAIN. Yes.

General DEMPSEY.—that they were in range, we would attack them.

Senator MCCAIN. That wasn't too hard to do.

General DEMPSEY. Not being part of it, Senator, I can't speak to the difficulty of it.

Senator MCCAIN. Have you seen media reports that the—that Gaddafi is using some of his air assets to attack, or attempt to attack, the pro-revolutionary forces?

General DEMPSEY. I have, Senator.

Senator MCCAIN. You have seen that. You might tell Admiral Mullen that you've seen that.

Do you believe that the Arab League and the people on the ground in Libya that are being attacked by Gaddafi's air assets should be listened to when they are asking for us to see that that's stopped?

General DEMPSEY. I think that they will have voice, and are having voice, inside the government.

Senator MCCAIN. And as a veteran of several conflicts, isn't it true that if you tell the enemy that if they take certain measures, there will be reprisals—what I'm trying to say, if we tell the Libyans and Gaddafi that we are imposing a no-fly zone, that is a strong deterrence to many of their pilots as to whether to fly or not. We've already seen pilots defect. We've already seen a couple of them land in Malta. Wouldn't that have a certain deterrent effect on them, psychologically?

General DEMPSEY. Deterrence is always one of the options that we should have available to the National command authority. And I will say, of course, that my own personal experience is, sometimes the way our potential adversaries interpret our deterrent actions is not exactly as we've planned it. But, deterrence is a valid option.

Senator MCCAIN. And the perception of Libyan pilots who now take off and land and attack pro-revolutionary forces might prove rather cautionary to them if they think that we will stop them and shoot them down if they carry out those missions.

General DEMPSEY. We have the finest air force in the world, Senator.

Senator MCCAIN. And may I just say, personally, I don't think it's loose talk on the part of the people on the ground in Libya, nor the Arab League, nor others, including Prime Minister of England, that this option should be given the strongest consideration.

I'm very concerned about Wikileaks. Almost daily, we see some additional revelation of the Wikileaks situation. First of all, how did this happen? And second of all, who has been held responsible for this greatest disclosures, frankly, of classified information in the history of this country?

General DEMPSEY. Senator, as you know, the—I can't answer the question, "How did it happen?" I have been made aware that there's an ongoing—you know it as a 15-6 investigation—essentially, a commander's inquiry—commissioned by the Secretary of the Army, to answer that exact question. I know that the individual responsible for the investigation has had a series of meetings with Secretary McHugh. And I'm looking forward to learning more about that, as well.

To your point about the protection of information, I think that this will be a wake-up call for us. And we have to go forward, but we have to balance our protection of information with the competing requirement to continue to collaborate with interagency partners on information so that we can be as agile as the networks that we fight.

Senator MCCAIN. To my knowledge, no one besides Private First Class Manning has been held responsible for Wikileaks. Is that correct?

General DEMPSEY. To this point, that is correct, Senator. I don't know that that'll be the outcome.

Senator MCCAIN. One of your major responsibilities will be the issues of acquisition. A recently completed Decker-Wagner Army acquisition review paints a rather gloomy picture. According to this report, between \$3.3 and \$3.8 billion of the Army's research and development budget has been wasted per year, since 2004, on programs that were subsequently canceled.

Do you believe those figures to be accurate?

General DEMPSEY. I do, Senator.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, let me specifically mention one program to you, as I conclude my questioning, that I don't understand, and maybe you could provide us with some written response, because you may not know a great deal about it. But, the title is, "U.S. to spend \$800 million as it leaves MEADS program." And it goes on to say, "Over the next 3 years, the U.S. Government to spend—plans to spend more than \$800 million on a missile defense," quote, "proof of concept that Army Secretary John McHugh has little confidence will even work." In this article, it says the termination costs would be very, very high. I still don't quite understand why we would negotiate a contract that, if a contractor fails to meet its goals and we have to cancel the contract, we have to pay off the contractor. Do you know very much about this particular program, General?

General DEMPSEY. I do not, Senator.

Senator MCCAIN. Good. Maybe you could provide us with some—a written response when you—after you are sworn in.

[INFORMATION]

Senator MCCAIN. But, this kind of thing—I don't think there are stronger advocates in support of our defense spending and our need to equip and train our men and women who are serving, but when our constituents read stories like this—and it may not be totally accurate—but, when they read stories that—it's entitled, "U.S. to spend \$800 million as it leaves the MEADS program," I think they deserve better, or at least a better explanation, at best.

I thank you, General.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, Senator.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.

And, General, you, then, will supply an assessment of that program and of that issue that Senator McCain has just raised, after you are confirmed.

General DEMPSEY. If I could clarify. The Senator said, "when sworn in." So, sometime after April 11th, I will dutifully respond.

Chairman LEVIN. I will stand corrected. And—

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, sir.

Chairman LEVIN.—the—after you are sworn in, then we would expect a—

General DEMPSEY. And actually I should say, "if I'm sworn in."

But—

Chairman LEVIN. You are correct.

General DEMPSEY. Yes, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. We hear that all the—you know, we assume that. And I'm glad you also do not assume that.

Senator Lieberman.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

I think it's a good assumption.

I thank you, General Dempsey, for your career of service. It has impressed me, as I've had the honor to get to know people in our military, particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan in recent years, that the quality of leadership, really, from top down, is quite remarkable. And I would set—and I particularly mean it in your case—set the level of capacity against leadership in any other sector of our society. So, we're very lucky to have had you rise to the position that you've been nominated for by the President. And I look forward to working with you in the years ahead.

I wanted to ask you one question about the ongoing situation in Libya, following up with what Senator McCain said. And I, too, have felt that the no-fly zone ought to be under active consideration, premised on a request from the opposition, once it established a provisional government, which now seems to have happened. And second, of course, hoping that we would have allies in that effort.

I want to ask you another alternative—about another alternative here, because this is an ongoing situation and its outcome will determine, I think, not only how the lives of the people of Libya are, and whether more blood is shed there at the hands of a truly maniacal leader, Gaddafi, but also has an impact on the succession or transition to democracy in the rest of the Arab world. So, that's why we're all focused on it.

And another alternative, obviously, is to try to help the opposition and stop Gaddafi, is to provide them with air defense systems, and train them in those systems. I—the question of whether we do that is not what I want to ask you about, because that has to be determined at a higher level. But, am I correct in saying that the Army has had experience in training militaries around the world in the use of air defense systems?

General DEMPSEY. Yes, Senator. If I can respond to that, recalling my experience as the acting CENTCOM commander, the answer to that is yes.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right. So, obviously, the—while we’re considering the no-fly zone—and I hear all the concerns about how it would be—how difficult it would be to implement—another alternative I’m raising is that we might provide the Libyan opposition with the capacity to defend themselves from Gaddafi’s aircraft. And I assume that, if directed to do so, the Army would be prepared, in your opinion, to carry out that mission, to train the opposition in Libya, to Qaddafi, in the use of better air defense systems.

General DEMPSEY. Internal to Training and Doctrine Command, we do have coursework and expertise in air defense.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thank you.

Let me go back—you’re not going to be surprised to hear that I’m concerned about the proposals to reduce the Army’s end strength, although when Secretary Gates was before us, and when he made the announcement, it was very clear that this is conditions-based, depending on what the demands on the Army are, as we head into 2015, which is the date when the reduction is supposed to occur. And all of us are haunted by the phrase “hollow Army.” We don’t want to go through that again. We fought hard, side by side, in the spirit that you suggested earlier, to increase the end strength.

I want to read to you an answer that you gave to one of the advance policy questions submitted to you by the committee. And you said, “The decreases in”—you were asked about the possible impact of decreasing Army end strength, and the service’s ability particularly to achieve the dwell ratio of 2 years at home for every year our soldiers been deployed. And that was a big motivator for the congressionally statutorially—statutory authorization of increase end strength. And your answer was, “The decreases in Army end strength are condition-based, and I’m not in a position, at this time, to assess whether there will be an impact on the dwell goal of 1-to-2, based on these reductions.”

So, I want to ask you whether you would say that one of the conditions that should be met, before the Army is asked to reduce its current end strength, would be a judgment that the 2 to 1 or 1 to 2 dwell ratio for our Active-Duty Army will not be jeopardized by that reduction in end strength.

General DEMPSEY. I absolutely agree with that, Senator.

Senator LIEBERMAN. I appreciate that very much.

And just coming to a particular question. We don’t know now whether the Government of Iraq will request that any of our Armed Forces remain in Iraq after the end of the current Status of Forces Agreement, at the end of this year. I hope they do, because I think it’s necessary to protect all that we’ve given there to achieve what has been achieved. But, just assuming, for a moment, that the Iraqi government did ask us to maintain some number of our Armed Forces in Iraq after December 31st of this year, and we decided to do so, I assume that that would have an impact on dwell ratios for our Army and on proposals for reducing U.S. Army end strength.

General DEMPSEY. It may, Senator. I think the—it would turn on the depth of that commitment they were asking us to make and our assessment of what common interests we have in doing so. And at some point, there is a bit of science to it. We know how big the Army is. We know what we’re asking it to do. We know we want

to have it on a 1 to 2 BOG-dwell, because of the human dimension, and we can figure—

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right.

General DEMPSEY.—it out.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Good enough.

One part of Secretary Gates' speech at West Point that's received less attention than other parts—and it was a very important and thoughtful speech—was his focus, not on the Army's hardware, but on the software of training, professional military education, doctrine, career management, and promotions, so much of which you've had a leadership role in, in recent years and overall in your career in the Army.

I wanted to ask you—I know you've been leading a study on the Army as a profession of arms, in your current capacity—whether you could give us any of your initial thoughts on how the Army can best rise to this—what I describe as the software challenge, particularly the element of leadership, which you referred to in your excellent opening statement.

General DEMPSEY. Yeah. Thanks, Senator.

It won't surprise you, I get a little advice, on occasion, in that regard from the junior officers and noncommissioned officers among us. And incidentally, in my office calls, over here with many of you, I tend to have time to chat with your fellows, who, by the way, are just a remarkable bunch. And that's across the services. And the question I always ask them is, How are you doing? How are we doing? You know, what are you doing? What do you want to do? Some of your MLAs, you know, are recently retired or resigned military. And I ask them, you know, Was there something we could have done to keep you in the ranks? So, I get a lot of inputs.

And I like the problem we have. You know, we talked about all the challenges we have. But, I'll tell you, I really like the problem we have, in terms of the leaders, and even the individual soldiers; because 10 years ago, Senator, we didn't really know whether we were a courageous, resilient, resolute, inquisitive, adaptable force. We didn't know. We hadn't been tested. Well, we certainly have been tested over the past 10 years. And that's the foundation on which we now have to build the future Army.

Our challenge will be that these young men and women have had capabilities, authorities, and responsibilities, as captains, that I didn't have as a two-star general. And I'm not exaggerating a bit when I say that. And so, continuing their development, you know, from that point, a much higher entry level than I had, is our challenge. And we think there are different attributes—inquisitiveness—we think, the ability to adapt. And we've got to line up our evaluation system with these attributes. We've got to relook at our professional military education, how much in the brick-and-mortar schoolhouse, how much can be done through these mobile learning devices. We've got to find ways to broaden these young men and women at places like these fellowships.

We can figure this out. But, what we can't do—and I think the message that SECDEF is sending us is, we can't simply—if we're—if I can use a—probably a poorly phrased metaphor here—but, if we were a rubber band and have been stretched over the last 10

years, we can't let ourselves simply contract back to our previous shape, because they won't stand for that.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Very well said.

Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Lieberman.

We are setting up a briefing on Libya that we will have tomorrow. It will be a classified briefing. And we will share with the members of the committee, as soon as we have it, the time of that briefing.

Senator INHOFE.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was—I appreciate Senator Lieberman talking about the end strength and the fellowship program. I've—I was going to ask about that, and I appreciate your answers.

The fellowship program, one thing that—I see a guy sitting, two seats to your left, who was a part of that—the only problem with that program: you learn to love these guys and gals and then they're gone. I don't know how we can correct that, though. So, I appreciate the fact that we went down—we started limiting that program, here, about 15 years ago, and it's been increasing since then. I would encourage you to keep that trend up.

Let me say this. Your predecessor, General Casey—one of the things I liked and appreciated about him—and I know you have those same characteristics, because I've already been exposed to them—and that is, he's very hands-on. He wanted to know for himself what was going on. Of course, you're interested in the JFETS Program and ADA and some of these things that are going on today. And so, I hope that we can continue with that. And I'm sure that we can. And I appreciate the fact that you have, in our Fire Center of Excellence and all these things.

It's a whole new concept, this simulation level that we've gotten to right now. People are in shock when they come from other countries and see and witness this thing. So, I'm hoping that you would keep that up.

Do you have any comments about the JFETS program?

General DEMPSEY. I think it's game-changing. And—

Senator INHOFE. Yes.

General DEMPSEY.—for the other members, it's a simulation, where we can link several different locations around the country. For that matter, we can link forward-deployed forces and have a common, live, virtual, and constructive environment in which leaders can grapple with complex problems, some of which are military, some of which—

Senator INHOFE. Yeah.

General DEMPSEY.—are not. But—and we're working to actually impose that model on the rest of the Army, at least in the institutional force. I think, eventually, though, the next training revolution in our Army will be what occurs at home station, because we've got to raise the bar at home station. But, JFETS is groundbreaking.

Senator INHOFE. Yeah, I agree with that.

Just one quick thing on the—some of the problems we're having that are health-related. We know, of course, with the strain, the OPTEMPO and all of this, that the suicide rates, divorces, and all

of this stuff that have gone on—and I know that we are addressing these and—but, I'd specifically talk about one of them, this traumatic brain injury. I've been interested in this for some time. In fact, the Chairman was good enough, at my request, to hold a hearing. And we've made another request to hold a hearing that would include not just the vice chiefs, which is what we had the first hearing, but also the medical people, civilians, some of the troops themselves. And I would like to be able to—you know, to have such a hearing. Would you encourage us to get into this—into the TBI and some of the other related problems, health problems that our troops are having?

General DEMPSEY. Senator, anything that this committee will do to remain teamed with us on the issue of care for wounded warriors, I will deeply appreciate and completely support.

You know, we all saw that Frank Buckles, our last World War I veteran, passed away, just a few days ago, at 110. The scars of this war will be with us for the next 90 to 100 years. And shame on us if we forget, when the conflicts dissipate a bit. Shame on us if we reflect that this is a long-term issue for—

Senator INHOFE. Sure.

General DEMPSEY.—our Army, but also for our Nation.

Senator INHOFE. Well, I appreciate that. I don't mean to imply that this is having a—that negative an effect on individuals. I—every time I go over—I spent New Year's Eve with the—in Afghanistan with the troops, and then again last week. And it's just shocking to me. I was a product of the draft, and so I'd never thought an All-Volunteer Army would be what this is. But, the spirits are so high, and it just seems that, even when the OPTEMPO is high, the spirits are high, and we've done a good job. You—I know you'll carry that on.

Senator McCain talked about the—some of the aging equipment that we have. General Casey and General Chiarelli have stated that we're burning up equipment as soon as we can field them. This is something that is a concern of mine. There was a statement that was actually in the press, and I'll read it. The study of the Secretary of the Army by former assistant Secretary of the Army, Gilbert Decker, and retired General Louis Wagner, found that the Army has spent \$3.3- to \$3.8 billion annually since 2004 on weapons programs that have been cancelled. I am concerned, and maybe just—you wouldn't know now, but for the record, I want to see if that has stopped by now. And if not, maybe we can address and find out why.

But, on the equipment, and the aging equipment, I—specifically, I've been concerned, as time has gone by—and I think Senator McCain mentioned this—that we start in with the—and a good example would have been the Crusader. We needed to increase that NLOS capacity that we had. Then we went on to the—I mean, right now, it—I—this the Paladin, that we're using today, is the same technology that was there 50-some years ago, when I was in the United States Army. Now we have a PIM program. But, we went through the Future Combat System and the—as has been stated before—and we get down the road to these things, then someone comes along and we whack them and start—try something new.

I hope, and I believe, that you will do all you can—now that we have the PIM program—down the road a little ways, that we can continue to do that. It's just remarkable that our capability with the old Paladin—that there are five countries, including South Africa, that make a better artillery piece than what we're using now.

Do you have any comments about where we're going to go in the future and what you're—you're going to try to keep that from happening again—the discontinuation?

General DEMPSEY. Simply my commitment, Senator, to work that. And I am familiar with the work of Dr. Decker and General Wagner. I think it's good work. My own professional view is that some of the programs that we aspire to fail because of the time horizon we establish for them. And I have been vocal, within Training and Doctrine Command, that requirements determination—the acquisition solution to those requirements and capabilities need to be taken on a shorter timeline, a 5- to 7-year time horizon instead of a 10- to 15-year horizon, because if we try to project our needs 10 or 15 years in the future, it's almost certain we won't get it right. So, I think we have some good ideas on that—in that report to work on. And you have my commitment, Senator.

Senator INHOFE. Yeah. Well, I'm sure that's right. My time has expired, but I would only tell you that—I remember the last year that I served on the House Armed Services Committee was 1994—we had a witness that came in that said, "In 10 years, we'll no longer need ground troops." So, you're right. As smart as all the generals are, we don't know what's out there in the future. But, I would like to have the—I'd like to get to the point where, no matter what is there, our kids have the best that there is out there, and I'm sure you feel the same way.

I look forward to serving with you.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

Senator Reed.

Senator REED. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

General Dempsey, welcome.

Let me follow up on a point that you responded to, to Senator Inhofe, in that this 100-year burden for soldiers who are—and marines and sailors and airmen—who are bearing the fight now, it has to reflect not only the DOD budget, but the VA budget. And I think you concur. I just—for the record.

General DEMPSEY. Absolutely.

Senator REED. Thank you.

We're talking, now, about the future. And that is being shaped, or thought about, in terms of several different dimensions. One is a changing context: new technologies, social networking, climate change affecting the natural resources and will be the struggles. That's—has to be factored in.

But, the other fact is sort of the traditional threat; you know, what other countries or nonstate actors have, in terms of weapon capabilities and intentions. Can you talk about that aspect, as you go forward, of how you're trying to weigh that issue—the threat? And does it synchronize well with Secretary Gates' speech at West Point?

General DEMPSEY. Yes, sir, I will speak to that. It gets at the reason—I don't think the Secretary was saying, "Shed the heavy force and invest entirely in the light force and special forces," because he and I have had conversations, for example, about the Israeli experience in southern Lebanon in 2006, where a nonstate actor, a terrorist organization, was as well organized, trained, and equipped as the traditional Israeli defense force that was confronting it: shore-to-ship missiles, air defense weapons, electronic warfare; advanced anti-armor capabilities. I mean really remarkable stuff. And so, as the Secretary and I—and this is mostly in my job as a CENTCOM commander—but, as we talked about the future of conflict, we generally believe that the future will be more a series of hybrid threats, where you have to be prepared to confront your adversary wherever he chooses to confront you.

And sometimes it'll be very irregular and decentralized, and sometimes it will look a lot like a conventional conflict. And so, what we owe the Nation is a force that has capabilities proportional to what we believe we'll confront but has all those capabilities. And then we need an institution that's adaptable enough that if we get it wrong—and, as we've said here earlier, we are likely to get it wrong—we have to have an institution that is adaptable enough to rebalance itself on a far more frequent basis than we have in the past.

But, I think, you know, the world is a far more dangerous place today than it's ever been, and we owe the Nation a—an agile force that can adapt to the future, whatever it finds in that future.

Senator REED. Thank you.

Let me go to another point that was raised in the West Point speech; that is, developing, not just an officer corps, but non-commissioned officer corps of expertise and flexibility and agility. And part of that goes as a reward structure. And do you have any thoughts or comments now about how you're going to think about changing or—the reward structure so that you find people at the upper levels of both the commissioned officer corps and non-commissioned corps who have a cultural awareness, who have a range of skills that are not the traditional tactical operational skills that have in the past been sort of the—really, the gate to get into the upper ranks?

General DEMPSEY. Yeah. I will say, Senator, that that's really been my life's work for the last 2 years, has been looking a leader development, both—really, all four cohorts; and I'll define the cohorts as officers, noncommissioned officers, warren officers, and civilians as well, working a great deal with the assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs on civilian development.

I think we've done some very good work, in particular, in the noncommissioned officer corps. You know, the expectation—when I came in the Army in 1974, a noncommissioned officer was very likely not to have a high school education. Now, it's the expectation that, if a soldier rises to the rank of sergeant major, he'll have a bachelor's degree before he gets there. And by the time he retires, he'll have a master's degree.

We haven't actually adjusted how we use them yet to account for that additional capability. Someone approached me yesterday about

the possibility of having NCO fellows here in the Congress of the United States. And, you know, you kind of slap your forehead and say, "Why didn't I think of that?" But, you know—so, we haven't really adjusted our—the way we use them. But, I've got great faith, and I applaud the selection that General Casey made of the new sergeant major of the Army, Ray Chandler, who will push us in that regard, in development of the noncommissioned officers.

On the officer side, and others, we're looking at a new personnel management model. You may have heard of the Blue Pages in IBM. We've got a prototype, on a thing we call the Green Pages, that allow us to—allow an individual officer to actually collaborate more on their career development, allows us to understand what they're interested in, not just the classes we've given them, but—you know, we might have somebody who worked in Outward Bound as a child or spent—as a military child, spent 18 years in the Pacific Rim. We wouldn't know that today, but we'd like to know that. So, there's a number of programs that are out there. Technology provides huge opportunities to use them.

What I will tell you, in closing this question, is, I am deeply committed to the development of our leaders, because we are likely to get the equipment, you know, sort of right, but not perfect, and the organization sort of right, but not perfect. We're probably going to give guidance a little late, I've found. The person that pulls it together is that leader on the ground, and we've got to keep committing to their development.

Senator REED. Just let me follow up on that, because—and I'm going to first—or, second your comment about the noncommissioned officers; they are the heart and soul of any military force, particularly the United States Army. And in 1971, when I came on Active Duty, the same comment could be made about the noncommissioned officers' education level, and now they're superbly trained. So, I think you're absolutely on target.

Second is that, with the advent of social networking—and this is not going to be a social network—but I was extremely impressed, years ago, when some enterprising young officers set up, sort of, Company Commander, Inc. or CompanyCommander com and—

General DEMPSEY. Dot com.

Senator REED.—dot com. And is that informal learning—I mean, how are you going to integrate that into the—

General DEMPSEY. That's the question that provides the greatest opportunities for us, I think, in terms of leader development.

I have to just back up a second and tell you, when I took the job at TRADOC, Senator, I found a CD of General Donn Starry. Now, he's a name familiar to you.

Senator REED. I know.

General DEMPSEY. But, Donn Starry was considered to be one of the great thinkers of our Army in the 1970s, and helped the Army, under other leaders, build to what it became in 1991, and even what it is today. But, he had a video—it was one of the first VCR tapes ever made in the Army—and it showed him walking into a mall in Hampton, VA, and looking at young men and women playing video games. And he turned to the camera and said, "We know they're in there. They're in there playing these games. They're paying for the opportunity to play. And they're learning something.

And what we don't know is what they're learning." That was in 1981.

I feel the same way today about social networking. We've got young men and women playing massive multiplayer online role-playing games, MMOGs as they call them, World of Warcraft and others—I mean, millions of children playing these interactive games. And they're learning something about developing as leaders, believe it or not, because of the way these games structure, and you have to impose your own leadership into the game.

We can figure out how to leverage a game like that for leader development, linking schoolhouses across the country—I'm talking about military schoolhouses. I think we'd be onto something in helping these young men and women collaborate, meet their desire to social network, and also facilitate the kind of learning we're going to need by introducing complex problems in that environment, that we can't replicate physically at places like Fort Hood and Fort Bragg and Fort Carson. So, I think social networking has enormous opportunities for us.

Senator REED. Thank you very much, General.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I think I recognize General Gordon Sullivan, the former Chief of Staff of the United States Army. His distinguished service must be applauded.

Thank you, General Sullivan.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Reed. And thank you for making that reference to General Sullivan.

We very much—very much intrigued by your answers here, I must tell you, General Dempsey. It's really mind-opening.

Senator Chambliss.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And, General Dempsey, let me echo the sentiments of my colleagues in congratulating you on this nomination, and also to thank you and your family for your service to our country and your continued commitment to freedom and democracy around the world.

Also, I want to commend you, likewise, on this fellowship program, and I appreciate your comments and strong support of that. I had just been blessed, going back to my days in the House, with outstanding young men and women serving in my office. And it's been a privilege to have a chance to dialogue with those folks, one on one, about what really is happening out there which, in addition to the great service they provide from an information standpoint, committee-wise—just personnel—personal-wise, they're just such an asset. So, very valuable program.

I want to go back to the question that Chairman Levin asked you about, on this decision regarding personnel serving in Europe. You'll recall, a couple years ago, a decision was made to put three brigades back in CONUS, one at Fort Bliss, one at Fort Carson, one at Fort Stewart. I'm not sure how the decision can be characterized as a reversal, putting on hold, or whatever. But, I'd like for you to characterize exactly where that is. What kind of importance is that decision being given in your current discussions, relative to what's going to happen, as far as bringing troops back from Europe? And then, lastly, what's your timetable on that study?

General DEMPSEY. Yeah, thank you, Senator.

As you know, we, at one point, were going to build 76 brigade combat teams. We took a decision—the Department did—that we would build only out to 73, and we held the four brigades in Europe, pending the outcome of the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, because we were—we had them on such a—all of the Army, as you know, on such a one-to-one BOG-dwell ratio that it would have been too disruptive to move them, under that situation.

Now we're looking at absorbing, potentially, the 27,000 reduction, and it's—it is inevitable, as Chairman Levin said, that there will have to be some structural changes to account for that 27,000. The analysis is just really beginning on that, and I haven't been made privy to it.

If confirmed, of course, that will come to the Chief and to the Secretary of the Army to determine which brigades are essentially the bill-payers for that 27,000 end strength. I'm not suggesting it will be all brigade combat teams. It'll have to be some portion of the entire Army, to include the generating force. And I think the timeline for that is probably the analysis over the next 6 months, because it'll be executed in the—in POM 13–17 and, as you know, the timeline for our submission of 13–17 is on or about the 1st of July. So, that's about the timeframe for this analysis.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Okay. While impressive gains in security have been made throughout the country of Iraq, Iraq still remains very dangerous place to live, travel, and work in 2011. Targeted assassinations, corruption, and Iraqi security force, medical, logistical, planning, and transportation shortcomings continue to undermine the Iraqi government security and infrastructure improvement efforts throughout the country. The security of their oil fields, pipelines, and terminals, while also much improved, remain a critical vulnerability and a prime target of insurgent forces.

As U.S. forces withdraw from Iraq, the Department of State will have to act quickly to significantly increase their security footprint in Iraq so that their diplomats can maintain a significant construction presence in Iraq for years to come, a job required sustained oversight engagement to watch over what remains of the \$58 billion in U.S. construction programs. While that ability to find, vet, and hire so many professional security personnel in such a short period is by no means a certainty, neither is continued stability in Iraq. And as we're seeing throughout the Middle East right now, there is all kinds of instability regarding neighbors to Iraq.

My question is, With this sustained instability throughout the Muslim world, is the withdrawal of all U.S. combat forces from Iraq at the end of this year still the right thing to do?

General DEMPSEY. I can't speak to whether it's the right thing to do for Iraq. And I think that's the piece of this, Senator, that we would have to examine.

We certainly have interests in Iraq and in the broader region. And it will be—it will have to be determined whether Iraq's interests and ours will be matched, and that part of that match will be additional force structure remaining in Iraq. I mean, that's very much a negotiation that will have to occur between the two sovereign nations.

I will say that some forward presence of—U.S. military presence, but, even more specifically, United States Army presence—in that

region is important to me. I think that's a very important region of the world, and will be, for the foreseeable future, and I am advocate of forward presence there.

Senator CHAMBLISS. There's also been some preliminary discussion and conversation about, when it becomes time to leave Afghanistan, that we may leave it—leave that country from a combat standpoint, but that we will establish at least one base in Afghanistan. What's your thought, with reference to that issue?

General DEMPSEY. I—I'm not—I haven't been made aware of that planning. I'm not surprised that someone is—someone should be, in fact, looking beyond the date 2014, which is the commitment we've made with our NATO allies to provide the kind of support, and to be in the lead. So, I'm not surprised folks are beginning to look beyond that to determine what is our long-term interest there.

I think the answer to that question, Senator, is about—is very similar to the one I gave vis-a-vis the Arab—the Arabian Peninsula. I think—as you know, we are very closely partnered with Pakistan and have some shared interests. We are currently in Afghanistan and have shared interests. And how those interests are managed over time, I think, will be dependent upon how the situation on the ground plays out in the next 3 or 4 years.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Yeah. Well, General, thanks again—as my time has expired—for your service. We look forward to continuing to work with you in your new role.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Chambliss.

Senator Nelson.

Senator NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And again, General Dempsey, thank you for your service, and your family, for their service, as well.

On a visit to Iraq, you and I spent time talking about how you were able to take the processes and procedures of acquisition of the U.S. military and use that to make acquisitions for the Iraqi military, recognizing that, in the absence of those processes and procedures—acquisition procedures in the Iraqi government—that it was—they were basically incapable of getting all the money spent in the right way, 100 percent for the acquisitions. By doing that, using Iraqi money, you were able to acquire their military material for their needs. And I thought that was novel at the time. It also showed me that there was a recognition by the Iraqi government that their responsibility was clearly theirs, not just simply the United States, to provide for the cost of their defense.

As we look toward leaving in December 2011, there is a possibility that we're going, as you and I discussed—that the Iraqis might decide—we—I hope they're able to provide for their own defense, but they might decide that they need continuing support for their defense. We understand. If they can't defend, they can't govern. Self-defense and self-governance go hand-in-glove.

So, what I'm getting to is, they're facing deficits in their budgets, as we're facing deficits in our budgets. On a relative basis, I would take theirs over ours. But, I—my point is, Can we look to ways in negotiating anything, if we're going to stay and provide assistance, where they can pick up a bigger share of the cost so that the American taxpayer doesn't end up picking up a bigger share of the cost?

General DEMPSEY. Senator, I think General Jim Madison—probably Lloyd Austin, who’s in Iraq—would be better positioned to answer whether they—

Senator NELSON. Well, I asked them, too.

General DEMPSEY. Oh, you did?

Senator NELSON. Yes.

General DEMPSEY. Well, I probably should have read their answer before I tried to hazard a guess at my own.

But, I—as I said in an earlier answer, Senator, I think this is all about identifying our common interests, and then challenging each of us to invest in those common interests. So, think that the proposal would be absolutely appropriate.

Senator NELSON. Well—and you may very well be, in your current—or, in the new position, when not only the Iraqi war winds down, but also perhaps, if we’re so fortunate, that we would see a reduction in the level of activity and the costs associated with Afghanistan.

While the Army is always engaged in planning, do you believe that we will be in a position to start looking towards some planning for a reduction in forces in Afghanistan? I know this is something we’re going to ask General Petraeus, when he’s here. But, from your standpoint, if that decision is made, that we are going to reduce forces, that you will take that into consideration, looking at our continuing end-strength needs, as well as our—the rest of the military needs, to support the kind of defense that Secretary Gates has been talking about.

General DEMPSEY. Well, Senator, I think—as you know, you will consider me for confirmation both as the Chief of Staff of the Army, but also as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; and that last point there is the responsibility of the Joint Chiefs, to balance our commitments around the world for our National security. And, if confirmed, I’ll absolutely take that obligation to heart.

Senator NELSON. Well, in—if we do that, how will this affect the current situation, where we’re looking to draw down 27,000 troops from the Army? Will that be—by 2014—will that be reevaluated, do you believe? Will that be—will that have constant reevaluation, or is that a date set and a goal that just must be achieved, or will that have to be constantly reevaluated in the days ahead?

General DEMPSEY. I consider it to be the latter case, Senator, where we have to evaluate—the assumptions on which those decisions were made need to be reevaluated as we see what occurs with Iraq, post-December 11, and what occurs with Afghanistan post-2014.

Senator NELSON. Now I’m really going to test you on what our Chairman said at the beginning, about giving your opinion, no matter how it might shape up with other opinions with your colleagues.

Chairman LEVIN. He’s not confirmed yet, though.

Senator NELSON. I said, if—[Laughter.]

Senator NELSON. That’s true. And that’s true. You can tell me anything—

Chairman LEVIN. But, we still expect that of you—I want to—

Senator NELSON. We still expect it.

Chairman LEVIN. Yes, I support Senator Nelson.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you for your first response, Chairman Levin.

[Laughter.]

Senator NELSON. If confirmed as the Army Chief of Staff, can we expect that you would be a very strong advocate for our National Guard?

General DEMPSEY. That's an easy one, Senator. Absolutely.

Senator NELSON. Now the tough one. Do you believe that the chief of the National Guard Bureau should become a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That's the tougher one.

General DEMPSEY. Yeah. That is—and it's tough, only because I haven't thought about it. And have learned, long ago, not to render an opinion about something I haven't thought about. What you can count on me to be is openminded about that.

Senator NELSON. Well, I hope that you will be openminded about it. The Guard has established itself as an operational force, no longer as a supply force. It's operational. It's not on the shelf, ready to go. It's active, as active as the active Duty military. And I would hope that you would consider that. Keep an open mind, but consider it. And I'm going to keep pushing for it, because I think of the—the importance of the role that the Guard has now taken is something that needs to be at the table all the time. Getting four—getting a four-star in charge of it was step number one. But, step number two, as a full partner, I think, involves being a member of the Joint Chiefs. I know it's touchy, but I hope that you and your colleagues will look very carefully at that.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, Senator.

Senator NELSON. Thank you. And good luck.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Nelson.

Senator Ayotte.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Dempsey, I want to thank you for your distinguished service to our country.

I also want to thank your wife, Deanie, and your son, Christopher. It's wonderful to have a military family here. And the sacrifices that your entire family has made, we're deeply appreciative of.

And I welcomed the opportunity, also, to have—to sit down with you yesterday.

I want to take this moment just to express my deep condolences to the families of the Air Force members who were killed yesterday in Germany on their way to Afghanistan. And I think it reminds us that we continue to be at war with terrorists, and the difficulties that we face, and also the sacrifices that our servicemen are making across the branches on behalf of our freedom and democracy in the world.

General Dempsey, in your answers to the advance policy questions, you state that the significant increase in the number of soldier suicides is of greatest concern to you, and I share your concerns. With the number of suicides in the National Guard rising to especially troubling levels, I share your goal of reducing those suicides. In particular, as we discussed yesterday, in New Hampshire we have a National Guard's Deployment Cycle Program which I believe is the model program, because we not only need to make sure

that the programs are in place for the full deployment cycle for our Active Duty members, but also, we've asked so much of our guardsmen and -women in the Reserve to make sure that we are taking care of our soldiers when they come home from the Guard, as well. This program is a highly effective and fiscally responsible initiative. And it's really a public-private partnership that I think is unique across the country.

Yesterday, Senator Shaheen and I wrote a letter to Admiral Mullen, urging him to take a close look at this program, and also to support this program. We have seen the program work to help on retention, to help with the many issues and challenges that our guardsmen and -women face when they return from duty, and also when they are going to duty, as well their families. So, I would ask you—and I will provide you with a copy of this letter—would ask for your support for this program, and for you to take a close look at it. I think it's a model for other States across the country, and very important that we not lose sight of our soldiers when they come home. And particularly in the Guard, when we've asked so much more of the Guard, with multiple deployments, than we have historically, that we make sure that those programs are in place.

I just wanted to get your thoughts on what you envision, going forward, in addressing our guardsmen and -women and the deployment cycle support for them.

General DEMPSEY. Yeah. Thank you, Senator. And thank you for, by the way, your role as an—the spouse of a national—of an air national guardsman. I know you've been through a couple of deployments, as well. So—

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you.

General DEMPSEY. You speak with great authority and experience in that regard.

And I have already passed to my staff, as the TRADOC commander, the task to look at that program you mentioned to me yesterday.

In general, though, I'll tell you that the—as you know, we continue to learn as we go. And we've been reminded, recently by some of those statistics, other kinds of trends within the force, of the accruing effects of 10 years of war. The Guard presents a unique problem, because, as you know, they don't come back to a central location. They come back, they spend a brief period of time, and then they dissipate, sometimes within a single State, sometimes within 10 or 15 States. And so, I can assure you, at this point, that we are beginning to grapple with understanding the problem, and we will partner with you and others to solve the problem. Because, it's one, again, that will be with us for some time.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you. I very much appreciate that, and look forward to working with you on solving that problem, which is so important in supporting not only our Active Duty troops, but our guardsmen and -women, and Reserve, who are—we're asking so much of them at this time.

General Dempsey, Chairman Mullen has also stated his belief that the National debt represents a preeminent threat to our National security. Do you share that concern?

General DEMPSEY. I do, Senator. The instruments of national power—diplomatic, military, and economic—have to be in balance for us to be the power we need to be.

Senator AYOTTE. And if we don't restore fiscal sanity to Washington and reduce our National debt, one of the concerns that I have is that the rising debt payments will begin to significantly crowd out the finances we have to be able to protect our Nation and its interests and, obviously, to fill our commitment to our Active Duty troops and to our veterans, who have sacrificed so much for us.

I would ask you, as the new—hopefully—new Chief of the Army, to look at two things, and also to get your thoughts on it. One is the recently released March GAO report. And in that report, the GAO found that there were instances of duplication and waste among the branches, where the branches could better coordinate, where there were redundancies on areas of equipment and areas where we could work together to reduce costs. Have you had a chance to review that report yet?

General DEMPSEY. No, I haven't reviewed the actual report, but I have seen the reporting on it.

Senator AYOTTE. I would ask you to review that report and look for ways to implement some of the recommendations that are made in that report so that we can reduce those duplications and make sure that we are using taxpayer dollars as effectively as possible, given the great challenges that we face right now.

General DEMPSEY. I will.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you. I also wanted to follow up on the comments that Senator McCain made about the acquisition programs in the Army. And we've seen, in some instances, where discretionary acquisition—there have been billions of dollars that programs have been canceled, programs have been broken. And how do you plan to address acquisition in a way that uses taxpayer dollars more wisely? And hopefully we can see some cost savings from that, as well.

General DEMPSEY. Well, Senator, we have to. We can't continue to hemorrhage resources that we will become increasingly challenged to—that you'll be increasingly challenged to help provide.

I think that the Decker-Wagner report gives an aperture through which to look at this issue much more seriously.

The earlier—one of the earlier comments was about these things called "capability portfolio reviews." I think you're familiar with them. The capability portfolio review process is really senior leadership of the Army, personified now as the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army himself, Pete Chiarelli—bringing together the requirement side of the house and the acquisition side of the house periodically to do exactly what you're talking about. I think the first step, in answering your question, is to institutionalize those capability portfolio reviews and then to take the Decker-Wagner report and implement it, or at least determine which pieces of it should be implemented.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you very much, General.

My time is up. But, I want to again commend you and your family for your service. And I look forward to working with you to make sure that we—you have the equipment that you need, but

also on these issues of where we can save taxpayer dollars and do things more effectively and more efficiently.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Ayotte.

And, Senator Udall.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Before, General, I direct some comments and questions your way, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New Hampshire. She's on point. The Senate, right now, seems to be the one institution here in Washington that's really working on a long-term deficit and debt-reduction plan. A broke country is a weak country. And we have some serious work to do. And the Department of Defense can help us get the job done.

You've talked about dwell time, General, and you know that, under the current Army force generation cycle, we're not able to provide that—the goal of 2 years at home. So, my question is, you know, Since the quantity of time at home station is limited, what steps would you take, as a Chief, to improve the quality of time at home for soldiers?

General DEMPSEY. Yeah, that's a interesting way to put it, Senator. I haven't heard it phrased that way, but it's worth thinking about.

Senator UDALL. I've got great staff, General.

General DEMPSEY. Yes. I—any of them behind you?

Senator UDALL. Yes.

General DEMPSEY. Okay. Good.

Senator UDALL. He's a retired Army helicopter pilot.

General DEMPSEY. Ah, a retired helicopter pilot. I might have known. I'm surrounded by helicopter pilots here, it seems.

Senator, just before I talk about the quality issue, the—there is a—I don't want to walk away from the absolute imperative of the quantity issue, because—I mean, every study we can possibly get our hands on suggests that it takes at least 2 years to fully recover from the experience that a young man or woman will have in a forward-deployed combat environment. So, it is quantity. And I have to remain firmly committed to it.

In terms of the quality, the issue, for me, is to determine—it's back to this best practices. There are some remarkable practices out there, some of which, by the way, we saw in effect at Fort Carson, Colorado, in a recent visit there. So, we've got, sort of, centers of excellence in different programs. And the—and one program, in particular, ties it together, called the "Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program," that has to be extended, and is being extended, into families, how to make families more resilient, right from the start of their service, not waiting until some crisis comes their way.

But, what we're trying to do is take those—the best of ideas out there, and share them and institutionalize them, because some of the family care program has been kind of a thousand flowers blooming. You know, we've—with good intentions, we've wanted to do as much as we could. Now we're in a position where we've seen a thousand things; we need to decide which 50 of them actually have the impact we're seeking. And we need to invest in those to get at the quality issue you're talking about. And that work is on-

going, generally through our Installation Management Command, commanded by Lieutenant General Ricky Lynch, but also with—in partnership with the assistant Secretaries of the Army.

Senator UDALL. I think that fits into, perhaps—I don't know if you've put this in a doctrine or not, but I think you've got the rule of 5 versus the lure of 55. And I hear you voicing that same kind of an approach to this.

If I might, let me turn to a question of Civ-Mil jointness, if you will. We're asking our soldiers to be what diplomats and ambassadors and trainers and negotiators—even have an eye for business cycles and dynamics—in all these theaters in which they're deployed. They come back as experts in areas we never could have envisioned a few years ago. And I'm wondering how we can ensure that they share what they've learned with other agencies before and after future combat rotations. Is there any joint predeployment training with nonmilitary agencies, like the State Department, at the NTC centers? Or do you—would you see any value in such training?

General DEMPSEY. First of all, absolutely, Senator. The—and, second, we are doing a good bit of it now. We jointly train the Provincial Reconstruction Teams, for example, that are forward-deployed. We train with them. To the extent we can, we try to get them, as well, to go through our mission readiness exercises with deploying brigades. Now, sometimes, because those other agencies of government are one deep at many of the skilled positions, unlike us, they can't make that training. But, we never deploy either a PRT or a brigade combat team without some of that training. Could and should we do more? Yes.

Second, in the educational system of our Army, we have several programs. I'll mention one. We have a interagency fellowship program at the Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, where we take young Army officers who have gone through an abbreviated Command and General Staff College course, and we'll put them into an agency of government—USAID, the Department of State, Department of Commerce, Department of Transportation—displacing one of their folks; that allows that person, then, to come to Fort Leavenworth and go through the 10-month Command and General Staff college experience. We've got about 20 of them out there now. We have the capacity to take 36.

But, those are the kind of programs I think we need to take a look at in the future, as well.

Senator UDALL. That would be a fantastic way to take advantage of that investment we've made. And I know those soldiers are keen to share what they've learned.

By the way, I just—I wanted to comment on your comments about the NCO-in-residence opportunity here. I had the great privilege of having a—Master Staff Sergeant Rubio serve for a year in my office as—in the first year of the NCO fellowship. It was phenomenal. And I want to just underline the importance of that approach.

Let me, in my remaining time, move to energy. The DOD's been leading the way in the development of renewable energy programs that will reduce the force's need for fossil fuels. And it's first and foremost about security. We know that many of the grievous inju-

ries in theater, delivered by IEDs, are aimed at supply convoys and the like.

The Marine Corps has set up what they're calling an experimental forward operating base in California. They're working with private industry to develop and test solar cells, batteries, and other products. And then they've taken the most promising approaches to Afghanistan, and they've cut their fuel consumption in the process.

Do you have plans, in the Army, to look at this XFOB model. And, if you don't, what can we do to help make that a reality?

General DEMPSEY. No, we do—we do, Senator.

You know, all the technological advances that we're introducing into the force all put an increasing demand on the generation of power. So, we have a capabilities-based assessment on the issue of power.

You know, there's a sort of a joke in Afghanistan: You can follow a U.S. Army unit through the mountains of Afghanistan by the trail of batteries they shed, because of the power requirement that all of these systems require.

So, we've got a study in place—a CBA, a capabilities-based assessment—to try to determine how we can meet those power demands and become more self-sustaining. The aspiration is to eventually, in the out years, develop the capability to have a self-sustaining brigade that can produce its own water, its own power, its own energy. We're a long way from that, but that's the right question to be asked. To those that partner with us, like DARPA, RDECOM, even the private sector, to try to help us become more self-sustaining.

Senator UDALL. That's exciting news, and count on me to be an advocate for what you're doing.

Thank you, again. And when you're confirmed, I look forward to further working with you.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, Senator.

Senator UDALL. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Udall. And thank you for raising the energy question. It's a critically important question for the Army. I also talked to General Dempsey about that, and the need for our security, in many ways, to address that issue which you have raised. And thank you for your ongoing interest in that piece.

Senator Brown, I believe, is next.

Senator BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I'm bouncing back and forth, between hearings, like many others, but—

Sir, I met you yesterday. Obviously, I asked a lot of the questions. I appreciate your candor. Look forward to voting in support of you.

And I just did—had a couple of questions. I know that—I think you know that I have an interest in, obviously, Guard and Reserve troops, and I attended the first National Guard Caucus event this year. And I agree with many of the priorities by—referenced by Senator Graham, a dear friend of mine. And he drilled down on several key themes that, if implemented, I believe would have a positive impact on our Nation's operational service and security.

And he was, in fact—acted as an operational Reserve after almost—well, he was in the Reserves and, I just found out, the Guard, as well. So, I look forward to hearing his perspective on a whole host of issues regarding the Guard and Reserves.

I'm concerned with the fact that our depressed economy is having a terrible effect on our heroes that have served, especially the Guard and reservists. Over 30 percent of our young non-Active-Duty soldiers are unemployed. And I'm wondering, you know, What does this mean to you, in your efforts, if any? And is there anything that we can do, and you can help us with, to have employers not only hire, but keep onboard, members of the Guard and Reserves?

General DEMPSEY. Yeah, Senator, thanks. And thank you for your service in the Guard.

We are partnered with the other agencies of government, notably the Veterans Administration, of course, but also with Governors across the country, in trying to raise the interest and awareness of the plight of the returning veteran, if you will.

As you know, recently the—General Petraeus' wife, Holly, was appointed to look at the predatory practices of some on trying to take advantage of soldiers, with things like loans and so forth.

Senator BROWN. Well, Senator Reed and I actually dealt with that in our FinReg bill, to try to address those.

General DEMPSEY. Yes.

Senator BROWN. I recognize that, as well.

General DEMPSEY. And that's not—as you know, that's—that crosses all components—Active, Guard, and Reserve.

Senator BROWN. Right.

General DEMPSEY. We've partnered with academia, to the extent we can, to find educational opportunities. And there's some—I won't name them, but there's some remarkable initiatives out there, in academia, where they are reaching out to veterans to allow them to use their GI Bill in a way that is both financially vital for them, but also to account for their unique needs as veterans as they come back from a conflict.

So, those are the things we're doing. What I would say to you, in response to your question, is, if confirmed, we've just got to keep the fire burning in that regard.

Senator BROWN. Right.

General DEMPSEY. Because, again, this is a—this is not a 2-year problem or challenge, this is a multiyear challenge.

Senator BROWN. Sir, also, I know that, you know, you're dealing with the real issue of not only Active-Duty suicide rates, but, you know, Guard and Reserves seems to—seem to be dramatically higher. You know, I'm trusting that you'll continue on with that effort and—

General DEMPSEY. Yes.

Senator BROWN.—try to address what the needs are and try to have more intervention.

General DEMPSEY. Absolutely, Senator.

Senator BROWN. Thank you. I'd appreciate that.

And also, I was wondering if you could give any insight as to the M-9 pistol competition, where that will stand in the new go-round. Anything you can share?

General DEMPSEY. In TRADOC, most of my attention to date, in terms of personal weapons, has been on the individual carbine, because we were—TRADOC was tasked by the Secretary of the Army to run an analysis of whether it was time to move away from the M-4.

We're actually doing two things with regard to the carbine. One is, improving the M-4, both its performance, but also the performance of the ammunition. And then, we're looking at whether we need an individual carbine beyond the M-4. That work is ongoing. I think the RFP, in draft, is—has been released. And I think the final RFP—request for proposal—will be issued sometime in the third quarter of this fiscal year.

I have not been involved, to date, Senator, on the issue of the M-9. And based on our conversation yesterday, I will look forward to learning more about that, if I'm confirmed.

Senator BROWN. Great. Well, sir, just in conclusion, I know the challenges are huge. You know, my concern is that we get the best value for our dollars, but also that, you know, we can provide the tools and resources to our men and women who are fighting to not only do the job, but come home safely.

One of the issues we talked about yesterday was the rules-of-engagement issue, and making sure that that's revisited and updated so we can allow the soldiers to do the job without being handcuffed by attorneys. And I'm one of them. But, you know, obviously, I think that's important. Out of all the things I've heard about the morale, the issues, it's that one issue that always seems to come back with us, saying, "You know what? I'd love to do A, B, C, and D, but the JAG says—or this person says—the commander's guidance is"—and I think, in some respects, in—at times, we may be, you know, jeopardizing the safety of our soldiers.

So, I know you said you were going to look into that, and I appreciate it. And good luck to you and your family.

Thank you.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Brown.

Senator Hagan is next.

And after Senator Hagan, Senator Shaheen, I believe, will be the last Senator, on this side at least, and I—and she has agreed that she could stay on, if other Senators appear, and take the gavel at that point. I very much appreciate that.

Senator Hagan.

Senator HAGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I just want to welcome General Dempsey, and really appreciate your service to our country, and your continued service.

And I also wanted to welcome your wife, Deanie, and your family. It's obviously a family affair, when somebody is—spends the number of years that you have with our military. And I just want to thank you so much. And to have three children also having been in the Army certainly is a testament to you and your wife. So, thank you both for that.

I want to ask a question about the sexual assaults. And I know you are—will take this seriously, but I did want to bring this up. And last month, a group of veterans and Active-Duty servicemembers sued the Pentagon, citing military commanders

aren't doing enough to prosecute sexual assault cases. And if these claims are founded, the failure to provide a—basic guarantees of safety to women, who now represent 15 percent of the Armed Forces, is not just a moral issue or a morale issue, it is a defining statement about the condition and the approach of our military.

The Pentagon has issued a statement, saying the issue is a command priority and that it is working to make sure all troops are safe from sexual abuse.

And in the Army today, what do you foresee as the challenges in implementing a safe and timely reporting system for sexual assaults?

General DEMPSEY. You have my commitment, as I expressed yesterday, that this issue is foremost in mind. And here's why, Senator. It's really—it rubs at the fabric of our profession. You may have heard that we're doing an analysis this year of, What have the last 10 years of war done to our profession? How are we different? How do we perceive ourselves to be different? How have some of the responsibilities we've pushed to the lower echelons—should they have changed the way we develop leaders? And these things are all tied together. And one of the things that has come out of the analysis already is that the core of our profession—if we're going to be a profession—and we can't take that for granted—is trust. And so, the reason that an issue like sexual harassment is so important is not just because we should be protecting young men and women from sexual predators, but it tears at the very fabric of our profession. It breaks the bond of trust between leader and led. That's why it's important.

And so, we have made some inroads. You know, we've got a—you're well aware of our three-phased program. We're well on the way to executing the program. Some of the reporting indicates, in the active component, that it's steadied out. But, that's not good enough. It needs to nosedive, you know, the number of incidents.

You'll hear folks talk about whether it's better reporting or more incidents. And, you know, I find that to be somewhat irrelevant, actually, because, again, it tears at the fabric of the profession. And I do think the key is experts inside of brigade combat teams—and we're putting them there; education of our leaders about why it's important—not just because of the gender issues, but because of this issue of trust. And we're doing that. But, what you have is my assurances that, if confirmed, I will press down even harder on the accelerator.

Senator HAGAN. I appreciate that. Thank you. And I'm sure everybody will appreciate that.

In the last decade, the Army has attempted to field the Crusader, the Comanche, the Future Combat System, the non-light-of-sight missile, and the Armed Reconnaissance Helicopter. And this research and development adds up, I believe, to about over \$10 billion of research and development for equipment that was actually never fielded.

And the ground combat vehicle is the latest possibility that will be added to the Army vehicle fleet. Do you think the requirements for this vehicle are realistic in development? And, more importantly, is the use of research and development funds being spent on the ground combat vehicle going to transform the battlefield ca-

pabilities? And will the ground combat vehicle be superior to the Bradley enough to justify the costs associated with developing and fielding it?

General DEMPSEY. Yeah, thank you, Senator.

I am convinced that the requirements for the ground combat vehicle have been articulated in a way that actually begins to get at some of our aspiration for acquisition reform, meaning this: We collaborated, right from the start, among senior leaders, those who do the requirements determination and the acquisition community, on the requirements, as opposed to, potentially, some of the other programs you mentioned, where the requirements were determined, passed to the acquisition community, and the collaboration clearly wasn't adequate.

The other thing we've done with the GCV, as you know, is, we've said, "Look, if you can't give it to me in 5 to 7 years, I don't need it." Because, we know that if we shoot our aspirations beyond that technology we can see, generally speaking, we will be disappointed in the outcome.

So, I think that the GCV is actually prototypical, not only of the next generation of ground combat vehicle, but of a process change. And that's how we should look at it.

The Bradley has been a venerable part of our inventory. But, it has reached its maximum capacity in weight and energy. And as we continue to add technological advances, as we continue to learn about what—more about what it means to protect, when we continue to learn more about the mobility required in urban areas, that's why we think the GCV is an important step in our modernization.

Senator HAGAN. And where are we on that timeline now?

General DEMPSEY. Well the RFP is out, and I think we're approaching one of the milestones—I don't recall which—in the fall of this year.

Senator HAGAN. Okay. Well, I think the collaboration is obviously very important to getting the right vehicle at the right time for the right price.

As addressed in General Chiarelli's Suicide Awareness Report, published last July, in 2010, the life demands of a soldier today, when you look at the moving, the promotions, the combat stress, the exposure to trauma—all of these issues are disproportionately high, compared to their—the suicides are comparatively high, compared to their civilian counterparts of the same age. And the Army developed the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness to institutionalize mental resiliency. And although the Army is treating the symptoms of deployments, the larger issue, I believe, is rebalancing the force to allow the soldiers and their families to reset.

As the Army works to teach soldiers to be internally prepared to deal with the challenges of the Army at war, what is the Army doing to create balance within the force, in terms of shorter deployments and longer stability within the assignments? And we spoke a little bit about this yesterday.

General DEMPSEY. No, we did, Senator. But, I appreciate the opportunity to reinforce it.

I mean, we must get to a position where we have a minimum of 2 years at home with 1 year deployed in the active component.

And, as you know, it's 1-to-4 in the Reserve component. I'm not sure that's going to be enough, to tell you the truth. I don't know.

As I sit here today, I'm confident that, if we can get to 1-to-2, we will be doing our soldiers and families a great service, that they well deserve, in terms of helping them cope with these life demands that Pete Chiarelli, who, by the way, deserves every accolade we can possibly heap upon him for the work he's doing in this regard.

One-to-two—my—as we see these conflicts extend—and again, I—the—we're making some assumptions about Iraq and Afghanistan; and if those assumptions prove true, then 1-to-2 might be adequate to the task. But, if we continue to deploy in the numbers we're deploying, then we might have to reconsider and seek an even different BOG-dwell ratio. It might have to be 1-to-3. But, I'm not in a position—none of us are, really—to say that, right now.

And we'll always do—you know this, Senator—but, we'll always do what the Nation needs. So, if we've got to break our BOG-dwell because of an emergency for this Nation, we're there. But, as a routine matter, when these issues become prolonged, we need to have a standard of 1-to-2 so we can address the issues you're addressing.

Senator HAGAN. Well, it's so important for the soldiers, as well as their families.

And I thank you for your testimony. And I look forward to your confirmation.

General DEMPSEY. Thank you, Senator.

Senator HAGAN. Thank you.

Senator SHAHEEN [presiding]. Good morning. It's still "good morning."

General Dempsey, congratulations to you on your nomination. And thank you, to you and your family, for all of the service you've given to this country.

I've been particularly impressed in the parts of your testimony, and questions that I've been able to hear this morning, about your work on leadership development. And I would suggest that perhaps you could design a course for Members of Congress, because I think that would be helpful.

General DEMPSEY. I think the appropriate response there is, "No comment," Senator. [Laughter.]

Senator SHAHEEN. I know that Senator Ayotte, in her remarks, mentioned New Hampshire's Deployment Cycle Support Program, which we have had in place for several years to help our deploying Guard and Reserves and their families. And I would just like to reiterate how important this program is. I think it's a model for the rest of the country. There's some very impressive data on the successes of the program. People who have been part of it are four times more likely to stay married when they come back. They're four times more likely to stay in the military. They're five times less likely to become homeless. And on the very critical issue of suicide prevention, that a number of people have raised this morning, 100 percent of those people considered at risk for suicide are in active prevention with licensed support personnel.

So, it is—has been a hugely successful program. And with the largest deployment in New Hampshire's history right now, we think it's very important. And I hope, after you are confirmed, that

you will help us figure out how we can continue this program, which had been supported primarily through congressionally directed spending. So, I hope you will take a look at this.

General DEMPSEY. I will, Senator. Thank you.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

This summer, I had the opportunity to visit Iraq for my first time, and Kuwait. And we visited Camp Arifjan. And I was truly amazed—and I think most people don't recognize that this is the—the deployment out of Iraq is the largest movement of people and materiel in the military since World War II. It was really quite amazing. And General Patton, I know, would be proud of what General Webster and folks there have been able to accomplish.

One of the things that impressed me the most was the way they had integrated savings into the entire operation there so that all of the men and women who were part of that effort are looking at how they can be more efficient in bringing people out and the operations of that unit.

I wonder if you could talk a little bit about how you see integrating that kind of culture into the entire Army, and what's happening on that right now.

General DEMPSEY. Yeah, thank you, Senator, because it gives me the opportunity to point out that I'm deeply committed to supporting the Secretary of the Army and what he's doing to inculcate that culture that you describe into our Army.

Secretary McHugh has been very clear with us, with the four-stars as we assemble from time to time with him, on that issue. And we're—and we both respect his judgments and the course that he's charted for us.

I would also mention that one of those who has accepted that responsibility is General Ann Dunwoody, who, you probably know, is our Army Materiel Command commander. And I've often said to her that she is accomplishing this retrograde of equipment out of Iraq in a way that actually almost makes it invisible to the rest of us, and suggested maybe it shouldn't be. You know, maybe we should—she's done a remarkable job.

And so, I think what you're reflecting is, you've seen, at the tactical level, the kind of adaptations and efficiencies that we're capable of. And what you're suggesting is, we've got to do the same thing as an institution. And you're exactly right.

Senator SHAHEEN. And so, how do you make that happen?

General DEMPSEY. Well, Secretary McHugh and General Casey, for the past few years, have pursued a thing that they call the "enterprise approach," which is a way of suggesting that the stovepipes of the Army—and, sad to say, but not surprising, I suppose, we do have our own stovepipes: Training and Doctrine Command, Forces Command, Army Materiel Command, the forward-deployed forces—we tend to see things inside of our own, if you will—

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

General DEMPSEY.—silos. And what the approach encourages is cross-collaboration. Now, I'd be disingenuous to suggest we're where we need to be. But, where we want to be, and where I think Secretary McHugh will guide us, is to an approach that allows us to see issues from—right from the start, with a resource-sensitive eye, which, frankly, to our discredit in some ways, we haven't had

to do that because the American people have been so generous with their resources over the last 10 years.

We've done fairly well with those resources, by the way. And, as has been said earlier, the—today's Army is the best Army it's ever been. And thank you for that. But, we have to understand that we also share part of the Nation's responsibility to be viable and to support the economic instrument of power, not just the military instrument of power. We're prepared to do that. To do that, we have to be more resource-conscious. We will.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

I want to also follow up on Senator Udall's question about how we reduce the dependency of our military on foreign oil and on how we are more efficient around energy use. And so, you got into that a little bit, but I wonder if you could elaborate some more on the kinds of things that we're doing and what kind of support would be helpful from Congress as you're looking at what you need to do.

General DEMPSEY. Well, you know what I'd like to do, Senator, is—if confirmed—is take on board the opportunity to actually engage this committee—and you, in particular—on what we're doing with regard to this issue of power and energy, because we are doing a great deal. Much of it is really nascent. It's not really very well developed. But, we're looking at the same things that our civilian counterparts are looking at, in terms of solar and wind and the other noncarbon fuels that we might leverage to make ourselves more reliant. It—to—for us, it's a—it's actually a matter of military necessity, because—

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

General DEMPSEY.—the more you're reliant on a fuel convoy, the more you're stuck to lines of communication; and you've what that's—happened to us in Iraq and Afghanistan.

So, let me take on board the opportunity to engage you on that more coherently or articulately to let you know what we're doing and to take—seek your advice on what more we might do.

Senator SHAHEEN. Good. I will definitely take you up on that.

General DEMPSEY. Okay.

Senator SHAHEEN. At this point, my time has expired. And since I am the last remaining Senator, I would like to again thank you. Thank you for being here, for your candor in your responses, and for your willingness to continue to serve.

At this point, the hearing is closed.

[Whereupon, at 11:37 a.m., the committee adjourned.]