

**HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON THE
U.S. EUROPEAN COMMAND U.S. AFRICA
COMMAND, AND U.S. JOINT FORCES COM-
MAND IN REVIEW OF THE DEFENSE AU-
THORIZATION REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR
2011 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE
PROGRAM**

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 2010

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:03 a.m. in room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, Senator Carl Levin (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Bill Nelson, Udall, Hagan, Burris, McCain, Inhofe, and LeMieux.

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

Majority staff members present: Jessica L. Kingston, research assistant; Michael J. Kuiken, professional staff member; Gerard J. Leeling, counsel; Jason W. Maroney, counsel; William G.P. Monahan, counsel; John H. Quirk V, professional staff member; and William K. Sutey, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: Joseph W. Bowab, Republican staff director; Paul C. Hutton IV, professional staff member; Michael V. Kostiw, professional staff member; Daniel A. Lerner, professional staff member; and Lucian L. Niemeyer, professional staff member.

Staff assistants present: Christine G. Lang, Hannah I. Lloyd, Brian F. Sebold, and Breon N. Wells.

Committee members' assistants present: James Tuite, assistant to Senator Byrd; Christopher Griffin, assistant to Senator Lieberman; Carolyn Chuhta, assistant to Senator Reed; Greta Lundeberg, assistant to Senator Bill Nelson; Roger Pena, assistant to Senator Hagan; John Richards, assistant to Senator Begich; Sandra Luff, assistant to Senator Sessions; Jason Lawrence, assistant to Senator Chambliss; Jason Van Beek, assistant to Senator Thune; Erskine Wells III, assistant to Senator Wicker; and Victor Cervino and Brian Walsh, assistants to Senator LeMieux.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN, CHAIRMAN

Chairman LEVIN. Good morning, everybody. Today's hearing is the first in a series of hearings that our committee will hold over the coming weeks with our combatant commanders to receive their testimony on the U.S. military strategy and operational requirements in their areas of responsibility. This is part of the committee's review of the fiscal year 2011 defense national authorization request.

This morning the committee receives testimony from Admiral James Stavridis, Commander, U.S. European Command and NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe; General William Ward, Commander, U.S. Africa Command; and General James Mattis, Commander, U.S. Joint Forces Command.

First let me take this opportunity on behalf of the committee to request that you pass along our gratitude to the men and women in your command and to their families for their commitment and their sacrifice in carrying out the missions of our commands.

While Admiral Stavridis is not new to appearing before this committee, this is his first time testifying as EUCOM Commander and Supreme Allied Commander Europe. U.S. European Command's engagement with our allies and partners in Europe is an essential component of the trans-Atlantic relationship. Nowhere are the benefits of this relationship more clearly demonstrated than in Afghanistan, where 43 countries and nearly 40,000 non-U.S. troops, the vast majority of which come from countries in the EUCOM area of responsibility, are participating in the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force. EUCOM's efforts to build the capacity and interoperability of our allies and partners in Europe are an important contribution to ISAF's mission to bring security and stability to Afghanistan.

We welcome the increased commitment of forces by our ISAF coalition partners since President Obama announced the commitment of additional U.S. forces in December. In addition, ISAF soldiers from Britain, Denmark, Estonia, and Canada joined U.S. soldiers and Marines and Afghan troops in the recent combat operations in Helmand Province, and more than a dozen ISAF troops have died in that operation. We honor their sacrifice and the sacrifice of their families.

At the same time, an issue that I want to get into further this morning is the continuing shortfall by our NATO allies to provide the additional trainers the NATO training mission in Afghanistan needs to build up the Afghan National Army and Police. It's apparent that growing the Afghan security forces so that they can take responsibility for ensuring their country's security is essential for the success of our counterinsurgency strategy and for meeting the July 2011 date that President Obama has set for the start of the reduction of U.S. troops in Afghanistan. There is no shortage of recruits for the Afghan Army, thanks in part to that July 2011 date, which has energized Afghanistan's leaders to bring in more recruits.

According to General Bill Caldwell, the head of our training mission in Afghanistan, a major problem is the continuing shortage of trainers to provide the initial basic training. Training the Afghan Army is a mission that our NATO allies should embrace, regardless

of their ability or their willingness to be on the front line of the fight. Yet, at a recent conference to generate forces NATO members pledged fewer than half of the approximately 1200 additional NATO trainers sought by General Caldwell. That is more than disappointing; it is unacceptable.

The European Command faces a number of other security challenges within its area of responsibility. President Obama's new plan for NATO—excuse me—for missile defense in Europe, the “Phased Adaptive Approach,” is supported by our NATO allies. In addition, later this year NATO plans to complete a revised strategic concept for how the alliance should adapt to today's security challenges, the first major revision of NATO's strategic concept since the events of September 11.

General Ward, the challenges in the AFRICOM AOR are staggering, from the conflicts that rage across borders to fragile governments, to nations where peacekeeping or peace-enforcing forces are the best and sometimes only hope for security and stability, and to the spread of violent extremism.

While confronting some of these issues falls squarely in the lap of a military command, many do not. And your command is being directed to assist in non-traditional ways where the jurisdictional lines between the Departments of State and Defense are blurred at best. The committee looks forward to your testimony on these issues and AFRICOM's activities designed to confront and to counter them.

The threat of terrorism from Africa, and particularly the potential for havens and recruiting grounds for terrorists in ungoverned or undergoverned areas, are cause for deep concern. The attempted Christmas Day bombing of an airliner reminds everybody that al-Qaeda and violent extremists who share their ideology are not just located in the Afghanistan-Pakistan region, but in places like Somalia, Mali, Nigeria, and Niger. The committee is eager to hear how AFRICOM is working to confront those very real threats.

Turning to the U.S. Joint Forces Command, General Mattis is responsible for the training, certification, and mission readiness of our armed forces as the joint force provider for present and future operational needs. I hope that General Mattis will discuss how JFCOM has changed and promoted DOD practices that result in more efficient and effective policies and coordination with respect to joint operations, as well as meeting the anticipated threats of the future.

We're also interested in hearing about the role of U.S. Joint Forces Command with respect to the drawdown of forces in Iraq. Specifically of interest would be your views on: how the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Iraq will have an impact on JFCOM's ability to source the combatant commander's requirements in the future, how the services and other government agencies are preparing to execute the drawdown, and how well the services are meeting their expected dwell times to restore readiness rates.

In addition, as persistent conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq continue to stress our armed forces, our committee is interested in hearing your assessment, General, of the readiness of deploying forces.

Again, we thank our witnesses for their dedicated and continued service and we look forward to your testimony.
 Senator McCain.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank all the witnesses for being here today. I'm grateful for your service and that of all the brave men and women under your commands.

Many of my colleagues and I have been strong supporters of our trans-Atlantic partnerships in the NATO alliance. During the Cold War, NATO succeeded, as we all know, in promoting and protecting freedom and democracy in Europe and we won. But today the alliance is facing a number of very significant challenges. Secretary Gates rightly said in his speech at the NATO strategic concept seminar last month: "Unless the strategic concept spurs operational and institutional changes, it will not be worth the paper it's printed on."

Right now the alliance has serious budgetary problems and is facing a budget shortfall of some \$900 million. The problem is not just the current underfunding of NATO. Over the years, NATO and the National defense budgets consistently have declined to where only 5 of its 28 member states are obligating the required defense spending of 2 percent of gross domestic product.

While the war in Afghanistan has shown a light on NATO's diminished capacity, these shortcomings are not new. For years before Afghanistan NATO, due to its limited budgets, has let its capabilities decline. For example, NATO lacks the cargo airlift, the helicopters, aerial refueling tankers, and ISR platforms needed to be effective in Afghanistan or in any other future conflict.

Member states should be explaining to their parliaments and to their citizens that NATO faces common threats and shares common goals. I am concerned that they continue to allow the idea to build up among their publics that NATO is fighting wars because the Americans are making them do it. The alliance must be about more than fulfilling our obligations under Article 5, as essential as that is. It must also serve to deter potential adversaries and build partner capacity within the alliance and beyond. Only then can we begin to collectively transform our alliance from one of common defense to one of common security.

Admiral Stavridis, I look forward to hearing your thoughts on the future of defense spending among our NATO allies and your prescription for developing and better leveraging NATO's capabilities to meet future threats.

I strongly believe it's important to nurture and scrutinize old friendships. It's equally important to develop and foster new ones. Africa is a continent full of potential friends and allies. We often grow too complacent and lack the foresight to prepare for the things we don't expect, and that's why I'm glad we have the Africa Command. Africa, as we know, has always been vulnerable to illicit trafficking due to widespread corruption, poor governance, and abject poverty.

Somalis continue to flow into Yemen and train with al- Qaeda and its affiliates, and we don't have to look any further than the

Christmas Day bomber, a Nigerian, as proof that violent extremists exist in many places we're not thinking about or fighting a war.

But we have partners in the region. Malian troops have launched an offensive against al-Qaeda along its northern border with Algeria and lost as many as 13 troops last summer. African nations are vulnerable to a variety of threats, narcotrafficking, piracy, and terrorism, any of which would further weaken an already-fragile region.

So, General Ward, I look forward to hearing your testimony and your command's need for trainers, forces, and resources.

General Mattis, your leadership of Joint Forces Command comes at a time when our troops are engaged more than ever in joint operations. The branches of our armed forces are expected not only to team with one another, but with allies and host nation troops, as we have seen most recently in the offensive in Marjah. The committee is interested in understanding how Joint Forces Command is preparing our troops to operate jointly and what steps you believe the services should be taking in this regard. I'm also curious about how the rapidly changing feedback from the field in Iraq and Afghanistan will be incorporated in Joint Command's future doctrinal development.

You're all highly decorated and highly respected members of the military. I appreciate your service and weigh your opinions, requests, and predictions heavily, so I look forward to hearing all of your testimonies.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Senator McCain follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.

We'll start I think with you, Admiral Stavridis.

**STATEMENT OF ADM JAMES G. STAVRIDIS, USN, COMMANDER,
UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND**

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Good morning, Chairman Levin. Good morning, Senator McCain, all the Senators who are here. Thank you very much.

Chairman LEVIN. Is your mike on?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Could you just move it closer to you a little bit if you can.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Thank you very much, Senator Levin and Senator McCain, all the members of the committee who are taking the time to hear from my two very good friends and wingmen this morning, General Kip Ward and General Jim Mattis. I feel as a Navy Admiral very safe between these two distinguished combat veterans.

I want to thank Congress, I want to thank this committee, for the support you give us in all of our operations. It's vital and it translates directly to our men and women, and we thank you for it.

I'll be glad to talk about all of the things that were raised by the chairman and the ranking member. In Afghanistan, I would say that I am cautiously optimistic. I think Secretary Gates yesterday in Afghanistan put it very well: We have some challenges ahead,

but we are seeing some bits and pieces of good news. And I'll be glad to talk about some of those.

Senator Levin, I agree completely that we need to focus like a laser on trainers for the NATO forces. I'm committed to doing that and I'll talk about it as we go along.

I did want to mention also we're very engaged from a U.S. European Command perspective in the Balkans. We don't talk a lot about that these days, but I think we see a real success story emerging in the Balkans. If we look back 10 years ago when we had almost 30,000 U.S. troops in the Balkans, today we're down to about 1200, and our allies are working very hard in the Balkans as we move toward a safer and more secure area there.

I'd also like to touch on today cyber and some of my concerns there, talk a little about Iran and potential threats to Europe, touch on our relations with Russia, and then talk a bit about some of the initiatives we're undertaking at U.S. European Command which focus on inter-agency, international, private-public partnering, and the use of effective strategic communications.

Sir, I'll close by saying I represent here 80,000 brave men and women from U.S. European Command. They're all proud to serve. They're all volunteers. They thank you for your support.

Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Stavridis follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Admiral.

General Ward.

**STATEMENT OF GEN WILLIAM E. WARD, USA, COMMANDER,
UNITED STATES AFRICA COMMAND**

General WARD. Good morning, Chairman Levin, Senator McCain, and distinguished members of the committee. It's great for me to be here this morning as well alongside my two great friends, the Admiral and the General, who we've come to partner with over time, and I think our collaboration has been good for our men and women who serve with us as well as for our Nation.

I am very happy to be here to address the points that you've raised as well as others, and I'd like to start off by just thanking this committee for the great support that has been provided to my command, its men and women, as we have carried forth our mission on behalf of our Nation.

We do what we do in AFRICOM to protect American lives and to promote America interests, and we do it by supporting security and stability programs in Africa and its island nations. We concentrate our efforts on helping African states build capable and professional militaries that respect human rights, adhere to the rule of law, and more effectively contribute to stability in Africa.

We are assisting our African partners in building capacities to counter transnational threats from violent extremist organizations, to stem illicit trafficking, to support peacekeeping operations, and to address the consequences of natural disasters.

Supporting the development of professional and capable militaries contributes to increased security and stability in Africa, allows African nations and regional organizations to promote good governance, expand development, and provide for their common defense, and better serve their people.

The Africa Partnership Station, which includes our European and African partners as members of the staff, is now on its fifth deployment and has expanded from the initial focus in the Gulf of Guinea to other African coastal nations. Africa Endeavor, a continental-wide command and control exercise, has been seeing a steady increase in participation and will amount to 30 nations participating this year. Exercise Natural Fire, conducted by the Nations in East Africa, a tremendously successful program that looks at how these nations respond collectively to a natural disaster.

These programs reflect the willingness of our partners to work with us and with each other against common threats and reflect that our programs and activities are indeed producing tangible results. My focus is on activities, programs, and communications that support our National interests and also reinforce success in ways that assure progress toward the long-term goals our African partners have established for themselves as they align with our National security objectives.

We closely harmonize our activities with our colleagues at State, USAID, and other agencies. Our service components are in fact maturing. Our Office of Security Cooperation, defense attaches, the network of forward operating sites and cooperative security locations, including Camp Lemonnier in Djibouti, are tremendously valuable as we pursue our U.S. security interests.

It's my honor to serve with the very distinguished uniformed and civilian members of the Department of Defense and our command who work every day alongside our inter-agency partners making a difference in this vitally important part of the world as we look to cause their work to lead to more effective global stability.

Their dedicated efforts exemplify the spirit and determination of the American people, and they do contribute to the strength of our Nation and the security and stability on the African continent, directly supporting our interests there.

I'm pleased to also say that, representing those men and women, I brought along today our Command Sergeant Major, the command's senior enlisted leader, Command Sergeant Major Mark Ripka as someone who just exemplifies the goodness of that great, great team.

So again I thank you for your support. I thank you for what you do to cause our mission to be successful, and I stand ready to add any additional information that I can. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of General Ward follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you so much, General.

General Mattis.

**STATEMENT OF GEN. JAMES N. MATTIS, USMC, COMMANDER,
UNITED STATES JOINT FORCES COMMAND**

General MATTIS. Chairman Levin, Senator McCain, members of the committee: Thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I request my written statement be placed in the record.

Chairman LEVIN. And it will be.

General MATTIS. Over the course of this past year, Joint Forces Command has continued to provide combat-ready forces to combatant commanders to support the military operations, continue to prepare for future conflicts while looking ahead. After an historic

change of command in NATO, which got handed over to the Supreme Commander, Allied Command Transformation, we continue to ensure Joint Forces Command remains closely linked with our allies and partners in NATO.

The character of this current conflict remains different or, better said, irregular. We have continued to adapt our forces in stride and become increasingly confident in irregular warfare. Across the board, Joint Forces has significantly adapted to this new environment. Our watchword is "balance." The Chairman and the Secretary of Defense have stated that we must not lose our conventional superiority in the process of adapting. Even as we continue to prepare and deploy forces in the irregular fights in Iraq and Afghanistan, we cannot permit dormancy of our conventional ability.

Our forces are achieving balance and will continue to do so as dwell times build with the Iraqi drawdown. Through effective training and education across the force, we can strike the appropriate balance while ensuring our current and future combat readiness.

I returned a week ago from Afghanistan and our field commanders there confirm that our troops are superbly trained for the fight, even as we use lessons learned to further improve our readiness and not fall back on complacency. Based on the reality of current active operations and future trends outlined in our work on the future, Joint Forces Command's top priority continues to reflect this balance between support for the current fight and our constant assessment of the future to ensure we remain the most capable military in the world.

Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of General Mattis follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, General.

Let's try an 8-minute first round.

Admiral, there have been a number of reports about the performance of the Afghan Army during the recent operation to clear the Taliban from Central Helmand Valley. Marine Brigadier General Larry Nicholson said that Afghan forces are not cosmetic; they are in the fight. But at the same time, there have been anecdotal accounts of Afghan soldiers looting the bazaar in Marjah, smoking hashish, and failing to help our Marines in fortifying their positions.

Admiral, give us your assessment of the performance of Afghan soldiers that are partnered with coalition forces in the fighting in Helmand?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Sir, as you can imagine, I discuss this frequently with General Stan McChrystal, my NATO subordinate, who is directing operations. I also receive reports on a daily basis. I am satisfied with the progress of the Afghan National Army and overall its performance I think has been effective in Marjah.

As you recall, Senator, when we went south about a year ago the ratio of ISAF troops to Afghan troops was ten of the ISAF for every one of the Afghan. In this particular operation, we are one ISAF troop and about just less than one Afghan. So we're approaching that one to one ratio. So that's the quantity piece has improved dramatically.

The quality piece, I think General Nicholson is spot on. We're seeing them actually in the fight. We're also seeing instances where the Afghan troops are stepping ahead of the coalition forces and saying, let me go through that door first, let me go up that road first. We're seeing that kind of shoulder-to-shoulder effective combat fight out of our Afghan partners.

In terms of individual instances or anecdotes, we follow up on every one of those. We report them. Action is taken by the Afghan chain of command. But overall, Senator, I am satisfied with the progress we've seen over the course of the year and I think the operation in Marjah shows that.

Chairman LEVIN. Well, that's important news. I want to just focus for a minute on that ratio. When we were there just, I guess the first time, maybe a year ago now and got into this issue, it was a five to one ratio, five of ours for one Afghan, five Marines. We heard that in Marjah, for that effort it was about two of ours to one of theirs.

Now you're telling us that it was actually a lot better than that, closer to one to one, which is very significant and important news, because that's critically important, just not only in terms of the turning over of responsibility for Afghan security to the Afghans, which is surely a major part of our mission, but also in terms of the credibility of what we're doing there to the people who live there, to the residents, but also to the training of Afghan troops, so that we can have that close training relationship. The closer that ratio is, not just to one to one, but two of ours to one of theirs, the closer we are to our own standard and our own goal.

We read in the paper this morning that, however, when that effort was undertaken that we left—I think Afghan troops left, or perhaps it was some Marines, a nearby area without adequate protection at all and a number of the Taliban just simply moved next door. Can you tell us anything about that and, if that was happening, why was there not a plan, particularly given the size of the Afghan Army, to have Afghan forces secure places where other combat troops were leaving in order to succeed in the fight in Marjah?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Senator, I'll have to take that one for the record and get back to you on that particular incident. I'm not familiar with it.

[The information referred to follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. You'll see a report in this morning's paper.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. As I mentioned in the opening statement, NATO members are falling short once again. At the most recent force generation conference, they fell short in meeting the NATO mission requirements, in particular the 1200 trainers that Lieutenant General Caldwell needs and NATO has committed to provide.

Can you give us any kind of assurance as to that, whether that's going to be filled in, whether the NATO countries that have fallen short of their commitments and obligations are going to be forthcoming?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. First of all, let me give you the exact numbers. We're looking for an additional 1278 and we have pledges at

this point for 541. So it is absolutely correct to say that NATO has fallen short in providing these vital trainers.

What we are doing about it is taking further steps in terms of contacting each of the Nations individually and going one by one through the precise requirement for each of the Nations in terms of where they could most effectively fill in the trainer mix. That effort is going on in real time both from my headquarters and up in Brussels, where the Secretary General is very engaged at the political level. So we will continue to hammer away at this until we fulfil that commitment, and I will continue to place it, as I told you, Senator Levin, at the top of my priority list.

Chairman LEVIN. Well, we appreciate that. General Caldwell at a press conference last week said that Afghan Army recruitment is going very, very strong. I think he said there was like an 800 percent increase in army recruitment over the last 4 or 5 months. But they can't put them into basic training right away because of the shortage of trainers, and that is totally unacceptable. It's almost unbelievable to me that we can't get NATO allies to carry out that kind of commitment, which is not the most dangerous of the positions that they need to fill. It's training. There's obviously danger anywhere, but compared to being in combat, it falls well short of that. We need to do everything we can, and I'm not sure what more we can do, but if there is anything more we can do, Admiral, please let us know.

In your judgment, can the recruiting trend, which is to a great extent due, according to General Caldwell, to the efforts of the Afghan leadership to stimulate recruiting, as well as an increase in pay—but he attributes the large increase more to the leadership of the Afghans than to the pay increase when we met with him. But will that recruiting trend in your judgment be maintained or is it maintainable right into the spring?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I believe it will be maintained, Senator. And I am also very focused on the other end of that equation, which is the retention piece, which is not going as well. So we have to continue to focus on retaining, just as we do here in the United States—it's so important to have the retention along with the recruitment piece.

So I'm confident we will continue to be strong on the recruiting side. I'm working very hard with Stan McChrystal and Bill Caldwell to focus on the retention side as well.

Chairman LEVIN. Now, there's a new missile defense plan in Europe called "Phased Adaptive Approach" that the Obama Administration has announced and begun to implement. Does NATO support that new missile defense plan?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. NATO is beginning that conversation. At the moment what we have is a ballistic missile defense C2, command and control, nascent structure, which is being explored to decide where, when, and how NATO could connect into this if the alliance decides to do so. I anticipate there will be a significant discussion about that at the defense ministerial, which will be in the May time frame, and I'm hoping to see a decision taken toward the time of the summit, which is in Lisbon in November. So it's very much an active conversation.

I don't want to prejudge the political decisions of the Nations, but it's certainly on the agenda.

Chairman LEVIN. From what you know, can you say that there seems to be a positive response to it?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I think overall that would be fair to say.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much.

Senator McCain.

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

Admiral, are we—as I understand, the President's proposal was that we would be adding approximately 30,000 troops and our allies, including in and out of NATO, would be adding an additional 10,000.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. How are we on track for that 10,000?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Sir, we're in pretty good shape. We're at 9,500. And if I can get the additional 700 trainers that I just talked to the chairman about, then that would put us over the 10,000 mark overall.

Senator MCCAIN. Now, does that include the 2,000 Dutch troops that are scheduled to leave?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. No, sir, it does not.

Senator MCCAIN. So you're really talking about 7,500. You don't have any illusion about the Dutch troops remaining, do you?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. My sense is, listening to the political dialogue out of The Netherlands, that they will be leaving.

Senator MCCAIN. All right, so we're really not on track, then. I mean, it's nice to say, but if you're going to lose 2,000 Dutch troops, who are, by the way, great fighters from my visits, it's not 9,500; it's closer to 7,500. And there are other of our allies whose commitments have certainly not been firmed up yet.

The Afghan Army as I understand it needs to be around 300,000 and 100,000 police; is that the right numbers that we would like to see over time?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I think over time, yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. How do we expect over time to pay for the Afghan Army?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I think the international community will have to be in a position to continue to support it for a great deal of time to come.

Senator MCCAIN. Roughly how much would that cost be on an annual basis?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I don't have that number at my fingertips, but it would certainly be in the billions, probably in the low billions.

Senator MCCAIN. We would expect our allies to foot the bill for that?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I think it is fair to say that it's an international effort and we would hope that all in the international community would continue to support it moving forward.

Senator MCCAIN. Overall, the operation in Marjah was successful?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I think it is going very successfully, certainly through the clearing phase. We're now in the build and hold, which I think will be challenging. But I am confident that the plans that

we have in place will give us a very good chance at overall success as we go through clear, build, hold, and ultimately transition.

Senator MCCAIN. What presence was our NATO allies in that operation?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Overall, 55—

Senator MCCAIN. The Marjah operation.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. The Marjah operation was in the range percentwise, of the ISAF forces, was around 25 to 30 percent.

Senator MCCAIN. And that was in direct combat roles?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Largely, yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. So some of our allies are fighting very well. Some of them have very restrictive rules of engagement, right?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. We have 22 nations that have no caveats and we have about 20 nations that have caveats, yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. And some of these caveats are very disturbing.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Some of them are very restrictive and we work very hard to try and reduce those wherever we can.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, I thank you. There's a lot going on in NATO and in Europe and we appreciate the great work you're doing.

General WARD, this sounds like perhaps a question that need not be asked, but should we be looking as part of Africa Command at some headquarters located in Africa?

General WARD. Senator, the work of the command is in its programs, its activities, its exercises, the things that we do across the continent to help the Nations of Africa increase their capacity. The headquarters location, quite candidly, doesn't affect that work, where we plan those activities, where we look to resource those activities. It's not something that the leaders in Africa are asking me about and at this time it is my estimation that any great efforts to locate an American-size headquarters of that nature would probably be more counterproductive than productive.

Senator MCCAIN. Because?

General WARD. Because of perceptions, because of the reactions to neighbors, to parts of the continent where the headquarters might not be located, many unintended consequences I think would fall out from that type of a move.

Senator MCCAIN. What's your area of greatest concern? Maybe tell us a couple of countries that are of your greatest concern, General WARD?

General WARD. Senator, as we look at the continent, clearly the challenges are there. There are also opportunities. But when we talk about what's going on—

Senator MCCAIN. What countries are of your greatest concern, General?

General WARD. There are what's going on in Somalia, what's going on in Sudan, what's going on in Nigeria, the extrajudicial means of changes of government that we saw in Niger, in Guinea. Those activities are concerning.

Senator MCCAIN. Do you believe we're making—since it's not in the news, perhaps it's obvious we are making some progress in the piracy issue.

General WARD. We are making progress from the standpoint of addressing the threat at sea. The weather lately also helped be-

cause of the high sea state and the inability of those small skiffs to go out and operate freely. The coalition that occurs at sea is an effective coalition. A big ocean, however, as you are aware, and so these skiffs do in fact go around and get through.

That piracy threat is not just in the Gulf of Aden, the East Indian Ocean. It's also the west coast of Africa. Our work to help these African nations increase their capacity to deal with their territorial waters is certainly making a difference. In addition to that, I would offer that the work that would need to occur on land, especially pertaining to good governance or governments that are more than less able to control their territories, will also contribute to increased stability and reducing the effects of piracy.

Senator MCCAIN. The main area of piracy operations is where?

General WARD. Predominantly the Gulf of Aden.

Senator MCCAIN. What country?

General WARD. Somalia.

Senator MCCAIN. Somalia, an incredibly unstable country.

General WARD. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. And very little prospect for stability in the future.

General WARD. Well, it's a work in progress, to be sure. Small things happening now, but much work to be done.

Senator MCCAIN. Could you just make a comment about Ethiopia and the situation there?

General WARD. Ethiopia remains a friend, a partner in our efforts to help produce stability there in the region. Their work that the Ethiopians do in the counterterrorism business, as well as in the work of their participation in peacekeeping operations, is important work, and I think our partnering with the Ethiopians as well as other East African nations is something that we would continue to look at in ways of helping produce stability in that part of the world.

Senator MCCAIN. I thank you, General.

Thank you, Admiral. Thank you very much, General Mattis.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator McCain.

Senator Lieberman.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Thanks to the three of you for your extraordinary service. General Ward, let me just pick up where Senator McCain was, particularly in Somalia. We know from experience that where there's no government trouble grows, either piracy or the provision of space for terrorists, Islamist terrorists particularly, to operate.

I gather that there is an attempt by, I'm not sure what you call it, the provisional government, to retake the capital city of Mogadishu, and I wonder if you could give us both your estimate of how that's going and to what extent we're able to be supportive of that effort?

General WARD. Senator, as you know, Somalia has been ungoverned space for almost 20 years.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right.

General WARD. What we're facing today is clearly not new. What I will say is the current Transition Federal Government being supported by the African Union, being supported by the African

Union's Mission in Somalia, AMISOM, and being supported by others of the international community, including the United States, is an effort that I would continue to endorse and think that it has for now our best potential for helping to turn around some of the instability and lack of governance that we've experienced there.

What's going on in Mogadishu with respect to the desires of the transition government to reclaim parts of Mogadishu is a work in progress. I'm not aware of the specifics. I'll have to come back to you, sir, with the specifics on what that current operation looks like. But to the degree the TFG, the Transition Federal Government, can in fact reexert control over Mogadishu with the help of AMISOM and others I think is something that we would look to do and support, as well as the other provisions of the Djibouti process that look to instilling governance, instilling developmental things that will serve the benefit of the Somalia people to cause that situation to reverse itself.

We look to participate with those who also support them, the other nations and the neighbors who contribute to the AMISOM mission, in particular Uganda, Burundi, supporting their work and trying to lend the hand they lend to the TFG and increasing stability. So those efforts are ongoing. It's an effort that I think we would certainly support and we would look to do it in ways that add to stability in that part of the continent.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Fine. Let me go to the Sudan. As you know, there's a lot of concern, continuing concern here about the situation in Sudan. We're in a critical period in the coming year with national elections next month, which are the first in almost—in more than 2 decades, maybe more than 2½ decades. Then there's a referendum in the south in January.

I'd like to hear first what your command is doing to support the UN-AU force in Darfur, where unfortunately the human rights abuses are continuing; and then second, what AFRICOM can and is doing to support implementation of the comprehensive peace agreement of January 2005?

General WARD. Senator, our support to UNAMID, the United Nations Mission in Darfur, is in the form of training assistance, logistics assistance, support to those forces who have been declared a part of that UNAMID mission. We provide logistics, lift support, as I've mentioned, and we continue to do that in support of the peacekeeping effort there in Darfur.

As you know, we have no direct, on-the-ground involvement there. Those processes as a part of the comprehensive peace agreement are essentially political processes that we certainly support. We do support in the case of southern Sudan the formation of the Southern Liberation Army in southern Sudan, some of their professional development initiatives, some of their training initiatives, and we do that through and in conjunction with the Department of State, working with the Special Envoy and doing those things that help increase the professionalism of that southern Sudanese force.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Let me ask you how you would suggest that we interpret the statements that President Bashir has made that essentially the war is over? How should we interpret those?

General WARD. Senator, the cooperation that we see emerging between Chad and Sudan, between President Debi and Bashir, I think we would look to that as an encouraging sign.

Senator LIEBERMAN. So it's real? Something is changing there?

General WARD. Something is changing.

Senator LIEBERMAN. For the better?

General WARD. It's for the better. It's still fragile. It's not irreversible, to be sure. But I think we should be encouraged by those signs and we look forward to more of that as this political dialogue continues.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Admiral Stavridis, let me ask you about Bosnia-Herzegovina. Senator McCain and I and a couple of colleagues visited there last month. You know, I think we feel a sense of pride about what the U.S. was able to do in the 90s to stop the aggression and genocide there. But as you indicate in your posture statement, the problems continue, particularly the ethnic divisions. It's not what it was in the 90s, of course, but you've got some really explosive situations and people there, particularly Mr. Dodek in the Republika Srpska.

I will tell you that the one most encouraging experience that we had was visiting with the military of Bosnia-Herzegovina, and I think EUCOM has had a lot to do with that. You've got all the ethnic groups in there. They're functioning together. They're at a higher level.

I want to quote from something which you said in your statement because it's really the question I want to ask after your evaluation. You warn that "the programmed reduction of NATO and European Union forces in the Balkans may induce additional risk of instability in the region." I'd like to ask you to evaluate the situation, but then specifically would you counsel now that the programmed reduction of NATO and European Union forces in the Balkans should not go forward, that it involves too much risk?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Thank you, Senator. Just again the context of the reduction of U.S. troops in the Balkans is really quite remarkable. 20,000 in Bosnia alone; we're down to 20 there now. In Kosovo we had as many as almost 10,000. We're down to about 1200 troops there now.

In Bosnia, you correctly hit on I believe a central element, which is the security force there, the armed forces. Moving them in a direction that is integrated I think will be very encouraging to the body politic in Bosnia-Herzegovina.

In terms of Kosovo, we had 15,000 NATO troops there as recently as December. We've been able to draw down to about 10,000 NATO troops there now, again about 1200 U.S. The next step in that process is for me to provide military advice to the Secretary General about whether to take the step to go from 10,000 down to 5,000. I'm evaluating that very carefully. There is still tension, understandable, between Serbia and what they perceive as a break-away province of Serbia, but what the United States and 62 other nations have recognized as the independent country of Kosovo.

So I think we need to move carefully in the Balkans so that we don't fall back. The progress has been extraordinary. We don't want to let it unravel. I will be looking very carefully in Kosovo. We'll continue our encouraging efforts in Bosnia. Overall, I'm confident

we'll continue to move in a good direction, but it requires sort of watchful, watchful approaches.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Well, I appreciate that. I'm encouraged by it. I guess I'd encourage you to err on the side of caution.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I agree.

Senator LIEBERMAN. I understand the pressure to reduce and reduce, but we may look back and really regret it.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, sir.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Just to end on a bright note, I remember one of the stories we were told by the commander of the military in Bosnia-Herzegovina was that at one point Dodek from Srpska called on all the Serbian members of the Bosnia-Herzegovina armed forces to return home and no one came. That's a great comment and a tribute also, I think, to EUCOM's role in training that force.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Lieberman.

Senator Inhofe.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Since Senator Lieberman ended on a bright note, I'll start on a bright note. Some of the things that are working—and we've talked about this before, in fact every time we have a hearing or a meeting in private—some of the programs, like the train and equip program, 1206, 1207, 1208, the IMET program, the CERP program, CCIF, those programs are working well.

Admiral Stavridis, I would ask you, with some of these things that have been changed recently, like in the 1207, the whole reason for structuring these programs the way they're structured with DOD is so that they can be activated quickly and get an immediate response. Now we're kind of going the other direction with the 1207. Do you want to comment on that?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Senator, first of all, I completely agree that the 1206 and the IMET programs have been superb. I think each of the combatant commanders has testified to that over the last couple years, and I've benefited from them greatly in 3 years at U.S. Southern Command and continue to be a strong advocate here at U.S. European Command.

1207 money is kind of dual-keyed between State and Department of Defense. I think that any time there's a dual key it's going to take a little bit longer to work through the challenges. So some of that immediacy that is so valuable in the 1206 funding is not as readily available in the 1207. But we're committed to work with our partners in State and make it go as rapidly as—

Senator INHOFE. Of course, I understand that's civilian to civilian.

Are you satisfied with the funding level of the CCIF program?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, sir.

Senator INHOFE. All right. General Mattis, with all the great things that are happening in simulation and modeling now, as you know, yesterday we broke ground on the new building for the JFEDS program. By the way, I appreciate very much your personal attention, going down, watching that. We have people from all over the world there under our IMET program. I think some 250 coalition members are being trained by this JFEDS program.

So just another example of how IMET is working, and also an example of how the JFEDS program is working. Why don't you just give us an update as to what you think is happening in terms of things with the JFEDS program?

General MATTIS. Thanks, Senator. You know this is an issue near and dear to my heart. In preparing our troops, which is ultimately my responsibility, we cannot do it as efficiently or as effectively or as cheaply, I might add, as we can, in the real world, as we could using simulation. One of the biggest challenges we face is breaking the old paradigm that somehow simulators are good for Navy submarines, good for aviation, good for ship drivers, good for ballistic missile defense preparations, but somehow we leave the people who take 80 percent of our casualties off the ledger.

So we are going forward very strongly with this from the small unit level, to how we integrate joint ISR, intelligence, reconnaissance, and surveillance, and more importantly joint fires, because as we distribute our forces more broadly on the battlefield we need to reduce the risk to them. That means they can access joint ISR and know what's over the next hill. That means they can access and use well joint fires.

The installation out in your district I'll just tell you, sir, is absolutely critical to the maturation of this.

Senator INHOFE. I think the best way to break that paradigm is to get the people out there to see it.

General MATTIS. Yes, sir.

Senator INHOFE. Because it's one of these things that you can't explain this to someone, the actual conditions that they experience out there. It's mind-boggling.

General MATTIS. Yes, sir. And we have a couple of programs to do that right now, and we're getting a lot of interest. We've actually had significant support from this committee.

Senator INHOFE. Good, good, good.

General Ward, of course, as you well know, I've been very interested in Africa. In fact, I've been criticized for the amount of time that I spend in Africa. I was very strongly in support of—back when we had it, it was hard for me to understand why we would have had Africa, the continent, under three commands, as we did. And now things I think are working.

As I've told you before, I would have preferred to have the headquarters in Africa someplace down there. I know the political problems that come with that. But let's start with—I was recently in Djibouti. I talked to Admiral Fitzgerald and to Rear Admiral Kurta. It's heavy lifting over there. But everything is happening there. Kind of briefly tell us what is happening in Djibouti and what are some of the successes there?

General WARD. Thank you, Senator, and thank you for your support to the command and also to our security efforts on the continent. We feel that and we appreciate it.

In Djibouti, as you know, the Combined Joint Task Force- Horn of Africa, we assumed responsibility for command and control over when we became a fully endorsed unified command a little over a year ago. Djibouti's programs, or the Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa programs, that we undertake in the eastern part of the continent, but also in other places as I determine a skill set

that they possess that's required, provide the type of training support, the type of mentoring, coaching, the type of programs that we are using, along with our civil affairs activities, to help the Nations in Africa concentrate their efforts in causing a degree of harmonization of the training, the professionalism, as well as the regionalization of security assistance and cooperation programs that I think are proving very, very beneficial insofar as moving to the next level the capacity of many of these African nations to increase their military and security capacity, doing it in ways, because of our long-term approach to doing business, doing it in ways that fully integrate the elements of diplomacy, development, as well as defense. Not that we do those things, Senator, but because we understand the importance of those activities being a part of this dynamic, the comprehensive approach, it is working.

Senator INHOFE. I want to expand on that a little bit. But first, on the cuts that were there on your information operations program, are they going to hurt you? Is that serious?

General WARD. It is serious. The information programs that we look to do, where we were cut the \$3 million, that was about a third of what we wanted to do. The focus for those additional programs would have been in the East Africa region, to complement what we're doing in the Sahel and in North Africa.

Senator INHOFE. It's a huge area. I think people just don't really comprehend that.

How about in the other equipment? At first there were some problems there. Do you feel fairly comfortable with the resources that you have?

General WARD. We are always looking for resources, Senator. What they have are sufficient to do the work that we want to do. We could enhance that with additional resources, but the work that we are able to do working with those nations, to include assisting them through, as was pointed out, the various programs, the 1206 program, very, very important, very beneficial, as we have worked with the Nations on their territorial security as well as their maritime security and capacity-building.

Senator INHOFE. I'm running out of time here. But do this for me. The reason that our activity in Djibouti is acceptable with the rest of the continent is because we were already there. Now, it's more difficult if you were to start anew. I have felt that, as large as that continent is, we ought to have something probably in Ghana. ECOWAS is there now. There is the activities there. Maybe for the record you could respond as to are there any hopes for that or if there's anything—should we continue to try to do that?

As I go around, I talk to the presidents. I find a lot of them, although there's a political problem with naming names because they don't want other people to know that they agree that we should have that kind of activity there—for the record, you might answer that.

Lastly, I've been heartened a little bit by some of the new faces in Zimbabwe that have been on the other side of Mugabe. I feel for the first time in many years somewhat optimistic that these new faces that want to bring that country hopefully back to where it was at one time, the breadbasket of sub-Saharan Africa. Do you share that there is room for optimism now in Zimbabwe?

General WARD. I do. I had a conversation with our new ambassador who's been posted there and he is going there, Senator, with that same sense of optimism to look to take advantage of what might be a changing political environment.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

Senator REED.

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

Gentlemen, thank you for your distinguished service. Admiral Stavridis, not to be overly simplistic, but the last several years have forced us operationally, in our budgets and in acquisition, to become expeditionary. Has that same fever caught on in the NATO countries? Can you describe their budget acquisition and military policy?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Senator, thank you; a terrific question. I think a little bit would be the answer. There's more of a sense of expeditionary, and this is part of what General Mattis tried to work so hard, and I think successfully moved the Europeans somewhat in this direction when he was the Supreme Allied Commander for Transformation, and I think that work continues in that side of the NATO organization. It's had some salutary effect.

Just the thought that we today have 100,000 NATO troops engaged on three continents speaks a certain level of expeditionary, including counter-piracy, including the Balkans, which is enormously expeditionary, but somewhat of course in Afghanistan.

So I think there's movement in that direction, and I really commend the work of JFCOM and ECT, Allied Command Transformation. We need to continue to encourage that and move it forward, because the nature of threats in this 21st century is going to demand more than just sitting behind our borders.

Senator REED. Has the military and political leadership got the idea and now it's a question of implementation? Or is it still something that's unresolved and under debate?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I think it is under debate, but I think increasingly the forces of security, the demands of these non-traditional threats, these trans-border threats, are moving the Europeans in this direction. I'm confident as the NATO strategic concept is unveiled in Lisbon in the fall we'll see further movement in that direction, sir.

Senator REED. General Mattis, if you want to comment on that. I have another question, but I know you're—

General MATTIS. Yes, Senator, and I completely agree with where Admiral Stavridis assessed this effort. In an explanation to the Nations, I made the point that Italian troops going to Afghanistan or Italian troops going to the Baltics would have to deploy about the same distance, when you look at what the alliance is trying to do under Article 5. So it's not an either-or. If you want the alliance to defend more than its own home turf, each army in its own country, they must be expeditionary.

I think that is becoming politically more acceptable, where at one time it was seen more along the lines of what Senator McCain brought up, that it was the Americans trying to get the Europeans to fight an American war. I don't think the expeditionary argument

is any longer characterized like that. So I am optimistic, like SACEUR.

Senator REED. Let me turn to one aspect of the way forward in Iraq, and that's the advise and assist brigades. I wonder if JFCOM has had a chance to evaluate these brigades. They've been configured to retain combat power, but also, as the name implies, to essentially be a trainer, mentor, and integrator with Iraqi forces. And our success in drawing down our forces and stabilizing Iraq rests on their performance. I wonder if you at JFCOM have done any work?

General MATTIS. Senator, we leave that tactical training, of course, to the chief of staff of the Army. However, we have looked closely at it and it is the behavior of the troops as much as any significant shift in their capabilities that is important. What I mean to say is that when those troops go in they will focus on the train and assist, but it would be ill-advised for the enemy to mess with them. They will still have their capability to fight and, should the Iraqis ask for it or should force protection demand it, these forces are quite capable of rocking the enemy back on their heels.

But they are going in with the mission and the troops are trained and adjusted to a train, advise, assist mission to the Iraqis. Right now, from our perspective these troops are exactly the right thing at the right time, and their preparation looks sound.

Senator REED. Just a follow-up question, because part of this is sustaining this effort with the best, highest quality forces we can. Is it your impression that within the Department of Defense, particularly the Department of the Army, that this mission is highest priority and they will organize these brigades in a way that we have the best possible component elements?

General MATTIS. Sir, obviously we're having to juggle a number of very high priorities. We also send combat troops in that can partner in Afghanistan. But the theme that we're seeing more and more now is that all of our troops going in must have this ability to fight in a coalition atmosphere and be able to partner, whether it be with Estonians, Afghans, Iraqis. This is part of the shift that Secretary Gates and Chairman Mullen have directed, where the entire military force is becoming more attuned to this advise and assist effort, whether it be in Africa or Afghanistan or Iraq.

I believe because of that there will be no lowered priority on something that is now considered an inherent part of the primary mission.

Senator REED. Can we assume that this model will be adapted into Afghanistan also, that as we make progress in terms of reducing the capabilities of the Taliban that we'll be able to put more of these type of units on the ground?

General MATTIS. Sir, I'd go so far to say that the units we're sending over there now into the area that Admiral Stavridis spoke about in Marjah are completely capable on their own as combat units of partnering with the Afghans. We are learning. As a British prime minister put it, once we've exhausted all the alternatives we'll do the right thing. We've got it right this time and we are using these lessons learned to change the very makeup of the unit training.

Senator REED. Thank you, sir.

General Ward, can you describe the nature of the partnership between AFRICOM and the African Union Standby Force of five brigades?

General WARD. The command, Senator, has a relationship where we have a presidential determination being put in place that allows us to work with these five standby brigades. Currently that determination is in place for the Southern African Standby Force, the West African Standby Force. We're working on one for the East African Standby Force.

We see that these regional alignments for peace are very critical, important, and where they don't exist we still work on a bilateral basis with the Nations who would send forces to these standby brigades to increase their capacity as well. So it's a training relationship, in some instances it is an equipping relationship. In some instances it is a doctrinal relationship where we provide that type of assistance to these standby forces that are part of these regional economic communities.

Senator REED. Do we have an ongoing liaison with them in terms of personnel on the ground with them on a day to day basis, or is this—

General WARD. We have a liaison officer with the African Union, which is obviously the continental organization. We have a liaison with ECOWAS, the Economic Community of West African States, and their standby force. We do not have a permanent liaison with the Southern African Developmental, or with the East African. But we do have a day to day relationship in East Africa with those East African forces as well. And we have supported each of them as they conducted training, exercises, and other things to help increase their capacity to bring these brigades together, yes, sir.

Senator REED. I want to thank you, General Ward. I also want to thank you for your service, because it's a long time that we taught together at West Point and I'm awfully proud of what you've accomplished for the military and for the Army. Thank you, sir.

General WARD. Thank you for the support, Senator. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Reed.

Senator LeMieux.

Senator LEMIEUX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, General Ward. Admiral Stavridis, nice to see you again. General Mattis, thank you for your service to the country. Thank you for being here to answer our questions today.

Admiral Stavridis, I want to talk to you about a report that came out, I guess it was last week, where a Spanish judge accused the government of Venezuela of maintaining illicit ties with FARC and ETA terrorists planning to kill senior government officials in Spain, including President Uribe. The reason I'm asking you, not only because of the Spanish connection, but your previous work at SOUTHCOM.

Is there good cooperation between your command and Southern Command to make sure that we're staying in front of these issues?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, sir, very much so. I'm in quite a bit of dialogue with General Fraser. Another example would be after the earthquake in Haiti he and I have been in close coordination in terms of support from the many European nations who have pitched in and helped. So a very strong relationship there, and I

would actually add also a strong relationship with AFRICOM. Those three combatant commands, EUCOM, AFRICOM, SOUTHCOM, tend to work together very closely. It's partially the propinquity of geography, partially the personal friendships, and partially the geopolitical issues that you correctly highlight.

Senator LEMIEUX. I have a concern that touches this issue that I just raised, with potentially an assassination plot against President Uribe running through Spain. That is also it's geopolitical, as you said, with the concern that Iran, with projecting its influence through Spain and also through Latin America, is becoming a destabilizing force. Certainly Europe is tremendously important for our security interests, and if we have a nuclear-armed Iran that's going to impact your area of responsibility.

Can you speak to that issue?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Senator, I find Iran alarming in any number of dimensions, not the least of which is, as you mentioned, increasing Iranian influence throughout Latin America and the Caribbean, drawing on my previous experience, their very active sponsorship of terrorism, and their pursuit, not only of a nuclear weapon, but also of ballistic missiles which can deliver such weapons. It's one of the reasons I think missile defense is particularly important, and I think a concerned international effort to focus on the dangers of Iran is well warranted.

Senator LEMIEUX. The administration recently made a decision about ground-based interceptors and not pursuing that in the Czech Republic and in Poland. Do you feel that the plan going forward to make sure that we have an adequate missile defense to protect Europe and the United States is adequate?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, sir, I do. I think the Phased Adaptive Approach is timely, it is flexible. It will provide the capability and be able to step up, hence the "Phased" and "Adaptive" aspect of the title of it, as the Iranian ability to use ballistic missiles goes forward.

It is being well received in Europe. We're in dialogue, we the United States are in dialogue, with a variety of the partners, potential partners, for emplacement of it. Secretary Tauscher, Ellen Tauscher, is in charge of that particular effort. She's doing a very good job working with the allies to move forward on it. So overall, yes, I am a supporter of it and I believe that it will be very effective in defending Europe over time, as well as the United States, of course.

Senator LEMIEUX. Thank you, Admiral.

General—and I may have missed this testimony before, so if I have forgive me. But can you give us an update of the status of al-Qaeda in Africa?

General WARD. We look at al-Qaeda in Africa, Senator, in two locations essentially, although likely that they're in more, but predominantly East Africa al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda Islamic Maghreb. We see in the northern part of the continent al-Qaeda Islamic Maghreb. They are operating, conducting kidnappings, other sorts of activities that certainly threaten our interests, threaten those interests of our partners in the region.

In the eastern part of the continent, there in East Africa, we see East Africa al-Qaeda. Recently the claims of a merging between the

Al-Shabab in Somalia with East Africa al-Qaeda are there, and the linkages between East Africa al-Qaeda and al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, that network. So I would say that we certainly see indications and the presence of al-Qaeda in Africa, predominantly there in the East Africa region, as well as in the Sahel there in the greater Sahara part of the continent as well, sir.

Senator LEMIEUX. Is it a growing influence? Are they becoming more organized?

General WARD. I would not characterize it there. I would come back with something for the record, more specific detail. But I would also offer that, based on what they are saying, that they are seeking to expand their influence there in the East Africa region as well as in the North Africa region.

Senator LEMIEUX. General, this weekend we learned that 500 people, including women and babies, were massacred in Nigeria. What's our current strategy to curtail human rights abuses in Africa?

General WARD. We obviously, Senator, as we conduct our military-to-military relations with the various nations of Africa, we encourage the promotion of human rights. We encourage the conduct of militaries in professional ways. Obviously, those activities that you described, I've seen nothing to point that they were committed by the military of Nigeria. Clearly the role that's been taken by the Nigerians to go in and stop that action is something that we applaud. We certainly, like all others, deplore that type of activity, the innocent killing of anyone, the killing of any innocents. So we would certainly encourage the work that's being done by the government of Nigeria to address those atrocities, those who are responsible, to arrest them, and do their very best to prevent that. But we clearly see that as something that is deplorable and we certainly regret that loss of innocent life to those means.

Senator LEMIEUX. Thank you, General.

General Mattis, there was a London Times article earlier this week which talked about our European allies and their vulnerability to a cyber attack and the rise of China as a hostile cyber combatant. What are we doing to strengthen our allies' defenses and safeguard the sensitive information that we share with them?

General MATTIS. Senator, I'd have to take that for the record to give you more data. U.S. Strategic Command, as you know, is our main effort on the cyber effort, and we're in constant contact with them. We also work on the concepts. Frankly, we're scrambling to find a concept that takes into account how best to protect our networks, and obviously we must maintain an exploitation capability against the enemy. It is hard to come up with a theory that also includes the constitutional issues within our own country as far as how we do this protection.

Our first step is to protect our DOD networks. We work closely with primary the NATO allies, but also some other allies in the world, who work with us on putting these concepts together. We're drawing a fair amount of effort now, traction now, with STRATCOM now that they've been assigned this and they're maturing it. But I'd have to get back to you with more detail, which I can do. But I will do so by going to Strategic Command to make sure I'm current.

[The information referred to follows:]

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Senator, may I just add that in Europe NATO has established a center for cyber. It's in Estonia, which is appropriate since they suffered a severe cyber attack 2 years ago. I think that's exactly, as General Mattis says, it's indicative that all of these organizations are reaching to build the first nascent structures that can focus on this problem. But I believe it's vital, and it is something we think about a lot in European Command. I know all the combatant commanders do.

Senator LEMIEUX. Thank you. I think it's vital, too, and I appreciate getting a follow-up on that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator LeMieux.

Senator Hagan.

Senator HAGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral Stavridis, you recently discussed your concerns with me on cyber security and in the broader context how you view the vastness of this realm as cyber sea. In a recent paper that you authored, I want to give a quote that really paints a picture of this sea for me. You wrote: "The seas I refer to, however, are not of water and waves, but of zeros and ones, optic fibers and photons, routers and browsers, and satellites and servers. The cyber sea is the new global commons and it is untamed."

Two recent examples that I can think of for cyber security attacks is when the Iraqi insurgents recently intercepted video feeds from a Predator UAV using off-the-shelf software, and then a second one concerning Google claiming that Chinese hackers stole some of its computer coding and attempted to break into Chinese dissidents' emails.

Will you describe your principal concerns with cyber security and how you think we can best mitigate our exposure?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Thank you, Senator. I completely agree with the thrust of Senator LeMieux's questions, as well as General Mattis's response. I think that today we have a billion, a billion, devices that are accessing the Internet. Our economies are fundamentally intertwined in this cyber sea, and it is an outlaw sea. We do not have the norms, the buoy systems, the navigation, the satellites. Nothing really exists to develop norms of behavior in the cyber world.

So I think that there's a military component to this, but it's actually a much larger problem. This is a classic example of "whole of society" approach must really be taken into account here. It's not even "whole of government." As you point out, Google and many other private companies are very engaged in this.

From the military perspective, what we're trying to do in European Command and in NATO is to highlight the challenges ahead, put in place initial structures, do the kind of damage control that General Mattis is talking about to initially at least protect ourselves, and then try and—I think what's necessary is to think our way forward through a process that can create these kind of global norms.

That may be a process that brings a lot of nations together to have this conversation. Just as we gather to talk about the climate

and have a global summit on the climate, I think at some point there needs to be a very global conversation on this challenge.

Senator HAGAN. Well, I understand that in the summer of 2009 EUCOM held an exercise called the Combined Endeavor, which included a mix of international, inter-agency, and public-private entities, focused on computer network defense. I also understand that NATO recently established a cooperative cyber defense center of excellence in Estonia to enhance the capability, cooperation, and information-sharing among NATO nations and our partners in cyber defense.

How can this endeavor serve as a model for the development of multi-national policies to ensure continued unimpeded and lawful access to cyber space?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Thank you for highlighting those activities of European Command. I hasten to say that each of the combatant commanders is taking this on. I know General Ward is doing this. I know obviously STRATCOM is at the very heart of it, as General Mattis said. We're all grappling with this. I think that the more we cross-communicate and cross-level our efforts at this stage, the more effective we'll be in dealing with this.

So I believe that exercises that bring international, inter-agency, and private-public actors together as we try to do a combined endeavor need to be elevated and taken to a higher level by the Nations that want to connect on this. We're working that very hard, as you mentioned, on the NATO side through the center in Estonia.

Senator HAGAN. I'm very concerned about this because I see just numerous examples going forward of where we will be subject to much more attack on the cyber sea.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, Senator.

Senator HAGAN. General Ward, as you know, the UN peacekeeping mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is the largest and most expensive, and reportedly the UN could begin withdrawing its troops from the western portion of the country, I understand, as early as June of 2010. Additionally, the UN peacekeeping mission reportedly plans to begin withdrawing from the unstable eastern portion of the country in June of 2011.

Studies estimate that up to 1200 people die each day from conflict-related causes as well as diseases and malnutrition. Rampant corruption and pervasive weak government allows members of the National army and members of armed groups alike to abuse civilians.

Can you please describe the effects that a UN peacekeeping mission withdrawal from the Democratic Republic of the Congo would have on the stability of the country and region, and what plans are in place to counter the Democratic Forces for the Liberation of Rwanda that's focused on destabilizing the eastern portion of the Democratic Republic of the Congo? And I'll be happy to repeat any of that.

General WARD. Well, thank you, Senator. I am sure if I don't get to everything you'll remind me.

First, as President Kabila talks to the United Nations on the withdrawal of those forces from the Congo, I too think it would not be a good idea for that to occur too quickly. The conditions that you described with respect to the corruption, the professionalism of the

armed forces of the Congo, their activity, the lawlessness in the eastern part of the country to be sure, all contribute to abuses to the population, to instability.

The United Nations force that's there has clearly been a force for good in addressing those conditions. Large as that contingent is, given the size of the Congo, it is still not covering that entire country. But any place where those forces are reduced would have I believe a negative effect. Right now the western part of the country is in fact the most stable, so it would probably be least affected with the withdrawal of United Nations forces. But clearly in the eastern part of the country, where the majority of the things occur against the people, either being committed by rebel groups who operate in that region or in some cases by the armed forces of the Congo itself, I think the removal of United Nations forces would have a detrimental effect on those overall conditions.

As we work with the Department of State and others with the Congolese as they address in a comprehensive way the plethora of conditions that contribute to that instability, that contribute to the lawlessness, our focus now is moving ahead with training of a battalion, a battalion that hopefully can serve as a model for what professional behavior is and what it could lead to for other parts of the armed forces of the Democratic Republic of Congo.

We have begun that program in earnest about 2 weeks ago. It will run about another 6 or 7 months, and should it prove successful there's potential that it could be expanded to other battalions as well to help a process of increasing professionalism and ability of the armed forces of the Republic of the Congo to move ahead.

The work being done by the FDLR in the east, those activities, the Congolese are addressing that through some of their activities, supported by the United Nations, and I think that too is important work as a part of the overall comprehensive way that those rebel groups have to be addressed. As we've also seen, I might add, with the cooperation that has existed between Uganda, the Congo, Rwanda, as well as the Central African Republic in a regional way to address these common threats is something that we also will continue to encourage.

Senator HAGAN. Well, I'm extremely concerned about the number of people that are dying every day and certainly the abuse of their men and women is just reprehensible. But thank you for your testimony.

Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Hagan.

Senator BURRIS.

Senator BURRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too want to add my thanks to these three distinguished Americans who've dedicated their lives to protecting us. So from me to you, thank you, gentlemen.

I will submit, Mr. Chairman, some questions for the record, because I have a whole list of them here, and I'm going to try to start with General Ward. General, your command was designed to employ the "whole of government" approach to executing theater security cooperation and to facilitate counterterrorism efforts within the African nations. General, what is the future role of the Joint Task

Force-Horn of Africa and the military base in Djibouti? What is the future role of that, General?

General WARD. Sir, Camp Lemonnier is I believe a very critical part of our National structure in that part of the continent. It serves four combatant commands, not just mine. It also serves U.S. Central Command, U.S. Special Operations Command, as well as U.S. Transportation Command, as a logistics hub, as an infrastructure point, as well as a training platform.

It I think is in the long-term interest of the United States to maintain that facility to the degree that we have it and continue to improve upon it, that will allow our activities in support of our missions in that part of the world to be facilitated. So it is very important to us. I think it has great long-term meaning for us and I will clearly endorse it over the long term.

CJTF-HOA, which is my force that's there right now, continues to do work in the region insofar as helping build the capacity of those nations in East Africa to counter the terror threat, as well as to be able to deal with the threat of terror by increasing their capacity. We are providing training assistance, equipping assistance, mentoring assistance, professionalization of their militaries, as well as helping to bring together them in a regional way as they continue to work together to address that common thread.

So both activities, both the platform itself, being Camp Lemonnier, important. The work being done by the Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa as it executes its programs, fully aligned with the goals and objectives of my command, of U.S. AFRICOM, are also very, very instrumental in promoting that degree of professionalism in East Africa and in other parts of the continent where we see those unique capabilities that could be applied, in particular the civil affairs work.

Senator BURRIS. General, do you feel, since you're the last command to be stood up here, that you are fully operative and fully personnel-staffed correctly? Or do you really need additional staff personnel?

General WARD. Well, Senator, we always look for more. We think that the work that we have done with the inter-agency through our OSD—the Deputy Secretary of Defense has written to all of his colleagues asking for additional inter-agency support. Not that we would do the work of the inter-agency, but so that the inter-agency input to our work could be further assuring that what we do in fact is in keeping with supporting the overall comprehensive work being done by other parts of our government.

We don't have all that we would like to have, but there is a recognition on the part of our inter-agency partners that they should be and want to be a part of this command, and as we continue to move forward we see that occurring. That's why I endorse all that the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman says about increasing the capacities of our inter-agency partners as well, so that they can in fact participate.

Senator BURRIS. Are you going to get Egypt into your African Command? When do you anticipate that taking place?

General WARD. Egypt, as you pointed out, Senator, is aligned with Central Command. But for matters of the continent of Africa,

currently we can work with Egypt. In fact, I will be in Egypt in a matter of a couple weeks—

Senator BURRIS. I see.

General WARD.—working with them on matters of the continent.

Senator BURRIS. Also, General, the reason why we have not been able to locate AFRICOM in an African country is because of the politics of these countries and locating the right country would be a major undertaking. Is that the reason why we have not located it there and it's still in Stuttgart, or can we find a very friendly African country to headquarter Africa Command on the continent of Africa?

General WARD. Senator, very complex. The reasons that you cite are part of it. But it's more than that. At this point in time, I think if our work is to be about increasing the capacity of African nations, it's our programs and our activities that we do in about 38 different countries right now. That's the important part, and the effort to find a location with all the other associated issues would be distracting to the real work of the command, that is through our programs.

Senator BURRIS. Admiral, theater engagement seems to be a major tool used by the command when partnering with the Nations within your area of responsibility. How is the National Guard's State partnership program integrated into your theater engagement strategy, Admiral?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Deeply, deeply engaged. This State partnership program, which brings the State Guard into individual nations to partner with their militaries, is fundamental to what we're doing. We have 26 of them around the U.S. European Command, and I'd highlight just one among many, which is the Georgia Guard, which is partnered with the military of the Republic of Georgia. The two of them are working hand in hand to prepare a deployment of the Republic of Georgia's brave soldiers. They're going to send 750 to Afghanistan.

So multiply that by 26 programs around the theater and you get a sense of how important this is, sir.

Senator BURRIS. Thank you.

General Mattis, you have a completed draft document, "Education and Employment Principles for Inter-Agency Operations and Integration." One of your working concepts is to stand up an exploratory civilian force. What is the mission and employment of the expeditionary civilian force?

General MATTIS. Sir, there are two expeditionary civilian forces that we're looking at. One is inside the Department of Defense, and this is where you actually take DOD civilians who can fill certain jobs overseas on these joint coalition inter-agency staffs in these irregular wars.

I think the one you're referring to there is the one where we work with Ambassador Herbst in Secretary Clinton's Department of State, and that is where we are putting together, with their help, concepts that would integrate better the civilian-military interface when we into these kinds of wars that cannot be won by military means alone. There will be an immediate response force that's being built. These will be people who have been trained. It's their primary job. Their packs are packed. They have their shots.

They've been through various exercises with the military, ready to go on short notice.

Then there will be a response force of members of various agencies, and they will be ones who are basically trained—they're like the Reserves. They go to some training every year. They're maintained as far as health records and deployment records, and they know what to do. But it would take us anywhere from 30 to 90 days to get them deployed.

Then there's a larger force of people that we would endeavor to train as well, and that would be the backup force, the sustainment force that would replace these others.

Senator BURRIS. We are using contractors for some of this?

General MATTIS. I'm sorry, sir?

Senator BURRIS. We are using contractors for some of this service, are we not, for these forces? The private contractors that you see in the theater.

General MATTIS. The ones we're looking at, that I just described, are under the Department of State, Ambassador Herbst's effort, and those are all government employees. Contractors would be a separate issue, and we do that when we have to fill the gaps, frankly, sir, when we don't have the active duty or active government civilians that we can put in.

Senator BURRIS. My time has expired, so I will yield, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Burris.

Senator Bill Nelson.

Senator BILL NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you for your public service. Tomorrow in our Emerging Threats Subcommittee we're going to look at the comprehensive way that the military, integrating with the civilian agencies, can best project U.S. power and interests. This is particularly applicable to General Ward and Admiral Stavridis, not only with regard to your present interests in Afghanistan, Admiral, but also your previous command of Southern Command. General Ward, clearly Africa Command is taking this comprehensive approach.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just was not very satisfied when we had the assistant Secretary of Defense, Ms. Flournoy, come to talk to us about the policy. It didn't seem to me that the Department of Defense had its act together on integrating, and it was like that there were the same old answers about stovepipes that we're trying to break down.

You give your commanders on the ground the opportunity that they have a certain amount of CERP funds that they can go out and dig a well or build a school. But above that, an integrated approach, which is key to Afghanistan, which is key to Africa, which is key to Latin America, things like wells, education, training for jobs, the position of women, medical, all of these things that for us to be successful in third world areas like we are projected, there's got to be a holistic approach.

Now, the military has been so good as the one who leads it, and that of course is what is the thrust of Africa Command and, Admiral Stavridis, your former command. I'd like to have you reflect, because I'm worried about Afghanistan that once we get beyond those

CERP funds that these courageous young officers can go in and utilize, that then we get right back into the old stovepipes.

I've got the head of USAID coming in in the morning and I want to talk to that person about this. So can the two of you give me some advice, and also advice for our Emerging Threats Subcommittee, which it's the subject of our hearing tomorrow, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Senator, I fully share your prescription, which is that we have to put together what we actually call a NATO, a comprehensive approach. It's a "whole of society" approach. It really is inter-agency, international, private-public, and it all has to be connected in a way that we have not been terrifically effective at in any of these theaters.

We will never deliver security in Afghanistan from the barrel of a gun. It has got to come as a result of all of these mechanisms working together. To that end, I just met myself with Dr. Shah, the Administrator of USAID. He's extremely impressive, highly energized and energetic, and he's coming out of the Gates Foundation, which gives him a very significant grounding in this private-public kind of connection.

So we're exploring with him how we can better partner. State Department, as General Mattis is talking about, is working very hard at this with Ambassador Herbst and his team. We have a long way to go, but I believe that this precise issue is the most important security issue for the United States moving forward in this 21st century.

Back to the cyber piece, if you look at cyber as one of these emerging threats, it's a classic example of why this comprehensive approach is needed. So fully validated. I believe all of the departments should continue to be pushed very hard to integrate their efforts at all levels, and that getting that balance of civilian, military, private, public, inter-agency, is crucial to our security going forward.

Kip?

General WARD. Senator, I clearly concur with what Admiral Stavridis just indicated. We know that it's something that's important to do. We have not broken the code on how to do it at echelon. We do it fairly well on the ground. The country teams in the countries where the Department of State, USAID, other members of the inter-agency who are there working with, obviously, the military component, do a fairly good job of harmonizing the activities that occur on the ground. How we plan those endeavors, we need to do better at it. In my command, as we bring in members of the inter-agency to help us with our planning, it's a two-way street because through their understanding of us, their input back to their parent organization can help ensure a harmonization of the planning that occurs.

As the Secretary has pointed out, we think that the capacity of some of the inter-agency partners to do that needs to be more robust. So we support those efforts that would in fact robust their capacity to participate in the planning as well as in the execution of these programs that bring the comprehensive effects to stability that you address.

So we recognize it's an issue. It works more, better than not, at the lower echelon. We need to expand that through echelons so that at the inception of our work we have done a better job of combining what we call this 3D approach, the issues of development—obviously, a public-private partnership—the issues of diplomacy, which includes obviously good governance and those things that address how a society is governed; and defense, those security aspects that need to be there so that those other things can in fact work.

Senator BILL NELSON. Well, what advice should I give to the head of USAID tomorrow? And what questions should I ask in our hearing tomorrow that would get around USAID, they go out and they contract with somebody to do this, let's say it's digging wells, but there's clearly need for education over here—let's take Afghanistan—and a medical clinic and training for jobs.

How do we get the comprehensive approach? You've got each of these NGOs and they want to do their thing. How do we get it all combined in an approach?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Two thoughts. One is the QDDR, which is what AID and State are working together now—this is happening in real time. So I think that that's an opportunity to work on the integration, the alignment, and the partnering between AID and State and how that marries up with the QDR, the Department of Defense document, is a place where you could get the three main actors in this security mix coordinating their plans, as Kip says, at echelon, at the very highest level.

If you click down one, I think Kip has it exactly right, General Ward has it exactly right, which is it's the planning. It's the planning that we ought to go after, because that's where our other agencies are off doing their plans and we're doing our plans, and then we meet in Afghanistan and the plans aren't particularly aligned.

So I think bringing together a layer of planning below that strategic layer represented by the QDR and the QDDR, I think in terms of how we can encourage the agencies to do plans together, to have transparency in planning, to show across the board what the big muscle movements are country by country, and integrate those plans, so there is not duplication.

So as General Ward says, one level down, now we're at the tactical level, it's seamless. It proceeds from the strategic through the operational planning down to the tactical execution. I'd focus in on that planning piece, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Nelson.

Senator Thune.

Senator THUNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General, Admiral, General, thank you very much for being here and thank you for your outstanding service to our country.

General Mattis, I wanted to get your views on the development of the air-sea battle concept. As you know, the new QDR directs the Navy and the Air Force to develop a joint air-sea battle concept for defeating adversaries with sophisticated anti-access and area denial capabilities, which in turn will help guide the development of future capabilities needed for effective power projection operations.

My question is, could you provide your views on the development of this new air-sea battle concept so far and where does Joint

Forces Command fit into the development, evaluation, and implementation of this concept?

General MATTIS. Yes, Senator. Thank you. The air-sea battle concept grew out of identification of a military problem, and that problem is how do we work together jointly in order to maintain control of one of the commons, the sea lanes. The situation is changing. It's always changing security-wise and adapting to that problem has brought these two services together.

Joint Forces Command is part of this effort. We're monitoring it right now, but we're monitoring it to make sure that what we've done in past experiments and concept development guides this forward and also that we harvest from them the lessons that they're learning as they come to grips with this problem broken down into bite-sized pieces.

What we're seeing is more and more this integration at every level of war. At one time we basically integrated at the strategic level and that was good. Then we got into the operational level of integration. You saw that in Desert Storm and certainly in OIF-1. We're now integrating down at the tactical level. No longer can any service go into even one of its primary domains—the Army on the land, the Navy at sea, the Air Force in the air—and not integrate with others.

It's the nature of warfare today, it's the nature of a lot of things, that you've got to integrate more than ever in this age. So it's going forward well. I think the identification of the problems is maturing well. I would say we're in very good shape on that. The solutions are not completely clarified yet, and we will also uncover additional problems as we go forward.

Ultimately we will see an increased reliance on naval forces as we look toward the future security situation. It must be that way for matters of limited access in certain areas for political or military reasons, and to bring the Air Force and the Navy together I think is a very healthy thing at this point, even though we have not completely got all the problems outlined. But we're getting there.

Senator THUNE. In your opinion how will long-range strike capabilities fit into this new air-sea battle concept?

General MATTIS. Sir, we look at these somewhat in phases, these kinds of issues. Certainly during phase zero, when we're engaging along the lines of what AFRICOM has been testifying to here today, what we're doing is we're trying to deter enemies and potential adversaries from ever doing something that we don't want them to do that would be disadvantageous to international stability.

When you put together a strong capability like this, you temper our potential adversaries' designs. Should it go into a combat phase, the planning for this comes under something called campaign design. In that area, the strike capability that would be built would be fundamental to ensuring that we deter our enemies and reassure our friends that we can get through to them and support them.

Senator THUNE. Do you see any, foresee in any future budget requests changes based on this new concept? For example, equipment requests with regard to this new concept?

General MATTIS. Sir, I'd like to take a pause on that one, because I think first we need to get the concept right before we come to you asking for money. Certainly the capabilities, strike capabilities, will have to be maintained at the cutting edge. But I can't tell you—I can't really forecast until we get the concept right, which is based on a very clear problem statement of what we're trying to solve, whether or not that will mean new programs.

Senator THUNE. Admiral, advanced weapons systems designed for anti-access and area denial are being proliferated throughout the world, including in the European Command area of responsibility. Russia's developing advanced surface to air missile systems, advanced fifth generation type fighter aircraft, and even hinting at plans to develop a new long-range bomber.

While the likelihood of conflict with Russia is low, it seems more likely that we will be involved in a future conflict against adversaries who possess advanced anti-aircraft and area denial weapons systems sold to them by the Russians. What are your views on these activities by the Russians to develop and proliferate anti-access and area denial systems?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Senator, we continuously evaluate globally all of the threat systems that are emerging, and indeed Russia is developing some very sophisticated ones that you mentioned, along with some, I would add, some sub-surface, submarine kinds of capabilities. So clearly we have to pace that. Clearly we have to maintain our superiority at all levels as we go forward, and I think that applies not solely to Russia, but really looking globally at all the threats that's a fundamental responsibility of the Department.

Senator THUNE. Do you view Russia's development of a fifth generation fighter aircraft as a cause for concern?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I'm sorry, sir?

Senator THUNE. Well, I was going to ask you, do you view Russia's development of a fifth generation fighter aircraft as a cause for concern?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I do.

Senator THUNE. And how about their planned development of a new long-range bomber? Is that something that—

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, I would put that again in the category of a wide variety of emerging global threats. But those would be among them.

Senator THUNE. I've got one other question I wanted to ask. The Russians are seeking to link missile defense to a follow-on START treaty and negotiations, as we understand, have stalled over the Russian demand for the option to withdraw from the treaty unilaterally if they determine that our missile defenses would threaten its nuclear missile force.

To the best of your knowledge, is there any effort foot to negotiate a side agreement with the Russians on this issue?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Sir, I have no idea. That would be squarely in the purview of the Department of State.

Senator THUNE. All right.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all very much.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Thune.

We expect votes just about now. There's four votes coming. So let's try to have a second round for everybody. You have additional questions, Senator Burris?

Senator BURRIS. No, Mr. Chairman. I'm just trying to listen to these distinguished gentlemen.

Chairman LEVIN. Okay, great. I just have a few and then we can turn it over to Senator Inhofe.

You've spoken about your support, Admiral, of the new Phased Adaptive Approach for missile defense. One of the possibilities being considered is to ask Russia to cooperate in the European missile defense effort with their radar information as a way to enhance security against shared missile threats. Do you support that idea?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I do, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. What would it add?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. It would add—well, first of all—

Chairman LEVIN. If you were able to achieve it, what would it be, or we were able to achieve it?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. First, it would create a zone of cooperation with Russia, which I think is an important good as I look at the military to military responsibilities I have in U.S. European Command.

Second, I think it could technically add to the early warning time because of the location of the system.

Then third, I think it creates confidence-building measures between ourselves and the Russians.

Chairman LEVIN. Does the Polish government now support the missile defense approach?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I think it's fair to say in general terms they do, yes, sir. I would not speak for the Polish government.

Chairman LEVIN. All right. Have they spoken on it yet?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. They have not. That's my intuition based on my conversations, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Is there discussions or agreements with the Polish government relative to the deployment of a Patriot training battery in Poland?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, sir, there is.

Chairman LEVIN. Has that been completed yet, those discussions?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I think we are literally signing the final MOUs this week, and I anticipate that deployment going forward in the next 30 days.

Chairman LEVIN. The AFRICOM manning issue has been raised, General, as to whether or not you have enough personnel. You've indicated you'd like some more if you can get them. But my question has to do with this. Apparently your service components are not assigned to you as assigned forces; is that correct?

General WARD. The service components are assigned, sir. They have no assigned forces under them, but my components are assigned to me.

Chairman LEVIN. Okay. But underneath them there are no forces; do I have that right now?

General WARD. That's correct.

Chairman LEVIN. Those forces are generally provided through a global force management and request for forces system. Have you

applied for forces? Have you made that request through that system?

General WARD. I have. I use the global force management process, as do the other combatant commands as well, for satisfying my requirements for forces to do our missions that we have to undertake on the continent.

Chairman LEVIN. Finally, the Department is currently in the process of updating the guidance for employment of the force, the GEF, which establishes the Department's strategic objectives for campaign planning and security cooperation and the priorities to be established. There's an ongoing rewrite of the GEF. It's the first, I think, since AFRICOM was established. Is AFRICOM receiving a fair hearing under that revision process?

General WARD. Yes, Senator. I've been a part of that process and I'm fully aware that the Department of Defense as it looks at is revision of the GEF is looking at ensuring that the requirement that we have for resources to conduct the very essential building partner capacity is being treated at a level of priority different than the past, so that those forces that are required to do that mission will enjoy a higher priority than has been the case in the past. And we are participating in that process.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much.

Senator Inhofe.

General MATTIS. Can I just—

Chairman LEVIN. Sure.

General MATTIS.—associate myself with General Ward on that particular issue. I think it is a bit of a sea change in the Department and it's a good one.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Senator Inhofe.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral Stavridis, there's only one area where I disagree with you, and I've told you this before. But I'd like to have you tell me where I'm wrong on this. Our intelligence tells us that Iran would have the long-range ballistic capability somewhere between 2015 and 2020. I'd say 2015 then, as serious as that is. The SM-31B, which is short and medium-range, that would be 2015, but it doesn't matter. I mean, that doesn't have the capability, nor does the 2A variety, which would get into intermediate, and that's supposed to be somewhere around 2018.

Now, the SM-32B, which is supposed to be comparable to what we would have had—at least I think this is the case—if we had had and kept the ground-based system or the ground-based interceptor in Poland, that's still—there is no date on that.

So I would say—of course, I objected to that first budget of the President just for the terminating of all these programs, such as the F-22, the C-17, the Future Combat System. But the thing I found most objectionable was when he pulled the rug out from under Poland and the Czech Republic. I was with Vaclav Klaus this last Friday.

I guess what I'm saying is if that capability is there and we don't have any way of deterring that other than—I understand the argument that we have the ground-based system in Alaska and California. I don't have the confidence that that would have that cov-

erage that far for the eastern United States. I guess I would just say, just briefly, what am I overlooking?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Senator, I'm going to ask to take that one for the record and come back to you. I think it's a technical issue that I would like to provide you a little more data on. I will say that, as a naval officer who has commanded multiple Aegis ships at sea, I am extremely impressed, naturally given my background, with the Aegis system and its ability to adapt. So part of my confidence comes out of my grounding in my many years at sea operating with that system and my belief that it can be successfully transitioned ashore.

Having said that, I want to provide you the hard data on this and I'd like to take that for the record to do that, sir.

[The information referred to follows:]

Senator INHOFE. That's all right, and I don't disagree with you. I've been a strong supporter of the Aegis system. But we're talking about long-range ICBMs. Okay, fine, we'll get that for the record.

General WARD, I was appreciative of the fact that you said some good things about Ethiopia in the response to, I believe it was, the chairman's question. Specifically, I know that the one who has been under attack in Ethiopia more than anyone else is Prime Minister Meles. My personal feeling is he's got a tough job, but he's a tough guy and he's been able to do it.

Would you make the same comments about his leadership as you would just Ethiopia in general?

General WARD. Senator, I meet with Prime Minister Meles quite regularly and I have a huge respect for his leadership and the work that he does, especially as it pertains to addressing the threat of terror and cooperating with those who also address that threat of terror in East Africa, yes, sir.

Senator INHOFE. The fact that he was there with us when the Somalia thing happened—I think he's taking a bum rap is my position.

You talked, when you were talking to Senator Hagan, I guess it was, about the cooperation between Rwanda, Uganda, and Congo. I personally have talked to Museveni and Kagame and Kabila on their cooperation with each other, but in another area, and that is the area of the LRA in northern Uganda, or wherever they are right now. We made a point to go over to East Africa to Goma thinking that was about where he was last seen, and he's had another reign of terror since that time.

We have legislation right now that is going to try to give more assistance to those presidents and those countries to try to end this what I call one of the worst reigns of terror I've ever personally observed, and I've been there and have observed it. Do you think we should be helping with more resources to end that particular LRA problem? Would you support me on that?

General WARD. Yes, sir. The work being done by that group of countries to combat the atrocities that the LRA has committed for over 25 years is work that's important and I think our support to those ongoing efforts is important support.

Senator INHOFE. Well, I think most of the members on this committee are actually co-sponsors of the legislation that we have that would be helpful to resolve that. One of the problems we have is

that all three of these presidents came from a military background and there's always a little bit of a concern over, is this reflecting I can't do it myself, type of thing. But I think we're finally in a position to jointly work on this thing.

Let's see. Is there anything else in terms of what is taking place right now in Africa? Maybe you can give us a couple of examples of the improvements you've made working with the African militaries, some of the successes there.

General WARD. Thank you, Senator. There are several. As an example, as we work with the littoral nations on their maritime safety and security, our various programs, one we call the AFRICOM Maritime Law Enforcement Program, it's an inter-agency construct. We bring in members of the Homeland Security, the Coast Guard, working with African nations, their legal systems, such that they have a better ability to provide for the territorial integrity of their waters. That is working.

We conducted an exercise in East Africa whereby we had five participating nations, the first time ever. They came together jointly working to help address a natural disaster or humanitarian assistance scenario. But as was pointed out to me by a chief of defense of one of these nations, the first time ever that as convoys moved through that part of the continent militaries that in the past, 10 years ago, you would not have thought that they would have come together to link up and then move to a common objective, which was conducted in the north of Uganda, where LRA had just 3 short years ago running with abandon and devastating the populations there.

Those are happening all over the place. We had a training operation in Mali. In the chairman's opening statement he mentioned what went on in Mali last summer. A member who received training this past January said had he had that training prior to that last July situation where the Malians encountered al-Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb forces, he said that would not have happened.

So our work to train and assist these countries so that they can be in a better position to address these threats themselves is paying off.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I applaud all three of you, you folks, for the great work you're doing.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

Senator LIEBERMAN. I'm going to have to leave now, so I'll turn the gavel over to Senator Lieberman.

Thank you all very much for your service.

Senator LIEBERMAN [presiding]. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

General Ward, I just wanted to really say to you first how impressed I am as I hear you answer the questions about what's happening within the African continent and your involvement in it, your knowledge of it, and how important it is, I think, that we created this African Command, because I think we were paying too little attention to this critically important continent.

I think you're bringing to it the same kind of critical different relationship with the leaders there. In some of the regions of the world, the most important person in the region really is our regional commander. Now, as you said to me when I began this con-

versation before the hearing, it's only in a sense the door in and it hopefully leads to other relationships, diplomatic, political, economic, etcetera.

But anyway, I wanted to thank you for the way in which you've done your job, and it's been very important.

Admiral STAVRIDIS, I wanted to ask you—I know you've been asked a little bit about missile defense. In your role, you are going to be responsible for operating the early stages of the Phased Adaptive Missile Defense System for Europe. I thought I'd ask you first for an analysis, if you will, or a report on what the state of European public opinion is about missile defense? In other words, do the Europeans feel vulnerable now? There have been times in the not so distant history where I think they haven't. Do they feel vulnerable, and if so who are they worried about firing missiles at them?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Sir, I think there's a growing appreciation in Europe for the danger specifically from Iran. I think they look at the nature of that regime, clearly a state sponsor of terrorism, working hard to develop a nuclear device. Additionally, I think there's a great deal of understanding that the ballistic missile technology that the Iranians possess is moving apace. So that is having a salutary effect on the European proclivity to be engaged with us in missile defense.

Now, it varies from country to country, and there are a number of factors that range from geography to relationships with the United States to general world outlook that shape it. But I think in my opinion it's fair to say that we are seeing a growing appreciation of it. Again, I have to applaud assistant Secretary Ellen Tauscher, who is moving forward on the diplomatic side of this thing. She's an expert in all of this and she's doing, I think, a very credible job of forging the practical partnerships which I believe over time will grow into a fully integrated missile defense.

Chairman LEVIN. I appreciate that, and I appreciate the work that Ellen Tauscher has done, as you do.

There was some concern here on Capitol Hill, as you know, when the decision was made to pull back from the initial plan, the Polish-Czech plan. How are we doing? I know you've answered this in part, but how are we doing on the development of the alternative system? And are you confident that it will meet the target dates we've set so it will provide adequate defense?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I'm certainly confident that the first stage will. It'll be sea-based and, as you heard me say to Senator Inhofe, I have a great deal of confidence in that part of it. Given the track record of that system and the technology embedded in it, I am reasonably confident that it will be adapted—Phased Adaptive Approach—and will transition to a shore-based system within the targets that are set for it.

Now, nobody can predict the delivery of defense technology. We've all been surprised on that occasionally. But given the track record of the system and given my understanding of where we are, I think it's very reasonable to expect that we will hit those bells as we move forward.

Senator LIEBERMAN. That's good to hear.

You probably saw, there was an article, a related article, relevant, in the Washington Post this morning about the MEADS system. I will quote from it. It says: "After several failed attempts, the Army is trying again to cancel the \$19 billion missile defense system that the United States is developing in partnership with Italy and Germany. Known as the Medium Extended Air Defense System, or MEADS, it has been in the works for more than a decade and is designed to replace in part the Army's aging Patriot system."

I wanted to ask you whether you've been involved in discussions with your Army colleagues about this program and what your opinion of it is, and ultimately do you see this—of course, the unique feature of this is that we've got a couple of our European allies, not only involved, but picking up a big chunk of the bill—whether you see the MEADS system as part of the phased adaptive missile defense system that you're now helping to implement?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I have not gone into detail on MEADS with my Army brethren who are developing that here in the United States. I will tell you in Europe there is a sense that the system can be a functioning part of a missile defense system. I recently spoke with several chiefs of defense from the participating nations who mentioned that.

I think, Senator Lieberman, it's also indicative of the relationship between the United States and Israel, where we are working and looking at some of the Israeli capabilities that you're aware of, the Iron Dome System, the Arrow System. I think we in the United States do not have the market cornered on all the smart technology. We would be well served by reaching out to our allies and finding what can be integrated. I think MEADS potentially is in fact a player in that.

So I will continue to follow the MEADS story as it unfolds. But I think it's more important as an example of how additional technologies can be adapted to the Phased Adaptive Approach, which is one reason it's an attractive system.

Senator LIEBERMAN. So at this point you're inclined to favor the continuation of the MEADS program?

Admiral STAVRIDIS. I don't know enough about MEADS to make that statement, sir.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right, okay. But I agree with you. There's a lot—there's a growing appreciation among allies in Europe, in the Middle East, and in Asia of the missile threat, particularly from Iran and North Korea. It just makes a lot of sense for us to operate, as we have been, cooperatively.

You're right, the last time I was in Israel I saw some video of testing of the Iron Dome System, which is a defense against short-range missiles or rockets. It was quite impressive. We're partners in that with the Israelis and we'll have full benefit, I think, from its technologies in terms, for instance, of protecting American personnel, bases, in places like Europe or the Middle East from potential short-range missile rocket attack.

Admiral STAVRIDIS. Yes, sir.

Senator LIEBERMAN. That's it for me. I've got to go over to vote. It's been a very informational and encouraging hearing. I'm sure the committee, as it normally does, will try our best to authorize

to a level that will continue to allow the three of you and the many men and women in uniform who serve under you to do the job that we ask you to do in defense of our security and our freedom.

Thank you very much. The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:12 a.m., the committee adjourned.]