

Stenographic Transcript  
Before the

COMMITTEE ON  
ARMED SERVICES

# **UNITED STATES SENATE**

NOMINATION – DUNFORD

Tuesday, September 26, 2017

Washington, D.C.

ALDERSON COURT REPORTING  
1155 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036  
(202) 289-2260  
[www.aldersonreporting.com](http://www.aldersonreporting.com)

1 HEARING TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATION OF  
2 GENERAL JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, JR., USMC, FOR  
3 REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL AND REAPPOINTMENT  
4 TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

5  
6 Tuesday, September 26, 2017

7  
8 U.S. Senate  
9 Committee on Armed Services  
10 Washington, D.C.  
11

12 The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m. in  
13 Room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, Hon. John McCain,  
14 chairman of the committee, presiding.

15 Committee Members Present: Senators McCain  
16 [presiding], Inhofe, Wicker, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst,  
17 Sullivan, Perdue, Cruz, Graham, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill,  
18 Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine,  
19 King, Heinrich, Warren, and Peters.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1           OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN McCAIN, U.S. SENATOR  
2 FROM ARIZONA

3           Chairman McCain: Good morning.

4           Since a quorum is now present, I ask the committee to  
5 consider a list of 3,196 pending military nominations. All  
6 of these nominations have been before the committee the  
7 required length of time. Is there a motion to favorably  
8 report these 3,196 military nominations to the --

9           Senator Reed: So moved.

10          Chairman McCain: Is there a second?

11          Senator Inhofe: Second.

12          Chairman McCain: All in favor, say aye.

13          [A chorus of ayes.]

14          Chairman McCain: The motion carries.

15          The committee meets this morning to consider the  
16 nomination of General Joseph Dunford for reappointment as  
17 Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

18          General Dunford, this committee thanks you for your  
19 decades of distinguished service to our Nation. We are  
20 grateful to your wife, Ellyn, for the support that she has  
21 always provided to you, and to all who serve our Nation in  
22 uniform. I'd also like to welcome your son, Patrick --  
23 Patrick -- fortunately, you look like your mother, Patrick  
24 -- thank you.

25          [Laughter.]

1 Chairman McCain: -- who is joining us this morning. I  
2 know that your other children, Joe and Kathleen, send their  
3 support from afar even as I'd bet they are a little relieved  
4 that they do not have to sit through your interrogation.

5 In order to exercise its legislative and oversight  
6 responsibilities, it's important that this committee and  
7 other appropriate committees of the Congress are able to  
8 receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of  
9 information. Have you adhered to applicable laws and  
10 regulations governing conflicts of interest?

11 General Dunford: I have, Chairman.

12 Chairman McCain: Do you agree, when asked, to give  
13 your personal views, even if those views differ from the  
14 administration in power?

15 General Dunford: I do, Chairman.

16 Chairman McCain: Have you assumed any duties or  
17 undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the  
18 outcome of the confirmation process?

19 General Dunford: I have not, Chairman.

20 Chairman McCain: Will you ensure your staff complies  
21 with deadlines established for requested communications,  
22 including questions for the record in hearings?

23 General Dunford: I will, Chairman.

24 Chairman McCain: Will you cooperate in providing  
25 witnesses and briefers in response to congressional

1 requests?

2 General Dunford: Yes, Chairman.

3 Chairman McCain: Will those witnesses be protected  
4 from reprisal for their testimony or briefings?

5 General Dunford: They will be, Chairman.

6 Chairman McCain: Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear  
7 and testify, upon request, before this committee?

8 General Dunford: I do, Chairman.

9 Chairman McCain: Do you agree to provide documents,  
10 including the copies of electronic forms of communication,  
11 in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted  
12 committee, or to consult with the committee regarding the  
13 basis for any good-faith delay or denial in providing such  
14 documents?

15 General Dunford: I do, Chairman.

16 Chairman McCain: And I -- my colleagues and I are  
17 aware that that is a routine, but -- given the political  
18 environment today especially, and certainly not any  
19 reflection on you, General Dunford, but those questions need  
20 to be asked, and I thank you for your responses.

21 General Dunford, my colleagues and I will have a lot of  
22 questions for you about the many pressing national security  
23 challenges we face, but this hearing also offers an  
24 opportunity to reflect on some broader topics that have  
25 historically and more recently been a major focus of this

1 committee's efforts, the unique role of the Chairman in our  
2 national security structure, and the state of civil/military  
3 relations. As, quote, "principal military advisor to the  
4 President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of  
5 Defense, and the Congress," the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs  
6 of Staff is the most important military duty in our Nation.  
7 The Chairman is the one military officer with the authority  
8 to present comprehensive analysis and advice to civilian  
9 policymakers, informed by all the military services and  
10 combatant commands, and spanning every global and functional  
11 issue of national security.

12       This responsibility is now more important than ever.  
13 Our country faces a multitude of national security  
14 challenges, all of which cut across the regional and  
15 functional organizations that divide up the Department of  
16 Defense. The Chairman is the only military officer with a  
17 truly comprehensive perspective on the joint force on -- of  
18 all the threats we face worldwide and the interplay between  
19 them. That is why this committee acted last year to clarify  
20 the Chairman's statutory responsibility to advise civilian  
21 leaders on the global strategic integration of our military  
22 efforts.

23       The Chairman's unique role lends extra gravity to the  
24 responsibility that you and every military officer  
25 possesses, the responsibility to provide best military

1 advice to civilian leaders. This is not a luxury, it is a  
2 duty. It is a duty that military officers owe to the  
3 American people and to the men and women under their  
4 command. Civilian policymakers in both the executive and  
5 legislative branches rely on our military professionals to  
6 better understand the military dimensions and the national  
7 security challenges we face, and the options at our disposal  
8 for wielding military power effectively.

9 But, best military advice does not stop there.  
10 Military officers, and especially the Chairman of the Joint  
11 Chiefs of Staff, must tell their civilian superiors what  
12 action they believe are best and right to take, and they  
13 must do so honestly, candidly, respectfully, but forcefully,  
14 whether civilians want to hear it or not. Best military  
15 advice may be disregarded, but it must always be given.

16 What's more, in my opinion, best military advice should  
17 not be narrowly limited to technical military matters. When  
18 the Chairman offers his best military advice, he's not  
19 simply offering the best advice "about" the military, but,  
20 rather, the best advice "from" the military. And that  
21 extends to issues of national security policy, strategy, and  
22 operations. For example, the decision to take our Nation to  
23 war properly rests with civilians. It's a policy question.  
24 But, military officers should not be prohibited from voicing  
25 their advice on such a matter. Indeed, it is their duty to

1 do so.

2           If you haven't seen Mr. Burns's series on Vietnam, I  
3 suggest that you pay attention to it, and I suggest that you  
4 examine the tensions that existed between the civilian  
5 superiors and the military. And I believe that you will  
6 come to the conclusion that the military advice was not  
7 given the weight and effect that it should have, which was  
8 one of the factors in leading to 58,000 names on the wall in  
9 granite, not too far from here.

10           Just as we are clear about what constitutions best --  
11 constitutes -- excuse me -- best military advice, we must be  
12 equally clear about its limitation. Advice is just that:  
13 advice. The Chairman is principal military advisor, is not  
14 in the chain of command. Ours is not a general staff  
15 system. In our system, operational command rests with  
16 combatant commanders who report, by law, to the Secretary of  
17 Defense. The Chairman must also advise civilian leaders on  
18 the military dimensions of strategy, operations, and plans,  
19 both within and among our combatant commanders' area of  
20 responsibility, and his right -- indeed, his responsibility  
21 -- to provide competing advice to policymakers when he  
22 disagrees with combatant commanders. But, the Chairman is  
23 not an operational commander.

24           Similarly, best military advice does not mean  
25 independent advice. It occurs in the context of

1 civil/military relations. And I want to say a few words on  
2 this, in closing.

3       Professor Elliott Cohen has described civil/military  
4 relations as an unequal dialogue. Civilian and military  
5 rules are not to be dichotomized and held apart. Rather,  
6 they must be brought together through an iterative process  
7 of discussing, scrutinizing, and refining military strategy,  
8 operations, and plans, a process in which civilian leaders  
9 must play an active role and make the major decisions. Best  
10 military advice is central to this dialogue, but it can  
11 never replace it.

12       Unfortunately, I sense that this civil/military  
13 dialogue has become strained. At times, civilian officials  
14 have disrespected military leaders, disregarded their advice  
15 on critical military matters, and shirked accountability for  
16 their decisions. More recently, civilian oversight and  
17 control of the military has morphed into meddling and  
18 micromanagement of tactical details for political purposes,  
19 which has harmed military effectiveness. The last  
20 administration distinguished itself in this regard.

21       What we must guard against, General Dunford, especially  
22 now, when so many civilian leaders at the Department of  
23 Defense are either missing or are, themselves, recently  
24 retired military officers, is an overcorrection. We cannot  
25 afford to swing from civilian micromanagement to civilian

1 marginalization. We need to restore balance in  
2 civil/military relations, where best military advice is  
3 always rendered and received, but is done so as part of a  
4 dialogue with civilians who participate actively and have  
5 the last word on policy, strategy, operations, and plans.

6 This committee takes its obligations seriously in this  
7 regard. The civil/military dialogue does not only occur  
8 within the Department of Defense, it occurs between the  
9 branches of government, as well. That's why the Chairman  
10 also serves as a principal military advisor to the Congress.  
11 And that's why, as part of the confirmation process, we ask  
12 current and future Chairmen, like all military officers, to  
13 provide their best personal advice to this committee, if  
14 asked. It is to ensure that the members of this committee  
15 and the full Congress are able to meet our independent  
16 constitutional responsibilities to the Americans we serve.

17 At present, this committee, and the Congress more  
18 broadly, is not receiving the information and respect it  
19 deserves as a coequal branch of government. We do not work  
20 for the President or the executive branch. We have distinct  
21 and equal responsibilities under the Constitution, and the  
22 administration needs to understand its obligation to the  
23 Congress in this regard.

24 Too often, members of this committee are learning in  
25 the media for the first time about major national security

1 and military activities that we, as the committee of  
2 oversight, should be told about and consulted on in advance.  
3 Even now, nearly 10 months into this year, we are told we  
4 have a new strategy for Afghanistan, but members of this  
5 committee have far more questions than answers. The  
6 administration must do better, and, until it does, the  
7 Congress and this committee will be forced to use what  
8 levers we have to show the administration that we are not,  
9 and will not be, a rubberstamp.

10 We will have many questions for you, General. We look  
11 forward to your candid, forthright, and best military  
12 advice.

13 Senator Reed.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1           STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, U.S. SENATOR FROM RHODE  
2 ISLAND

3           Senator Reed: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

4           I also want to welcome General Dunford this morning,  
5 and thank him for his outstanding service to this Nation  
6 over many years.

7           General Dunford is joined by his wife, Ellyn, and son,  
8 Patrick. Thank you. And also like to acknowledge the  
9 General's other children, Joe and Kathleen, who were not  
10 able to join us today.

11          And, on behalf of our committee, we thank the entire  
12 Dunford family for their continued sacrifice and support.  
13 It means a great deal to us, but, more particularly, to the  
14 men and women of the Armed Forces. Thank you.

15          Under the leadership of Chairman McCain, this committee  
16 has maintained a robust hearing schedule focused on the most  
17 pressing threats and challenges facing our Armed Forces.  
18 Our committee has heard from the most senior political  
19 leaders in the Department, the highest echelons of the  
20 military, and distinguished outside experts. Time and  
21 again, these hearings have underscored that the United  
22 States is faced with a myriad of challenges that offer no  
23 quick or easy solutions and require adroit military  
24 leadership.

25          During General Dunford's tenure as Chairman, he has

1 provided sound military counsel and demonstrated a deep  
2 understanding of the national security threats our Nation  
3 must address. As Chairman, General Dunford has made it a  
4 priority to keep this committee well informed on the  
5 Department's policy decisions impacting our Armed Forces and  
6 changes to our military strategy to counter the risks posed  
7 by our adversaries. While this committee may not always  
8 agree with General Dunford's views, he has been honest and  
9 conducted himself with integrity. Therefore, I believe he  
10 should be reappointed to serve as the Chairman of the Joint  
11 Chiefs of Staff.

12 As we pause to consider the state of the world today,  
13 General Dunford's professionalism and commitment to duty  
14 have served him well. This is not the first time in our  
15 Nation's history that we have had to confront multiple  
16 threats from abroad, but it is an incredibly dangerous and  
17 uncertain time. North Korea's nuclear missile program poses  
18 an immediate and grave national security threat, and  
19 heightened tensions on the Peninsula are deep cause for  
20 concern. The global order established by the United States  
21 following World War II is under siege by a revanchist Russia  
22 determined to reassert its influence around the world.  
23 China continues its saber-rattling in the Asia-Pacific  
24 region by undermining the freedom of navigation and using  
25 economic coercion of its smaller, more vulnerable neighbors.

1 Iran continues their aggressive weapons development  
2 activities, including ballistic missile development efforts,  
3 as well as other destabilizing activities in the region.  
4 Finally, our military has been consumed by two prolonged  
5 wars against violent extremist groups, like ISIS, that have  
6 sapped readiness and precluded our military personnel from  
7 training for full-spectrum operations.

8 As we grapple with these threats, we must also be  
9 mindful that our President continues to show a lack of  
10 indepth knowledge or nuance in foreign policy and defense  
11 matters. It had been my sincere hope that the magnitude of  
12 the office, coupled with the enormous challenges we face,  
13 would have encouraged the President to be more judicious  
14 with his comments and thoughtful with his actions.  
15 Unfortunately, that has not been the case. To date, our  
16 foreign policy has been predicated on alienating longtime  
17 allies, discounting the value of international organizations  
18 and our global commitments, and retreating from our  
19 leadership role in the world, while, at the same time,  
20 decisions on our defense posture and complicated military  
21 personnel issues are promulgated by presidential tweet.  
22 Such trends lend more uncertainty to already dangerous  
23 times, and I believe the risk of miscalculation and  
24 unintended consequences have never been higher.

25 Resolute leadership at the highest echelons of our

1 military is a necessity, now more than ever. I commend  
2 General Dunford for the steady hand he has demonstrated in  
3 guiding the Joint Chiefs during his tenure as Chairman, and  
4 for the sterling example he has set for all those that wear  
5 the uniform.

6 Thank you, again, General Dunford, for your willingness  
7 to serve our Nation.

8 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 Chairman McCain: General Dunford, welcome.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1           STATEMENT OF GENERAL JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, JR., USMC,  
2           NOMINEE FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL AND  
3           REAPPOINTMENT TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

4           General Dunford: Thank you, Chairman.

5           Chairman McCain, Ranking Member Reed, distinguished  
6           members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to  
7           appear before you today. I'm honored to be renominated as  
8           the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

9           I'd like to begin by thanking the committee for your  
10          support of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines. This  
11          year's National Defense Authorization Act is a reflection of  
12          your commitment to ensure that they remain the most well-  
13          trained, well-equipped, and capable military force in the  
14          world.

15          Today, we have a competitive advantage over any  
16          adversary, and I can say with confidence that our Armed  
17          Forces are ready to protect the homeland and meet our  
18          alliance commitments. However, that advantage has eroded in  
19          recent years. If reconfirmed, I look forward to working  
20          together with the committee to ensure that the Chairman  
21          testifying in 2025 has the same degree of confidence in our  
22          ability to provide for the common defense.

23          This committee is keenly aware of today's complex and  
24          volatile security environment. Both the Chairman and the  
25          Ranking Member have mentioned it. And I don't expect the

1 strategic landscape to improve in the near future. Russia  
2 continues to invest in a full range of capabilities designed  
3 to limit our power projection, erode U.S. influence, and  
4 undermine the credibility of the NATO alliance. Similarly,  
5 China is focused on limiting our ability to project power  
6 and weakening our alliances in the Pacific. Iran is  
7 projecting malign influence across the Middle East,  
8 threatening freedom of navigation while supporting terrorist  
9 organizations in Syria, Iraq, and Yemen. And, while we're  
10 all focused on the destabilizing threat posed by North Korea  
11 and Kim Jong Un's relentless pursuit of a nuclear  
12 intercontinental ballistic missile that can threaten the  
13 United States, we are also confronted by al Qaeda, ISIS, and  
14 other transregional terrorist organizations. And, while  
15 we've made significant progress against core ISIS in Iraq  
16 and Syria, we are not complacent, and much work remains to  
17 be done. In Afghanistan, we are beginning to deploy  
18 additional U.S. and coalition forces in support of the  
19 President's broader South Asia strategy.

20 In the context of these and other challenges, we need a  
21 renewed focus to restore joint readiness and develop the  
22 warfighting capabilities we'll need to defend the Nation in  
23 the future. As this committee has highlighted in hearings,  
24 we face very real and significant readiness challenges  
25 today, and we have failed to adequately invest in the

1 future. I can't state it any clearer: If we don't address  
2 this dynamic with sustained, sufficient, and predictable  
3 funding over the course of several years, we will lose our  
4 qualitative and quantitative competitive advantage. In the  
5 end, this will have a profound effect on our ability to  
6 deter conflict and to respond effectively if deterrence  
7 fails. If reconfirmed, I'll commit to working with the  
8 administration and the Congress in addressing these  
9 challenges to ensure our men and women in uniform never find  
10 themselves in a fair fight.

11 Chairman, I listened very carefully to your opening  
12 statement. I fully understand my responsibilities to  
13 provide candid best military advice to the President, the  
14 Secretary of Defense, and the National Security Council, and  
15 I'll be forthright when I'm asked to appear before this  
16 committee and other congressional venues.

17 And, with that, I'm prepared to answer your questions.

18 [The prepared statement of General Dunford follows:]

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1 Chairman McCain: Well, thank you very much, General.

2 In June, you testified, "Without sustained, sufficient,  
3 and predictable funding, I assess that, within 5 years, we  
4 will lose our ability to project power." We still don't  
5 have sustained, sufficient, and predictable funding. And I  
6 -- and, as you mentioned, I'm not sure we will for the  
7 foreseeable future unless Congress finally steps up to do  
8 its job. As you know, we'll start fiscal year 2018 on a  
9 continuing resolution, with no insight into what the final  
10 funding levels will be for the year.

11 What's the effect of the average first lieutenant who's  
12 out there -- captain, as a company command -- and they --  
13 and they don't have sufficient funds to carry out their  
14 training regimen, and their pilots are flying less hours per  
15 month than their Chinese and Russian counterparts? What --  
16 first of all, what effect does that have on our ability to  
17 defend the Nation? And, second of all, what does it do to  
18 the men and women of the All-Volunteer Force?

19 General Dunford: Chairman, I'll answer the first part.  
20 When you say, What does it do to our ability to defend the  
21 Nation? And, when I -- in my opening remarks, I mentioned  
22 "competitive advantage." And we've done some very careful  
23 analysis about, Where are the current threats? And we'll  
24 use, largely, Russia and China to benchmark our  
25 capabilities. And if you go back to 1999 or 2000, we had

1 what we should have as the United States of America, a  
2 nation that thinks and acts globally. We had a significant  
3 competitive advantage in our ability to project power when  
4 and where needed to advance our national interests. I can't  
5 say that today. We are challenged in our ability to project  
6 power, both to Europe and in the Pacific, as a result of  
7 those threats. And other nations, to include nonstate  
8 actors, as well, have capabilities on the high end that  
9 challenge our ability to project power. So, over time, that  
10 has eroded.

11 With regard to the question about lieutenants and  
12 captains, I think I have some insight into that, in the  
13 sense that I was a platoon commander in the late 1970s, and  
14 I lived through a period of time when we weren't properly  
15 resourced, we didn't have sufficient money for training, we  
16 didn't have sufficient personnel, and, many times, the tasks  
17 that we were asked exceeded our capability. I think it has  
18 to do with the confidence. And I would give you an example  
19 of a pilot. If you look at a pilot, specifically, you know,  
20 in the past, pilots might have had 30 hours a month to fly;  
21 now they may be down as low as 15 hours a month. On a day-  
22 to-day basis, you may not be able to see the difference  
23 between pilot A and pilot B, but, if there is an in-flight  
24 emergency, I can guarantee you that the pilot that has 30  
25 hours will immediately feel much more comfortable and

1 confident in their ability to deal with an anomalous  
2 situation, be able to control their physiological response.  
3 And you and I may never find out about that incident. On  
4 the contrary, if a pilot has 15 hours a month, we may very  
5 well find out about it, because it's a Class A mishap.

6 Chairman McCain: And our noncombat casualties and  
7 fatalities are now higher than -- in operations than in  
8 combat.

9 General Dunford: Chairman, they are. And I would  
10 attribute that to two things. I mean, one, it's the  
11 material condition that does affect the numbers of hours  
12 that a pilot flies, a driver drives, so forth. It's also  
13 the size of the force relative to the requirements that we  
14 have. Going back to my lieutenant days, if you think about  
15 training, whether it's on a ship, in a plane, or in the  
16 infantry as a series of 101, 201, 301, 401 tasks, when I was  
17 a lieutenant, we didn't go to 201 until we were confident  
18 that we were well-founded in 101, and we didn't go to 301  
19 til we were well-founded in 201. And I would argue that,  
20 while we may have trained to standard in the past, when we  
21 had sufficient time and resources, now we're training to  
22 time, because that ship is going to go to sea, that pilot is  
23 going to go to war, that infantryman is going to go to war,  
24 whether or not they've had an opportunity to retrain,  
25 sometimes, in the basic tasks, or not.

1 Chairman McCain: Do you believe it's possible for the  
2 United States to achieve its national security objectives in  
3 Afghanistan as long as Pakistan provides support and  
4 sanctuary to groups such as the Taliban and the Haqqani  
5 Network?

6 General Dunford: I do not believe that we can attain  
7 our objectives in Afghanistan, Chairman, unless we  
8 materially change the behavior of Pakistan.

9 Chairman McCain: And have you got thoughts on how you  
10 do that?

11 General Dunford: Chairman, while it will require a  
12 broad approach to do it, I think it's unacceptable that --  
13 you hit the key issue -- it's unacceptable that Pakistan  
14 provides sanctuary, and we ought to bring the full weight of  
15 the U.S. Government and our coalition partners on Pakistan  
16 to ensure that they do not provide the sanctuary that they  
17 have provided, historically, to groups like Haqqani and the  
18 Taliban.

19 Chairman McCain: Are you satisfied now with the rules  
20 of engagement, which have been changed with the new  
21 administration?

22 General Dunford: Chairman, I am. And I had a long  
23 conversation with General Nicholson, in NATO over the  
24 weekend, to ensure that he also had the same degree of  
25 confidence. And Secretary Mattis has spoken to General

1 Nicholson in the past week to make sure he's confident that  
2 he has the rules of engagement that allow him to engage any  
3 enemy that is a threat to the Afghan government, our  
4 mission, coalition forces, or U.S. personnel.

5 Chairman McCain: Is some of it reminiscent of our  
6 rules of engagement during the Vietnam conflict?

7 General Dunford: Well, Chairman, they may have been.  
8 I can assure you today that we have the rules of engagement  
9 necessary to advance our objectives in Afghanistan, and to  
10 protect the force, as well.

11 Chairman McCain: Thank you.

12 Senator Reed.

13 Senator Reed: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

14 Thank you, General Dunford.

15 In response to the committee's pre-hearing policy  
16 questions, you indicated that Iran is adhering to its  
17 obligations under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or  
18 the JCPOA, but you do, rightfully, point out that they are  
19 engaged in the extremely destabilizing activities in the  
20 region, missile development, activities that can't be  
21 tolerated.

22 But, going back to JCPOA, is it your view that it was  
23 designed to limit their nuclear capacity, and that it is  
24 currently achieving that objective?

25 General Dunford: Senator, it was designed specifically

1 to address what I would describe as one of the five major  
2 threats of Iran, the nuclear threat, as you point out. What  
3 the agreement didn't address was the missile threat, the  
4 maritime threat, Iran's support of proxies, and the  
5 cyberactivity that they have conducted.

6 Senator Reed: And they're still pursuing those other  
7 venues very aggressively, in your view.

8 General Dunford: They are, Senator. And we see a  
9 physical manifestation of that in Yemen, we see it in Iraq,  
10 we see it in Lebanon, we see it in Syria.

11 Senator Reed: In this complicated world where there's  
12 so much going on, we're -- I have a focus on North Korea.  
13 If we were to step away from the JCPOA, would that have an  
14 effect, in your professional view, on the ability to  
15 negotiate or to come to some type of nonkinetic solution in  
16 Korea?

17 General Dunford: Senator, it makes sense to me that  
18 our holding-up agreements that we have signed, unless  
19 there's a material breach, would have an impact on others'  
20 willingness to sign agreements.

21 Senator Reed: And, in terms of a force that we've all  
22 commented on as stretched, if, in reaction to rejecting the  
23 JCPOA, would you assume that the Iranians would step up  
24 their activity even more, causing us to, at least in a  
25 contingency, have forces that would be in that area and not

1 able -- available for Korea?

2 General Dunford: Senator, I would. We watch, every  
3 day -- and this is even in addition to the JCPOA issue, just  
4 our relationship with Iran -- we watch, every day, for  
5 indicators that either Iranian-backed militia forces or  
6 Iranian maritime forces would pose a threat to the force.  
7 We have postured the force to deal with those threats. And  
8 we watch the intelligence carefully to make sure our  
9 posture, every day, is in the context of the current threat.

10 Senator Reed: It -- you've said it, and the Secretary  
11 of Defense has said it, and the White House has said it,  
12 too, is that our major effort against North Korea is  
13 diplomatic at this moment. Is that accurate?

14 General Dunford: Senator, it absolutely is. The  
15 military dimension today is in full support of the economic  
16 and diplomatic pressure campaign that Secretary of State is  
17 leading in North Korea.

18 Senator Reed: One of the things that's difficult to  
19 comprehensive is, we do not have an Ambassador in South  
20 Korea, do we?

21 General Dunford: We do not. We have a Charge, at this  
22 time, Senator.

23 Senator Reed: And, in respect, General Brooks is sort  
24 of doing double duty, informally?

25 General Dunford: No, Senator, we're very proud of what

1 General Brooks is doing right now, as both a -- he sits  
2 there at the nexus of the political/military.

3 Senator Reed: No, I'm very -- as you have confidence  
4 in General Brooks, but it's -- if we're in a diplomatic  
5 mode, we don't have an Ambassador -- I'm told we don't also  
6 have an Assistant Secretary for the area in the State  
7 Department -- we just don't seem to have the team in place  
8 to have an all-court press for a diplomatic solution. Is  
9 that -- unfair comment or --

10 General Dunford: Senator, I certainly -- probably  
11 would comment, not only because I have clearly urged  
12 Secretary Tillerson, also comment on the difficulty he has  
13 right now, doing all the things that the State Department's  
14 been called upon to do, with some of the gaps that continue  
15 to exist.

16 Senator Reed: In terms of the situation on the  
17 Peninsula now, can you give us your judgment of where we are  
18 today, given the statements, back and forth, between leaders  
19 of both countries, given our aerial operations off the  
20 coast, given the response yesterday that could trigger a  
21 reaction by the North Koreans? Can you give us an  
22 assessment?

23 General Dunford: Senator, I can. It -- you know,  
24 while the political space is clearly very charged right now,  
25 we haven't seen a change in the posture of North Korean

1 forces. We watch that very carefully. We clearly have  
2 postured our forces to respond, in the event of a  
3 provocation or a conflict. We also have taken all the  
4 proper measures to protect our allies -- the South Koreans,  
5 the Japanese -- the force, as well as Americans in the area.  
6 But, what we haven't seen is military activity that would be  
7 reflective of the charged political environment that you're  
8 describing.

9 Senator Reed: Thank you very much, General.

10 Chairman McCain: Senator Inhofe.

11 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 General Dunford, I'd like to pursue two things. One,  
13 intelligence; and the other, modernization. In doing this,  
14 I want to get three statements in the record, to begin with.

15 On Sunday, Kim Jong Un released a propaganda video  
16 depicting the U.S. aircraft carrier and bomber being blown  
17 up by North Korean missiles. He further threatened that a  
18 U.S. attack would see our forces, as he said, "head to the  
19 grave."

20 I've been very proud of the uniforms coming out and  
21 talking about how real the threat is. General Hyten, the  
22 Strategic Command Commander, said last week that he views  
23 North Korea's ability to deliver a nuclear weapon on an ICBM  
24 as a matter of when, not if. And Defense Intelligence  
25 Agency assesses that North Korea will be able to reliably

1 range the U.S. mainland with nuclear ICBMs by the end of  
2 2018. Well, I remember when that 2018 was 2020, and it was  
3 2019. I'd have to ask you how confident you are in the --  
4 in our intelligence community's ability to monitor and  
5 detect just where they are, and how accurate you believe  
6 "the end of 2018" is.

7 General Dunford: Senator, from my review of the  
8 intelligence, I think that what General Hyten said, and what  
9 you've just described, reflects the collective judgment of  
10 the senior leadership in the Department. And I think  
11 something that General Hyten said is something I've also  
12 said in public, is that, whether it's 3 months or 6 months  
13 or 18 months, it is soon. And we ought to conduct ourselves  
14 as though it is just a matter of time, and a matter of very  
15 short time, before North Korea has that capability.

16 Senator Inhofe: Yeah. And I think it's important to  
17 get in the record -- name a couple of the unique challenges  
18 in getting intelligence on North Korea that don't exist in  
19 other places.

20 General Dunford: The -- well, they may exist, to some  
21 degree, in other places. The North Koreans, over time, have  
22 buried much of their capability underground, which creates  
23 new challenges. There's also some specific weather  
24 challenges in North Korea that limits our collection at  
25 various periods of time. And, to be honest with you,

1 Senator, part of it also has been, you know, the competing  
2 demand for a limited amount of intelligence, surveillance,  
3 and reconnaissance. Certainly, over the last 18 months, we  
4 have increased our collection against North Korea. But, for  
5 a long period of time, we had decreased our collection  
6 against North Korea, because of competing demands elsewhere  
7 in the world. So, I think those are probably three of the  
8 most significant challenges we face.

9 Senator Inhofe: That's good. The -- and I assume  
10 you're equally concerned about their activity in trading  
11 technology and missile technology with other countries, such  
12 as Iran.

13 General Dunford: Senator, we are. We've looked at  
14 that nexus quite a bit. I'm not sure we've seen any  
15 transfer of nuclear technology, but we certainly have seen  
16 missile technology and a wide range of other weapon systems  
17 that they have exported, or expertise that they have  
18 exported outside of North Korea.

19 Senator Inhofe: On modernization, both of the Army  
20 generals, Anderson and Murray, said recently at -- in our  
21 subcommittee, "Given the complex range of threats, the Army  
22 has a very short window to improve capability and capacity.  
23 Meanwhile, our adversaries are closing the capacity gap." I  
24 think you said, in your opening -- if I wrote it down  
25 correctly -- you said, "If we don't have sustained funding,

1 we'll lose our qualitative and quantitative advantage over  
2 our adversaries." I think I -- that that is accurate.

3 And you've expressed your concern that we're getting  
4 very close on that. Is that correct?

5 General Dunford: I have, Senator. And I think this  
6 reflects -- both the Chinese to Russians and others have  
7 studied our strengths over the course, now, of 20 years.

8 Senator Inhofe: Yeah.

9 General Dunford: And they have been on a path of  
10 developing capabilities that exploit our vulnerabilities.  
11 And we know what those are. And we have a plan to correct  
12 those. But, if we don't correct those, our ability to  
13 project power -- for example, when the Army talks about it  
14 -- our ability to project power into Europe, but then  
15 operate freely within Europe, to include to support our  
16 forces with logistics bases, sustainment efforts, is going  
17 to be challenged.

18 Senator Inhofe: And I think your statement, along with  
19 some of the other military -- some of the uniforms -- are  
20 helpful to us, because the American people really don't  
21 understand the level of threat that's out there, the  
22 complexity of it, how it's not something that's happened  
23 before, and that we need to start prioritizing our military  
24 and our defense issues.

25 One last thing. General Milley recently testified,

1 during the '18 Army posture hearing, that we are now  
2 outranged and outgunned. Do you agree with that statement?

3 General Dunford: Relative to certain threats, under  
4 certain conditions, I do, Senator.

5 Senator Inhofe: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

6 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 Chairman McCain: Senator Gillibrand.

8 Senator Gillibrand: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 Thank you, General Dunford, for your service.

10 The uncertainty that's facing our transgender men and  
11 women in uniform since late July has been deeply unsettling  
12 to many members of the committee. Chairman McCain, Ranking  
13 Member Reed, Susan -- Senator Susan Collins and I have  
14 introduced a bipartisan bill that would prevent the  
15 Department of Defense from separating currently-serving  
16 transgender individuals solely based on their gender  
17 identity. These men and women across all services and  
18 occupations were told by the Department of Defense that they  
19 would be allowed to serve openly and continue in their  
20 military careers. Many have worked diligently within their  
21 chains of command to meet every requirement put forth by the  
22 former administration. Now they have been plunged into a  
23 career of uncertainty, and their service and sacrifices have  
24 been unfairly tarnished. Many of us on the committee are  
25 deeply disturbed by the developments of the last few months.

1 Do you agree that our thousands of openly-serving  
2 transgender men and women have served their country with  
3 honor and valor?

4 General Dunford: I do, Senator. I would just probably  
5 say that I believe any individual who meets the physical and  
6 mental standards and is worldwide deployable and is  
7 currently serving should be afforded the opportunity to  
8 continue to serve.

9 Senator Gillibrand: Thank you. If reappointed, can  
10 you promise currently-serving transgender individuals who  
11 have followed Department policy and meet every requirement,  
12 as you've just said, asked of them, that they will not be  
13 separated from the armed services based solely on their  
14 gender identity?

15 General Dunford: Senator, I can promise that that will  
16 be my advice. What I've just articulated is the advice I've  
17 provided in private and I've just provided in public.

18 Senator Gillibrand: Thank you.

19 And have you had the opportunity to meet with any of  
20 the thousands of transgender individuals currently serving  
21 in uniform on Active Duty to hear how the recent  
22 developments have impacted their lives? And, if not, will  
23 you commit to doing so?

24 General Dunford: I have not, since the -- since, I  
25 guess, August, when the announcement was made, but I would

1 certainly do that, Senator.

2 Senator Gillibrand: Thank you.

3 On the subject of military sexual violence, we've been  
4 at this for a while now. Every Secretary of Defense since  
5 Dick Cheney was Secretary of Defense have said zero  
6 tolerance for sexual assault military. But, we still have  
7 serious issues of climate. Our assault rate is still 15,000  
8 estimated assaults, sexual acts and unwanted sexual contact.  
9 But, we really aren't moving the needle in the way we  
10 should.

11 During a hearing, over the last few years, we had  
12 General Dempsey, who said -- in 2014, he said that, "We are  
13 currently on the clock, if you will. If we don't make  
14 serious progress in a year, we might have to look at  
15 legislation."

16 Now, more than the -- more than half of the Senate has  
17 voted twice to take the decisionmaking of whether a crime  
18 has been committed out of the chain of command and giving it  
19 to trained military prosecutors as a way to professionalize  
20 our military justice system. This is a reform that our  
21 allies have already done, long ago, mostly for defendants'  
22 rights, whether it's the U.K., whether it's Israel, whether  
23 it's Australia, Canada, Netherlands. And they've done it  
24 purposefully, because they believe that, if someone could be  
25 sent to jail for life, that the decisionmaker who makes

1 those decisions should be well-trained as a criminal  
2 prosecutor, have no biases, not know the perpetrator or the  
3 victim -- the accused or the accuser, and have that criminal  
4 justice background so that they can leave biases at the  
5 door.

6 We've done every type of reform that has been  
7 recommended by every panel that's been impaneled to look at  
8 this. We have special victims' counsels in place to give  
9 survivors more legal advice during the process. We have  
10 changed the rules of evidence to make them more similar to  
11 the civilian system so there's more protections. We have  
12 done literally anything anyone can think of that the  
13 Department of Defense will not oppose. We've made  
14 retaliation a crime 3 years in a row. Not one case has gone  
15 to court-martial of retaliation, of the hundreds of cases  
16 I've looked at. The largest bases for each of the services,  
17 I look at all the sexual assault cases every year, and do a  
18 broadbased review.

19 So, we're not fixing the problem. I would like a  
20 commitment from you that you will work with me on ways to  
21 fix this problem, and to honestly look at this command  
22 structure, because, more often than not, the decisions that  
23 being -- are made aren't necessarily the right decisions.  
24 Using nonjudicial punishment when going to court-martial is  
25 recommended by those who have done the investigation.

1 Kicking somebody out who has many witnesses against them,  
2 instead of taking them to court-martial. These are kinds of  
3 decisions that are not making our military stronger.

4 So, I would like your commitment that you will work  
5 with me on this issue this year to try to make a difference  
6 to solve this problem.

7 General Dunford: Senator, I don't think any of us are  
8 satisfied where we are, and I would commit to work with you  
9 to look at this issue.

10 Senator Gillibrand: Thank you.

11 Chairman McCain: General, let me just say that this  
12 committee has had hundreds of hours of hearings, input from  
13 leaders such as yourself, from -- this issue has been  
14 thoroughly vetted by this committee. The Secretary of  
15 Defense is looking at this issue, and others. And I am  
16 convinced that the one aspect of this issue that this  
17 Chairman will not tolerate, and that is to undermine or  
18 cause the commanding officer not to have both authority and  
19 responsibility in this process. I just want to make that  
20 very clear to you, the position of the majority of this  
21 committee. We've got a lot of work to do on the issue, but  
22 to take away the commanding officer's authority and  
23 responsibility would be a violation of everything I've ever  
24 known about the United States Navy for 70 years.

25 General Dunford: Chairman, can I respond --

1 Chairman McCain: Please.

2 General Dunford: -- to both you and Senator  
3 Gillibrand?

4 I mean, I'm on record as having said -- and I believe  
5 this -- that we will not solve the problem unless commanding  
6 officers are singularly personally accountable and  
7 responsible for command climate and for fixing the problem.

8 What I answered to Senator Gillibrand, just to be  
9 clear, and to be honest today, is to continue to look at the  
10 issue and find ways to address sexual assault. I was not  
11 referring to the chain of command not being responsible or  
12 accountable. My experience is similar to yours over the  
13 last 40 years, that any problem we have ever had inside of  
14 the organization has been solved when commanders were  
15 engaged, responsible, and accountable for solving that  
16 problem.

17 Chairman McCain: Well, I thank you for that statement,  
18 General. And we will continue to debate it. And there's a  
19 lot of work that needs to be done, as I think you'd be the  
20 first to acknowledge. But, to say that commanding officers  
21 no longer have responsibility for the conduct of those under  
22 their command undermines about 200-and-some years of  
23 military chain of command and responsibility. If commanding  
24 officers are not carrying out those responsibilities, then  
25 they should be -- then their lack of assumption of

1 responsibility they should be held accountable to. But, to  
2 take them out of the chain of responsibility, my view, is a  
3 serious, serious mistake.

4 Senator Fischer.

5 Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 Thank you, General Dunford, for being here today, and  
7 for your continued service.

8 On July 4th and July 28th, North Korea tested a new  
9 missile, now known as the KN-20. And, based on the  
10 capabilities demonstrated in these tests, numerous press  
11 reports estimate that the missile has a potential range of  
12 over 10,000 miles, which would put much of the United States  
13 within its reach. And, while I understand technical hurdles  
14 still remain before North Korea possess a reliable,  
15 accurate, and nuclear-capable ICBM system, what's your  
16 assessment of the ballistic missile threat to the homeland  
17 from North Korea? Where do you see that trend line moving?

18 General Dunford: Senator, I think, for all planning  
19 purposes, capability development, we should assume now that  
20 North Korea has the capability. As you suggest, there are  
21 some technical elements of their program that haven't been  
22 fully tested, from a reentry vehicle to some of the ability  
23 to stabilize a missile in flight, but I view all those as  
24 engineering solutions that will be developed over time.  
25 And, frankly, I think we should assume today that North

1 Korea has that capability, and has the will to use that  
2 capability.

3 Senator Fischer: The last major modification of our  
4 homeland missile defenses came in 2013, when, in response to  
5 an accelerating threat from North Korea, then-Secretary  
6 Hagel announced plans to increase the number of interceptors  
7 from 30 to 44. And, given what we've witnessed over the  
8 past year, do you believe that the current threat  
9 environment requires additional homeland missile defense  
10 capabilities?

11 General Dunford: I do, Senator. And, over the last 7  
12 or 8 weeks, we did a very detailed look at increasing  
13 ballistic missile defense capability for the North Korean  
14 threat, certainly, but for other threats, as well. And we  
15 do think an increase is warranted. And I believe, in the  
16 NDAA -- and we certainly support that -- there's an  
17 additional 21 interceptors that's -- that are in the NDAA  
18 that was just passed.

19 Senator Fischer: Right. And should the Department  
20 program additional resources towards ballistic missile  
21 defense across the FYDP?

22 General Dunford: Senator, we should. And both the  
23 Congress and the President have directed us to do that. And  
24 we have.

25 Senator Fischer: Thank you.

1 I'd like to follow up on some previous questions that I  
2 think we were trying to get to, what happens when  
3 operational demands aren't necessarily met. As you know, we  
4 conducted a hearing recently on the naval accidents that are  
5 happening in the Pacific. And we looked at the concern that  
6 the Navy is trying to do too much with too little. Demand's  
7 outpacing the supply, that's what we're seeing. And I don't  
8 think it's just focused on the Navy. I think there's  
9 concerns with other services, as well. We know the Navy's  
10 doing its reviews. And I think those really focus on the  
11 supply side of the equation on that. Can you tell me if the  
12 Joint Staff is reviewing the operational demands that have  
13 been placed on the Navy and have these incidents have an  
14 impact on the way that we are looking at how to assess a  
15 high optempo -- how that poses a risk to our forces now?

16 General Dunford: Senator, we have. We have reviewed  
17 that. And what we're making sure now is that readiness of  
18 the force, as well as our ability to respond to the  
19 unexpected, is a key element, even as we meet the  
20 requirements. You know, in the past, without going into a  
21 lot of detail, we had a bottom-up process for global force  
22 management, meaning each one of the commanders provided us  
23 with all their requirements, and then we kind of leveled  
24 across and met all those requirements. We have now  
25 implemented -- and this year, we will implement it for the

1 first time -- a top-down process, where we fence certain  
2 numbers of forces as a result of the services needing those  
3 forces to be back in the United States to generate  
4 readiness, or somewhere else, located where they are  
5 generating readiness and not allocated, so we can continue  
6 to sustain the force. We realize that what we've been doing  
7 in the past is unsustainable, moving forward. This -- the  
8 demand does exceed the supply, and we need to make an  
9 adjustment to the demand as well as the supply, as you  
10 alluded to, Senator.

11 Senator Fischer: Do you anticipate reducing the  
12 demand?

13 General Dunford: I anticipate managing risk in a  
14 different way until we can grow the capacity to meet the  
15 demand. I do.

16 Senator Fischer: Does that put more of a threat on the  
17 readiness of our troops, then?

18 General Dunford: It -- we're --

19 Senator Fischer: I mean, they're not just -- take the  
20 Navy -- they're not just out there on ships, doing  
21 operations with no strategy in place.

22 General Dunford: They are not, Senator, but what we  
23 have to do is get to the point where we have a balance  
24 between the time that units are at home station, training,  
25 developing their capabilities in the time they're deployed.

1           If you talk about the Navy example, I was aboard the  
2 USS Barry some months ago. USS Barry had been at sea 70  
3 percent of the time in the previous 12 months. So, when we  
4 go back, now, and we look at, Were they able to do all the  
5 training necessary, and what was their life like during  
6 those 12 months? -- 70 percent of the time underway is an  
7 unsustainable rate, and so, we're going to have to make  
8 adjustments in the demand. That will incur managing  
9 operational and strategic risk, there's no doubt.

10           Senator Fischer: Thank you.

11           Chairman McCain: And it also incur -- include 100-hour  
12 workweeks?

13           General Dunford: Chairman, absolutely. And when  
14 sailors are at sea 70 percent of the time, they're at work  
15 most of every day.

16           Chairman McCain: Thank you.

17           Senator Donnelly.

18           Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19           General Dunford, I want to thank you for your  
20 leadership, your continued service to our Nation. And, to  
21 your family, thank you very much. I think you've done an  
22 extraordinary job, and we're privileged to have you in this  
23 position.

24           In your written responses to the committee's questions  
25 in advance of this hearing, you addressed a few of my

1 questions about improving mental health and suicide  
2 prevention services. You highlighted the growth in embedded  
3 mental health providers. The FY15 NDAA included a  
4 bipartisan provision called the Sexton Act that I authored  
5 with Senator Wicker. It requires every servicemember to get  
6 a confidential mental health assessment each year. In the  
7 past, you and the service chiefs have said that you believed  
8 it would be fully implemented no later than October 1 of  
9 this year, which is next week. General, are the services  
10 fully implementing the requirements for robust annual mental  
11 health assessments?

12 General Dunford: Senator, thank you. And, as you  
13 know, I've worked that issue personally now for some years.  
14 And I appreciate your support in that area.

15 The Army, the National Guard, several of our components  
16 are completely compliant, and they'll make the deadline.  
17 There are some outliers that haven't met the standard. And  
18 that was the word out as I prepared for my testimony. So, I  
19 can assure you that both the Secretary and I will be engaged  
20 in cleaning it up. I think the vast majority of the  
21 Department has become compliant with the Sexton Act, but  
22 there are some outliers, and we'll get the full details to  
23 you. I became aware of that this week as we prepared for  
24 testimony.

25 Senator Donnelly: Thank you.

1           Can you describe your understanding of our strategy to  
2 counter North Korea, and how you're working with your  
3 partners across interagency --

4           General Dunford: I --

5           Senator Donnelly: -- to execute that?

6           General Dunford: I can, Senator. And, very briefly,  
7 when Secretary Tillerson came in last year, people told him  
8 that there were two things that he couldn't do anything  
9 about. One was that nuclear weapons were inextricably  
10 linked to survival of the regime in North Korea. They  
11 wouldn't trade away nuclear weapons. And the second is that  
12 China wouldn't cooperate. Secretary Tillerson is testing  
13 those two assumptions, because the alternatives at the time,  
14 to not testing those two assumptions, were so dire. So, we  
15 have now a pressurization campaign, applying economic and  
16 diplomatic means, primarily, to force the North Koreans to  
17 denuclearize the Peninsula. We are also working very  
18 closely with the Chinese. Secretary Tillerson has been  
19 almost relentless in dealing with the Chinese over the past  
20 few months to get them cooperate with the U.N. sanctions  
21 regime.

22           On the positive side, there's been four U.N.  
23 resolutions passed this year, and I think the Chinese  
24 cooperation, to include the Russian cooperation, in passing  
25 those sanctions is unprecedented. We're at the phase now

1 where implementation of the sanctions is going to determine  
2 whether or not we have a peaceful solution to  
3 denuclearization on the Peninsula.

4 So, we are continuing with the military dimension, to  
5 support, primarily, Secretary Tillerson's economic and  
6 diplomatic pressure campaign, but also making it clear that  
7 there is -- there are military options available to the  
8 President if the economic and diplomatic pressure campaign  
9 fails. We think that's important, that North Korea  
10 understand that. We also think it's important that China  
11 understand that. And I personally went to China, in the  
12 middle of August during the recess, to deliver that message  
13 to Chinese senior leadership.

14 Senator Donnelly: When you look at North Korea -- and  
15 there's significant speculation about Kim Jong Un's motives  
16 -- but do you think it's about just survival of the regime,  
17 or do you think he is also looking to take over South Korea,  
18 as well?

19 General Dunford: Senator, I look back at, you know,  
20 our experience with North Korea, and I realize that Kim Jong  
21 Un has only been there for a short period of the history.  
22 Since 1953, we have effectively deterred North Korea from  
23 attacking South, and to -- or attacking into South Korea.  
24 My assessment, based on the intelligence I've read, is that  
25 Kim Jong Un's development of nuclear capability and his

1 development of missile technology is primarily associated  
2 with regime survival. That's not to say that they don't  
3 pose a threat to South Korea and to others in the region.  
4 But, my judgment is that that is what has driven his path of  
5 development over the past 18 months.

6 Senator Donnelly: Switching over a little bit to  
7 Syria, you've had significant success in Iraq, moving ISIS  
8 out. There's ongoing battles in the Raqqa area. Six months  
9 from now, where do you hope to be?

10 General Dunford: Six months from now, Senator, with  
11 the -- I guess, from experience, always -- gosh, it's about  
12 laying out timelines. And so, I won't -- for the campaign.  
13 But, I do believe that we will have completed operations  
14 more properly. Our partners will have completed operations  
15 in Raqqa. And we'll be well on our way to going after the  
16 external operations capability and the media capability of  
17 ISIS that remains in the middle Euphrates River Valley. And  
18 we'll also be supporting our Iraqi Security Forces partners  
19 on the east side of the border to better secure the border  
20 between Iraq and Syria. So, I think we'll have continued to  
21 degrade, most importantly, their external operations  
22 capability, the ability they have to plan and conduct  
23 external operations. I think we will have undermined the  
24 credibility of their narrative. They will increasingly not  
25 be able to say that there's a physical caliphate in

1 existence. I think that'll have an impact on the  
2 recruiting. We've already seen the numbers drop, the  
3 numbers of individuals who are inspired to join the ISIS  
4 movement. So, I think we'll continue to see reduction of  
5 territory, reduction in freedom of movement, reduced  
6 resources, and less credibility in the narrative. Those are  
7 the four areas where I think we'll continue to see progress.

8 Senator Donnelly: Thank you.

9 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 Chairman McCain: I'd just assert the privilege of the  
11 Chair and ask what your take is on the vote in Kurdistan.

12 General Dunford: Chairman, in the wake of that vote,  
13 my primary concern now is making sure that the vote doesn't  
14 disrupt the cooperation that we have seen between the  
15 Peshmerga and the Iraqi Security Forces. The real challenge  
16 in the campaign right now is that operations in the north --  
17 the reason why we were successful in Mosul, the reason we're  
18 successful in the north is because of the cooperation  
19 between the Peshmerga and the Iraqi Security Forces. If you  
20 look at the next area that the Iraqis are focused on, in the  
21 Hawija area, which is southwest of Kirkuk, it's going to  
22 require cooperation between the Kurds and the Iraqi Security  
23 Forces.

24 So, I'm concerned that the referendum will disrupt that  
25 cooperation, but my focus, from a military perspective, will

1 be, try to mitigate the effects. And I know that's what  
2 Secretary Mattis and General Votel are also trying to do, is  
3 mitigate the effects.

4 Chairman McCain: And President Erdogan has made some  
5 pretty aggressive statements.

6 General Dunford: President Erdogan has made some very  
7 aggressive statements, and so have the Iranians, Chairman.

8 Chairman McCain: Senator Cotton.

9 Senator Cotton: General, welcome back.  
10 Congratulations on your renomination. And thank you for  
11 your many decades of service.

12 In your written testimony, you say, on page 10, that  
13 Iran has not changed its malign activity since the JCPOA  
14 went into effect. Have they increased the pace or scope of  
15 their malign activities?

16 General Dunford: Senator, I think you could argue that  
17 they have, certainly in Syria. I think it's been relatively  
18 constant in Yemen with regard to their support for the  
19 Houthis. Clearly, their support for Lebanese Hezbollah has  
20 been at a high level for some period of time. So, in those  
21 three areas, I would say that Syria is the one place where  
22 it's probably increased. And you could argue, over the last  
23 few months, whether or not it's related to JCPOA or not that  
24 Iranian activity inside Iraq has certainly increased as they  
25 look to the end game in Iraq.

1           Senator Cotton: Thank you.

2           Without going into the content of rules of engagement,  
3 which are obviously classified, have our rules of engagement  
4 changed, in the last 8 months since President Trump took  
5 office, in the Persian Gulf as it relates to Iranian  
6 harassment using small craft or drones or aircraft?

7           General Dunford: Our rules of engagement have not  
8 changed, Senator. What we have done in the wake of a number  
9 of incidents is, we've gone back, at every level, from the  
10 Fifth Fleet to United States Central Command, and made it  
11 very clear what our forces were capable of doing, were they  
12 to be threatened. And so, I'm confident that it's -- in  
13 application of rules of engagement, if our forces are  
14 threatened, they are both postured and capable of  
15 effectively responding.

16          Senator Cotton: Thank you.

17          On page 29 and 30 of your written testimony, you  
18 restate your support for our nuclear triad as well as  
19 modernizing the National Airborne Operations Command Center.  
20 Strangely, to me, the Air Force has just announced that the  
21 next version of Air Force One will not have in-flight  
22 refueling capability. What do you make of that?

23          General Dunford: Senator, I think that was a decision  
24 that was not made by the Air Force, but made by the White  
25 House. And I think it had to do with fiscal constraints on

1 the program. It will certainly be a limiting factor, and  
2 we'll have to plan accordingly.

3 Senator Cotton: I think we might need to revisit that  
4 decision here on Capitol Hill.

5 I want to turn to the Open Skies Treaty. Not many  
6 Americans know about that, but it allows the United States  
7 and Russia and many other countries, but primarily those two  
8 countries, to fly aircraft over each other's territory and  
9 take lots of pictures. Russia has been violating that  
10 treaty, as Secretary Mattis testified earlier this year. I  
11 assume that you agree with his testimony earlier this year.

12 General Dunford: I do, Senator. And we, as a Nation,  
13 declared them in violation, back in June.

14 Senator Cotton: And there's a Wall Street Journal  
15 article today, saying that, in Vienna today, we will take  
16 steps to curb their flights in response to their actions by  
17 limiting our flights over Kaliningrad, their enclave in  
18 Europe which they hold most of Europe at risk, their  
19 limitations in Abkhazia and South Ossetia and Chechnya, and  
20 also their altitude floor over Moscow. Are those steps that  
21 we're about to take?

22 General Dunford: Those are all part of an overall  
23 effort, Senator. Let me probably just make sure that we  
24 make it clear. We believe that, on balance, it would be  
25 best if the treaty continued to be in place, but we don't

1 believe the treaty should be in place if the Russians aren't  
2 complying. And so, there is a decidedly aggressive  
3 diplomatic effort right now to bring the Russians back into  
4 compliance, which we think would be the best outcome.

5 Senator Cotton: Do you expect some of these reported  
6 steps -- for instance, restricting flights over Alaska and  
7 Hawaii -- will bring Russia back into compliance?

8 General Dunford: Senator, I don't know. But, this is  
9 the best plan we have right now to bring them in compliance  
10 before we might consider other alternatives.

11 Senator Cotton: Given the size and capabilities of our  
12 satellite constellation, versus Russia's, is it fair to say  
13 that Russia gets more benefit from these flights than does  
14 the United States?

15 General Dunford: I believe that argument's been made,  
16 and it -- it's compelling to me.

17 Senator Cotton: I want to turn to missile defense in  
18 North Korea. We focus a lot on systems like Aegis Ashore  
19 and THAAD, our West Coast interceptors. What's the  
20 prospects, currently, for a boost-phase intercept  
21 specifically from unmanned aerial vehicles, either with hit-  
22 to-kill interceptors or with directed energy?

23 General Dunford: Senator, there's been a lot of work  
24 done on boost phase. As you know from asking the question,  
25 we don't have that capability right now. I would offer to

1 you a classified briefing, at a time of your convenience, to  
2 walk you through where we think we may be right now. But,  
3 we do not have that capability today.

4 Senator Cotton: I think we have that scheduled for  
5 later today. Be a helluva thing if we could put a UAV up  
6 over the North Korean Peninsula and shoot down any missile  
7 as it was taking off. I'd suggest that we need to look as  
8 aggressively as we can at that.

9 Finally, General, the deaths of the sailors in the  
10 western Pacific has commanded a lot of attention, rightfully  
11 so. You had, I believe, 15 marines that were badly wounded  
12 a couple of weeks ago out on the West Coast, though, in a  
13 fire involving an amphibious assault vehicle. How are those  
14 marines doing today?

15 General Dunford: Senator, I don't know how each one of  
16 them individually is doing, but we've been getting routine  
17 reports about their progress, and they are making progress.  
18 Some of them, you know, some significant injuries.

19 Senator Cotton: I know that your -- the Marine Corps  
20 is conducting a review of the matter, and will have a  
21 report. What's the likelihood that the impact of the --  
22 many years of sequestration budget cuts could have played a  
23 role in either the level of training or operations and  
24 maintenance for that vehicle in this incident?

25 General Dunford: Senator, I can't talk to that

1 specific incident, but I am confident that a combination of  
2 fiscal challenges and high operational tempo have created  
3 conditions that actually have led to some of these  
4 incidents. Of that, I'm confident.

5 Senator Cotton: Thank you, General.

6 Chairman McCain: Senator Hirono.

7 Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 General Dunford, welcome back. And it was a pleasure  
9 to meet with you not too long ago.

10 And, with the natural disasters that have been  
11 occurring, I also want to take this opportunity to thank the  
12 many members of our Armed Forces, including the Active,  
13 National Guard, and Reserve personnel, who were very  
14 instrumental in helping to save lives and transporting  
15 supplies during the recent natural disasters.

16 General Dunford, in your 2015 confirmation hearing to  
17 serve as Chairman, you stated that Russia presented the  
18 greatest threat to our national security. And you included  
19 their nuclear capability, ability to interfere with our  
20 sovereignty of our allies, and you said their behavior was  
21 nothing short of alarming. And, of course, we can now add  
22 involvement in our elections to the list. You then rank-  
23 ordered China, North Korea, and ISIS -- ISIL or ISIS -- as  
24 two to four on your list of threats to national security.  
25 In the intervening time, we have North Korea.

1           So, my question, as we sit here today, would you change  
2 your threat-assessment order? Is North Korea still third on  
3 your list?

4           General Dunford: Senator, the one thing I've said to  
5 my staff is that we don't actually have the luxury of  
6 identifying a single threat today, unfortunately, nor  
7 necessary to look at it in a linear fashion. So, what I  
8 would say is that, in terms of a sense of urgency today,  
9 North Korea certainly poses the greatest threat today. In  
10 terms of overall military capability, I believe China --  
11 Russia poses the greatest threat, because of the nuclear,  
12 cyber, electronic warfare, and the activity that we've seen  
13 from the Crimea to the Ukraine. If I look out to 2025, and  
14 I look at the demographics and the economic situation, I  
15 think China probably poses the greatest threat to our Nation  
16 by about 2025, and that's consistent with much of our  
17 analysis.

18           So, that's -- you know, in other words, I'd -- I can't  
19 look at it just in terms of overall capability, but I've got  
20 to factor in time and conditions. And, when I do that, I  
21 look at all three of those threats in that way.

22           Senator Hirono: I would agree with you, in terms of  
23 your assessment, and particularly with regard to North Korea  
24 being an immediate threat.

25           I'm always asked-- of course, Hawaii being in the

1 middle of the Pacific, we feel quite vulnerable. So, it is  
2 on the forefront of -- certainly of my minds of  
3 constituents, and particularly, of course, not just Hawaii,  
4 but Guam and Alaska. And I understand that the results of  
5 the Ballistic Missile Defense Review are expected later this  
6 year. Is that correct?

7 General Dunford: Senator, they are. But, we didn't  
8 wait for the review to request increased ballistic missile  
9 defense capability. We've done that in the last couple of  
10 weeks, and also noted that, in the NDAA, the committee also  
11 addressed that.

12 Senator Hirono: Well, I know that a large new radar  
13 system is being planned for Hawaii. And I just had a  
14 meeting with Admiral Harris. And this will take a few  
15 years. And he indicated that it would be good to move up  
16 the radar for Hawaii a year or 2. And I'd really like to  
17 put that into your way of thinking so that we can get on  
18 with that radar system. I certainly want to ensure that  
19 Hawaii, Alaska, and the rest of the United States are  
20 protected. Do you -- as we sit here today, are we  
21 adequately protected -- Alaska, Hawaii, rest of the United  
22 States?

23 General Dunford: Senator, we are adequately protected  
24 against the current threat. And I think one of the issues  
25 that we all ought to appreciate is that, as the capacity of

1 the threat increases -- that is the size, not just the  
2 lethality, not just the fact that North Korea can reach us,  
3 but the numbers of missiles that they may possess that can  
4 reach us -- and what we need to be concerned about is  
5 ensuring that our ballistic missile defense capability keeps  
6 pace with that threat.

7 Senator Hirono: I think it's a -- it's very important  
8 to have that ongoing assessment. And, in particular, if you  
9 project til maybe 3 years down the road, as far as North  
10 Korea's capabilities, I believe that there is an assessment  
11 occurring as to whether or not Hawaii needs a system in  
12 place, besides the radar. So, that is my understanding.

13 General Dunford: Absolutely, Senator. And we are  
14 constantly assessing -- and again, as recently as the last  
15 several weeks, where we made some recommendations based on  
16 that assessment -- our ability to protect all Americans --  
17 Guam, Hawaii, continental United States, Alaska.

18 Senator Hirono: I know you were asked about the JCPOA.  
19 And you state that briefings you have received indicate that  
20 Iran is meeting -- adhering to its obligations under the  
21 JCPOA. My question is, As long as Iran is in compliance, is  
22 it in America's national security interest to maintain the  
23 JCPOA?

24 General Dunford: Senator, the intel community  
25 assessment is, in fact, that they are in compliance right

1 now, and therefore, I think we should focus on addressing  
2 the other challenges -- the missile threat they pose, the  
3 maritime threat they pose, the support of proxies,  
4 terrorists, and the cyberthreat they pose.

5 Senator Hirono: Yes. And those were not areas that  
6 were covered under the JCPOA.

7 General Dunford: They were not, Senator.

8 Senator Hirono: Yes. So, is it your intent to advise  
9 the President to recertify Iran's compliance ahead of the  
10 October 15th deadline --

11 General Dunford: Senator, mindful of the Chairman's  
12 opening comments, what I would ask is if I could provide the  
13 advice that I'm providing to the President now, prior to his  
14 decision, to be in private, certainly share that, but not to  
15 do that publicly until after the President has made a  
16 decision.

17 Senator Hirono: Thank you.

18 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 Chairman McCain: Senator Rounds.

20 Senator Rounds: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 General, first of all, thank you for your service to  
22 our country.

23 General, the Budget Control Act is a symptom of a much  
24 larger problem Congress has been avoiding for far too long,  
25 a looming national security issue that I hope you could

1 comment on. The Congressional Budget Office reports that,  
2 by 2025, mandatory spending will be 51 percent higher than  
3 it is today, and interest we pay on the national debt will  
4 nearly double as a percentage of GDP. CBO projects that the  
5 impact on discretionary spending will result in about a 13-  
6 percent reduction to defense spending as a percentage of  
7 GDP.

8 My question is, As the Future Years Defense Program  
9 begins to overlap the mid-2020s, has the Department of  
10 Defense started to look at how this fiscal picture might  
11 change what we can afford and where we invest? And has the  
12 potential fiscal future been accounted for in any of our  
13 future operating concepts or global power projection  
14 strategies?

15 General Dunford: Senator, our planning to date, first  
16 and foremost, has highlighted the fact that our capabilities  
17 are going to require somewhere between 3 and 7 percent. And  
18 I -- we can debate that, and I'm perfectly willing to come  
19 over here with the analytic foundation for my assessment  
20 that between 3 and 7 percent -- and that's depending on how  
21 much risk you want to assume as you build the force -- but,  
22 between 3 and 7 percent is going to be required for us to  
23 build the capabilities we need. Where did we come up with  
24 that percentage? We looked at the capabilities of Russia  
25 and China today. We looked at the trajectory that they are

1 on for capability development. We looked at where we are  
2 and what investments we need to have to maintain a  
3 competitive advantage over those peer competitors -- we used  
4 them as a benchmark, if you will -- in the mid-2020s.

5 What I would say, I suppose, in response to your  
6 question, is that we will have to fundamentally reorder the  
7 strategy if we are unable to build the capabilities and  
8 capacities to deal with those peer competitors. Right now,  
9 what we have done is, we've taken the national security  
10 strategy, we've taken the initial guidance from Secretary  
11 Mattis -- he'll come out later with a defense strategy after  
12 the first of the year -- and we've looked at the military  
13 capabilities and capacities necessary to support those  
14 strategies. There will be a fundamental disconnect if we  
15 don't move on a path that I've just described.

16 Senator Rounds: And yet, at the same time, as Senator  
17 Hirono has just asked, the concern right now with regard to  
18 the topic of the day, which is North Korea and the threats  
19 that they may pose, and the additional responsibilities  
20 imposed upon our military to respond to this particular  
21 country's current activities and the threats that they  
22 suggest with regard to, you know, the use of ICBMs against  
23 any part of our country or our allies. And so, in this  
24 particular case, as you've indicated, you believe, or at  
25 least you think, that right now we have the capabilities.

1 But, does that include the ability right now to protect  
2 Hawaii against an ICBM attack by North Korea? And was that  
3 planned in? And what happens when that occurs? Do you --  
4 do we do that, and do we place our resources on that? And  
5 does that change the overall planning for the next 7 to 10  
6 years?

7 General Dunford: Senator, based on the current  
8 capacity of the North Koreans, the current threat -- so,  
9 both the type of the threat and the amount of missiles that  
10 they possess -- we can protect Hawaii today against an ICBM.  
11 We can protect the continental United States against an  
12 ICBM.

13 Senator Rounds: But, it seems as though the American  
14 public simply assumed that that is just automatic, and then  
15 we've got the resources to not only respond to that and to  
16 still be able to build for the future threats, or at least  
17 to maintain our ability to defend against those future  
18 threats from our other peer competitors. And I guess that's  
19 my point, is -- is, when we look at all of the different  
20 threats that are out there, the assumption that we simply  
21 have the resources right now, and that we're not just  
22 keeping pace, but we are improving -- is that a fair  
23 assumption on the part of the American public?

24 General Dunford: Senator, there's a few things that I  
25 wouldn't assume in the future, were we not to make

1 investments. I wouldn't assume access to space, and all  
2 that that means for our economy and for our military  
3 capability. I wouldn't assume our ability to protect our  
4 networks, both for commercial activity and military  
5 activity. I wouldn't assume our ability to deal with the  
6 growing electronic warfare threat of our adversaries. And I  
7 wouldn't assume the capability to deal with the growing  
8 ballistic missile and cruise missile threat of our  
9 adversaries, unless we maintain pace with capability  
10 development. Those would be bad assumptions.

11 Senator Rounds: And that requires more than what we  
12 would otherwise find under the 2011 Budget Control Act.

13 General Dunford: There's no question. In fact, just  
14 to, maybe, put it in perspective, Senator, the bipartisan  
15 NDAA that you just passed is \$89 billion more than what the  
16 BCA level would be, and probably some number less than what  
17 some members of the committee thought it ought to be.

18 Senator Rounds: Thank you, General.

19 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 Chairman McCain: Senator Kaine.

21 Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

22 And, General, welcome, and congratulations on the  
23 renomination. And you have done a superb job, and, you  
24 know, my vote is going to be that you continue to do a  
25 superb job. Thank you for the service.

1           You have testified often to us about the readiness  
2 challenges, and we had a pretty sobering hearing last week  
3 digging into the potential sources of these Navy collisions,  
4 and readiness issues, and the extent of training of  
5 something that was on the table. We've had a recent report  
6 from the GAO about -- increased operations and extended  
7 maintenance challenges have posed real problems on the Navy  
8 side. I was with the commander of the Langley Air Force  
9 Base this weekend, and he described to me reduction in  
10 training hours as being a real challenge. So, everything  
11 you have testified to us about diminished readiness  
12 resulting from the budget sequester is coming true. It  
13 wasn't, you know, Chicken Little saying, "The sky is  
14 falling." What we've heard from military leaders since the  
15 sequester went into effect and the budget caps of March of  
16 2013, we're seeing it. And I just think that it puts an  
17 additional burden on our shoulders to try to deal with that.

18           I want to ask you about something that I'm really  
19 worried about now, which is the humanitarian crisis in  
20 Puerto Rico. So often, when there's a humanitarian crisis  
21 anywhere in the world -- a tsunami in Southeast Asia, an  
22 Ebola crisis in Africa -- the U.S. military is there, a  
23 projection of America's humanitarian spirit. And I am just  
24 stunned that this humanitarian challenge in Puerto Rico --  
25 Puerto Rico American citizens with an amazing track record

1 of serving in the military over generations -- centuries,  
2 really. Could you talk a little bit about current DOD  
3 operations to try to prevent this humanitarian crisis from  
4 really spiraling downward in a way that would be devastating  
5 to these American citizens?

6 General Dunford: Senator, thank you. In fact, one of  
7 the last things I did this morning before coming over here  
8 was go through the Northern Command update. We get those  
9 every few hours. And so, I had the most recent update, as  
10 of about 8:30, before I came over here to the Hill. For us,  
11 it's both professional and personal. These are Americans  
12 that need support. I've got people who have their families  
13 in Puerto Rico on my staff. One of the heads of my personal  
14 security detail, until last night, hadn't heard from his  
15 family yet. So, this is something that's been on our minds  
16 and in our thoughts and prayers with the people in Puerto  
17 Rico.

18 The key thing that I think we are delivering right now  
19 -- one of the challenges, Senator, in getting aid has been,  
20 the ports and airfields weren't accessible. And so, step  
21 one is, we're doing all we can do right now to increase the  
22 throughput of humanitarian supplies. That's something U.S.  
23 military can uniquely provide. We also are providing some  
24 generators, and so forth, for power. We don't expect them  
25 to have power for some time, so that's something that is

1 important that we can provide.

2 Senator Kaine: And this impacts hospitals --

3 General Dunford: That's --

4 Senator Kaine: -- and long-term- --

5 General Dunford: -- that's right. And so, we have  
6 generators --

7 Senator Kaine: -- -care facilities that --

8 General Dunford: -- and so forth --

9 Senator Kaine: -- cannot afford to be without  
10 continuous power.

11 General Dunford: Absolutely, Senator. And that's why  
12 power generation and generators is one of the key areas  
13 we're focused on right now. Fresh water and food, clearly  
14 right away, and then medical capabilities. So, those are  
15 the key areas that Northern Command, under General  
16 Robinson's leadership, are focused on right now. There's  
17 literally hourly meetings between FEMA and the government  
18 officials in Puerto Rico to make sure that we are doing all  
19 we can. The guidance from Secretary Mattis has been clear,  
20 "What they need, they get, just make it happen." And so,  
21 what we're doing right now is just making sure that  
22 everyplace that we can uniquely contribute to the disaster  
23 in Puerto Rico, we're poised to do that. And we're  
24 anticipating what they might need next week, even if they  
25 haven't thought about it yet.

1           Senator Kaine:  And, just for purposes of committee  
2 members and the public -- I think I know the answer to this,  
3 but I'm not sure I do -- how is the Puerto -- the response  
4 to Puerto Rico sort of organized?  The DOD has a piece of  
5 it, but you are not necessarily the lead.

6           General Dunford:  Right.

7           Senator Kaine:  Is that sort of organized through DHS  
8 and FEMA, and then, you know, with the DOD taking on an  
9 assigned role?  Is that sort of how it's being led?

10          General Dunford:  That's exactly right, Senator.  This  
11 is anyplace in the United States.  And so, we are in support  
12 of FEMA.  And General Robinson is a supporting agency to  
13 FEMA.  And so, we're doing every -- all of the support for  
14 Puerto Rico is being coordinated, as you suggest, through  
15 Department of Homeland Security, and FEMA specifically, and  
16 -- but, again, we're doing two things.  We're responding to  
17 the immediate requests, but then we have a little experience  
18 in these kind of operations, and so I know what General  
19 Robinson and her team are doing also is offering things that  
20 maybe people haven't asked for today, and also looking  
21 around the corner to see what they might need next week.

22          Senator Kaine:  Very important for us to be on this,  
23 because the scale of it is just devastating.  And I  
24 appreciate your testimony.

25          Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 Chairman McCain: Senator Ernst.

2 Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3 And thank you, General Dunford, Ellyn, to you both, and  
4 your family. Thank you so much for your support of our men  
5 and women in uniform. I know it's a joint effort. So,  
6 thank you very much.

7 We do agree, General, that properly resourcing a joint  
8 force really is a collaborative effort between Congress and  
9 our military, and those military leaders. That is why many  
10 on this committee have pushed to repeal BCA. Senator Rounds  
11 brought up the financial implications, moving forward, and  
12 what sequestration might do in regards to many other issues  
13 that we're facing with our mandatory spending. But, looking  
14 at that, we also need to use what we have efficiently and  
15 effectively. I'm pushing for an audit within the DOD. I  
16 think many of us support that. We need to know that our  
17 taxpayer dollars are being spent well.

18 For your part, can you describe the steps that you have  
19 taken during your tenure as the Chairman to work with that  
20 joint force and make it more efficient? Are there specific  
21 examples you can give the committee today?

22 General Dunford: There are, Senator. The first one is  
23 that we're implementing the direction that we have from the  
24 Congress to reduce our overall headquarters by 30 percent.  
25 That, in itself, is not an insignificant step that we have

1 taken. Also, with regard -- we alluded to it with global  
2 force management -- what we have done is done a number of  
3 things to integrate, at the strategic level, the  
4 prioritization and the allocation of resources to ensure  
5 that we are deploying them most effectively and in the  
6 context of our strategic objectives. And then there's a  
7 number of things that, of course, wouldn't be something that  
8 I would do in the joint force, but certainly am familiar  
9 with in dealing with the chiefs. Business practices across  
10 the Department are also an area where efficiencies are  
11 sought. The leader for that is the Deputy Secretary of  
12 Defense. And, on the Joint Staff, the Vice Chairman sits  
13 with him on what's called the Defense Management Advisory  
14 Group. And that involves all the vice chiefs. And there's  
15 a wide range of business practices that we're looking to be  
16 more efficient. Fortunately, we do have some expertise now  
17 from outside the Department that has come in and looked at  
18 us through a different lens. And so, those are areas where  
19 I think there are most promise.

20 What -- the other thing I'd say, Senator, is that,  
21 since 2010, we have gone through a litany of efficiency  
22 drills. And, while we have gained some efficiencies, they  
23 never quite realize the savings that you expect them to, so  
24 you've got to stay after it. But, this isn't something that  
25 we started just in the past year. We really have, I think,

1 in a concerted way, been after it since 2010.

2 Senator Ernst: Very good, General. And I am certain  
3 that you will continue that push, going on, as we hope to  
4 see you continuing in this position. So, I thank you for  
5 that.

6 And then, in your answers to advance policy questions,  
7 you also stressed your concern regarding our near-peer  
8 overmatch. And I share that concern, as well.  
9 Unfortunately, the Department will send mixed messages to  
10 Congress. On one hand, our services ask for rapid  
11 acquisition of commercial off-the-shelf systems in -- as a  
12 solution; and, on the other, then they prefer appropriating  
13 dollars forward for the next best and greatest thing. But,  
14 unfortunately, a lot of times the next best, greatest thing  
15 never really materializes. So, how are we going to  
16 prioritize acquisitions moving in the future?

17 General Dunford: Senator, that, as you know, is a  
18 complicated issue, and I think getting the balance right  
19 between moving out right now and buying what's available,  
20 and then in looking long term for the most effective  
21 capability, has been something we struggle with. On the one  
22 hand, you might quickly say, "Hey, we ought to just be able  
23 to just go out and buy what's available, and field it."  
24 Well, I can remember, some years ago, when we ended up with  
25 16 links that could communicate from air to ground, and --

1 but they couldn't necessarily communicate with each other.  
2 I can also remember when we all went out and bought our own  
3 software, only to find out that we couldn't effectively  
4 communicate with each other.

5         So, there is a balance in all of this. And I think the  
6 key thing is -- and the committee inserted some of the  
7 language in the NDAA -- and that is to make sure that the  
8 Joint Requirements Oversight Council, which is led by the  
9 Vice Chairman and reports to me and the chiefs, is  
10 effectively, one, overseeing the requirements that are  
11 existing for capabilities, and also then the process for  
12 making sure that we meet those requirements in a timely  
13 manner, and that those requirements are actually validated.

14 And I think that's probably a key piece of it, too, is the  
15 requirements.

16         I think if you get the requirements right, and senior  
17 leadership is engaged in the requirements -- and I say this  
18 both from the perspective of my current job as well as a  
19 former service chief -- service-leader engagement with the  
20 requirements, validating those requirements before we look  
21 at material and nonmaterial solutions to those requirements,  
22 in my judgment, is the key to success, and that is something  
23 that I think has happened to a greater degree over the last  
24 couple of years, with the pressure, in part, that has been  
25 put on by this committee.

1 Senator Ernst: Absolutely.

2 Thank you very much, General.

3 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 Chairman McCain: Senator King.

5 Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 Beginning with -- I know, General Dunford, you're a  
7 reader. And, going back to the Chairman's statements, at  
8 the beginning of this hearing, about the relationship  
9 between the military and civilian officials, I commend to  
10 you, although I suspect you have already read, "A  
11 Dereliction of Duty," by your colleague, General McMaster, a  
12 stunning analysis of what not to do, in terms of the  
13 relationship between civilian and military officials. You  
14 nodded. I assume that means you know the book.

15 General Dunford: Senator, I have read it.

16 Senator King: And I think an additional one I would  
17 add to your list -- it's a little bit longer -- Barbara  
18 Tuchman's "March of Folly," which takes us from Troy to  
19 Vietnam, again talking about relationships and how these  
20 mistakes are made.

21 Which brings me to Korea. I have a queasy feeling that  
22 we're in 1914, stumbling toward Sarajevo. And what worries  
23 me is not an instantaneous nuclear confrontation, but an  
24 accidental escalation, based upon the rhetoric that's going  
25 back and forth. The Foreign Minister of North Korea

1 yesterday characterized our President's comments as a  
2 declaration of war, and he said, "Therefore, as a -- since  
3 the United States has declared war on our country, we will  
4 have every right to make countermeasures, including the  
5 right to shoot down United States strategic bombers, even  
6 when they are not in the airspace border of our country."  
7 That's what worries me, is a misinterpretation,  
8 misunderstanding, and an event -- a shooting down of a  
9 bomber, a strike on a ship -- that leads to a  
10 countermeasure, that leads to a countermeasure, and the end  
11 result is, if Kim Jong Un feels his regime is under attack,  
12 then the unthinkable happens. Make me even -- either feel  
13 better or worse about where we are.

14 General Dunford: Senator, I will make you feel better.  
15 I can tell you that I, personally, the Secretary of Defense,  
16 and Admiral Harris are looking at all of our posture, and  
17 managing risk on a day-to-day basis, informed by the need to  
18 avoid the risk of miscalculation. The recent operations  
19 that we conducted, I can assure you that even -- I was on  
20 the road -- we probably -- Secretary Mattis and I probably  
21 personally invested several hours each in reviewing those,  
22 to manage those and, without going into classified  
23 information here, to look at all of our capabilities, look  
24 at all their capabilities, look at timing, look at the  
25 probability --

1           Senator King: What worries me about it is  
2           misunderstanding and misinterpretation. What we view as an  
3           exercise, they may view as an imminent threat.

4           General Dunford: Senator, what I -- I guess what I'm  
5           suggesting to you is that where we conduct these exercises,  
6           we're informed by the North Korean posture at a given point  
7           in time, we're informed by the need to avoid miscalculation  
8           in an inadvertent engagement.

9           Senator King: Do we have communication with North  
10          Korea with regard to these kinds of situations?

11          General Dunford: We --

12          Senator King: "This is just an exercise," for example.

13          General Dunford: Right. We do not have military-to-  
14          military communications with North Korea right now.

15          Senator King: Turning the North Korea question  
16          slightly, you testified earlier -- and all the intelligence  
17          community agrees -- that Kim Jong Un's primary motivation is  
18          regime survival. Therefore, it seems to me that statements  
19          that suggest regime change or regime destruction only  
20          solidify his determination to develop and maintain nuclear  
21          weapons. Would you agree?

22          General Dunford: Senator, I have been very careful, at  
23          the military level, to make no statements that would  
24          exacerbate the current crisis. And I certainly won't  
25          comment on things that our senior political leadership have

1 said, but I certainly can tell you, inside the military,  
2 we've made no statements, and we've had a conscious decision  
3 not to make any such statements, to ensure that the lead  
4 right now is Secretary Tillerson and the message that's  
5 being delivered is primarily being delivered by the State  
6 Department.

7 Senator King: But, you do agree that the primary  
8 motivation for the development of the nuclear weapons is a  
9 kind of insurance policy for regime survival. Is that not  
10 the case?

11 General Dunford: That would be my assessment, Senator.

12 Senator King: Fine. Thank you.

13 What would be the practicality of a preemptive nuclear  
14 strike or a preemptive military strike on North Korea, in  
15 terms of the military effect? Would it -- there is some  
16 feeling, I hear -- somebody talked about a preemptive strike  
17 the other day, not in the administration, but on this -- in  
18 this body. That would not be a short, easy action, would it  
19 not?

20 General Dunford: Senator, you bring up a good point.  
21 And part of the advice that I've provided to date is, when  
22 we do something, we shouldn't assume, at that point, that we  
23 can control escalation. So, we need to think about this in  
24 terms of what might happen as well as what we would want to  
25 happen.

1           Senator King: And part of the problem is, those  
2           artillery that are ranged across the North Korean border  
3           within Seoul, which is about as far as from here to Fairfax  
4           County --

5           General Dunford: That's right. The greater Seoul  
6           area, which has 25 million people, 250,000 Americans on any  
7           given day that would be in Seoul, would certainly be  
8           threatened by the rockets and the missiles along the border.

9           Senator King: So, a military -- the idea of a so-  
10          called "surgical strike," to bring back a term from 40 years  
11          ago, is really not valid in this situation. It would not be  
12          -- this is not something that would be easy to take out, for  
13          example, the nuclear capability of the North Koreans.

14          General Dunford: No -- that's right, Senator. I mean,  
15          while we could do things that, from our perspective, could  
16          be less than a full execution of an operations plan, we need  
17          to be informed by the potential risk to the greater Seoul  
18          area, no matter what we do on the Peninsula. I think that's  
19          fair.

20          Senator King: Thank you, General.

21          Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22          Chairman McCain: Colonel Wicker.

23          Senator Wicker: Chairman Dunford, do you support  
24          providing lethal defensive aid to Ukraine?

25          General Dunford: I do, Senator, and have made that

1 recommendation.

2 Senator Wicker: As I understand it, DOD has officially  
3 made an affirmative recommendation, and State Department,  
4 also. So, where is that decision? And can you enlighten  
5 the committee?

6 General Dunford: Senator, my understanding is, that  
7 decision is at the White House.

8 Senator Wicker: And do you have any idea when we might  
9 be able to get an answer on that?

10 General Dunford: I don't, Senator. I will ask, when  
11 we get back today. We've been asking, for the last couple  
12 of weeks. But, I'm not sure.

13 Senator Wicker: Well, I think it's very important that  
14 the Ukrainian government succeed in resisting further  
15 Russian expansion. What -- why did you recommend yes on  
16 providing lethal aid?

17 General Dunford: In my judgment, from a military  
18 perspective, the Ukraine needed additional capabilities to  
19 protect their sovereignty. As you probably know, Senator,  
20 in 2016, we trained a number of their battalions; 2017,  
21 trained additional battalions. We provided medical  
22 supplies, night-vision goggles, countermortar radars, and  
23 other things. But, we felt like their ability to stop  
24 armored vehicles and so forth would be essential to them to  
25 protect themselves. And so, we just looked at it as a

1 military gap that existed that, if that gap was filled, it  
2 would increase the probability the Ukrainians could defend  
3 themselves.

4 Senator Wicker: And I agree. I would just encourage  
5 members of the administration to move forward on that.

6 With regard to Russia's asymmetric threats, such as  
7 information operations, cyberattacks, and jamming, I want to  
8 ask you specifically about the 173rd Airborne Brigade, which  
9 is said, in a report, to be underequipped, undermanned, and  
10 inadequately organized. According to an Army review, 3  
11 years after Crimea, why is this the case? Is it the case?  
12 And what can we do about it?

13 General Dunford: Senator, I read the media article and  
14 asked a couple of questions after I saw it. And I think  
15 what the leader was doing was describing, you know, the  
16 current character of war, and indicating that he believed  
17 that we ought to make some organizational changes and some  
18 equipment changes to make the 173rd, based in Vicenza,  
19 Italy, more competitive. I think you could make that  
20 statement more broadly. So, this was a leader looking at  
21 his particular unit. I think you can look at that statement  
22 more broadly and say that we need to adapt the U.S.  
23 military, really the entire U.S. Government, to be able to  
24 compete at that level, below war, where the Russians have so  
25 successfully integrated information operations, cyber,

1 political influence, economic coercion, and information  
2 operations. So, really, I think what the 173rd was  
3 describing is a force that is designed for conventional war,  
4 and in needing to make some organizational changes and add  
5 different capabilities to be competitive in the space that  
6 we're describing now.

7 Senator Wicker: So, writ large, actually this fairly  
8 accurate statement about the 173rd actually could be said  
9 about the entire Department of Defense. Is that what you're  
10 telling this committee?

11 General Dunford: Senator, I think I would broaden it.  
12 What I would say is, today, Russians, Chinese, and others  
13 are, on a day-to-day basis, doing what I describe as -- they  
14 are conducting adversarial competition at a level that falls  
15 below conflict, and they have integrated the entire  
16 government to be able to do that. And, in my judgment, we  
17 need to improve our ability to compete in that space. And  
18 in the areas specifically I would mention, from a military  
19 capability, would be our electronic warfare capability, our  
20 cyber capabilities, and our information operations  
21 capability. But, all those -- those all have to be  
22 integrated with those things that we don't have inside the  
23 Department of Defense -- of course, the economic and  
24 political tools. But, in my judgment, bringing all those  
25 together on a day-to-day basis more effectively is something

1 that we do need to do.

2 Senator Wicker: And finally, General, with regard to  
3 the 355-ship requirement, this is a requirement that's been  
4 developed by the generals and admirals, in consultation with  
5 our leadership around the world. This committee, in the  
6 form of the NDAA, has put the ships at -- in the Senate-  
7 passed version, it makes the 355-ship requirement the policy  
8 of the United States Congress. The House of Representatives  
9 has also done that, and I expect this'll be coming out of  
10 conference very soon.

11 This requirement is, in fact, a serious requirement, is  
12 it not? And can you assure us that, from the level of the  
13 administration, we're serious about getting to that number  
14 and getting -- and fulfilling that requirement, rather than  
15 the 276 ships we have, and doing it as quick as practical?

16 General Dunford: Senator, I don't think there's any  
17 question that all of us know that the Navy is smaller right  
18 now than it needs to be to meet all of those requirements.  
19 And that requirement that you've identified is one that's  
20 based on analytic rigor, and it should be a target that we  
21 shoot for. It would be good to get there as soon as we can.  
22 And, of course, many of the conversations we're having about  
23 the budget will inform our ability to do that. But, we  
24 certainly appreciate your leadership in that regard.

25 Senator Wicker: Thank you.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 Chairman McCain: Senator Heinrich.

3 Senator Heinrich: Thank you, Chairman McCain.

4 Welcome, General Dunford.

5 I want to follow up on Senator King's line of  
6 questioning with regard to North Korea. As you're aware,  
7 all six of North Korea's previous nuclear tests have  
8 occurred underground. That obviously contains the  
9 radioactive fallout. But, Kim Jong Un has since threatened  
10 to conduct a test in the Earth's atmosphere. Can you talk a  
11 little bit about what the global risks and implications of a  
12 nuclear weapon detonated in the atmosphere would be, as Kim  
13 Jong Un is reportedly considering? And if you were speaking  
14 to the North Korean people right now, what would you say to  
15 them regarding the risks of detonating a nuclear weapon in  
16 the Earth's atmosphere?

17 General Dunford: Senator, I think the best experience  
18 we have recently, of course, would be the nuclear reactor in  
19 Russia, some years ago, and the incident that took place in  
20 Japan. And even with something that isn't anywhere near  
21 what the North Koreans are suggesting, we had significant  
22 health challenges for many, many years, and, obviously, the  
23 loss of life. It would be an incredibly provocative thing  
24 for them to conduct a nuclear test in the Pacific, as they  
25 have suggested. And, you know, I think the North Korean

1 people would have to realize how serious that would be, not  
2 only for the United States, but for the international  
3 community.

4 Senator Heinrich: I want to just take a quick moment  
5 to thank both you and Secretary Mattis for the sober and  
6 serious manner that you're approaching North Korea. I think  
7 that is the sort of temperament we need now more than ever.

8 I want to shift gears real quickly. Our Commander of  
9 Special Operations, General Thomas, has said that the use of  
10 weaponized commercially-available drones by our adversaries  
11 was SOCOM's, quote, "most daunting problem," end quote, in  
12 2016. How serious is the threat? And can you explain why  
13 it's so difficult to deal with this threat with conventional  
14 weapons and kinetic means?

15 General Dunford: First, Senator, I agree with General  
16 Thomas's assessment, and that's the consistent feedback we  
17 had -- we have from our operational commanders. And, in  
18 fact, about 3 months ago, 4 months ago, we sent a team over,  
19 led by my J8, Lieutenant General Tony Ierardi, to sit down  
20 with the commanders to make sure we had a full appreciation  
21 of what they were dealing with so we can come back here and  
22 immediately send to them every single capability we possibly  
23 could. And we've made some progress in that regard, in  
24 their ability to deal with this particular threat. But,  
25 it's also going to require continued experimentation and

1 adaptation to make sure that we stay out in front of the  
2 technology that the enemy has delivered.

3 So, this -- we have seen them deliver chemical weapons.  
4 We've seen them deliver bombs. We've seen them be able to  
5 provide increased intelligence, surveillance, and  
6 reconnaissance against our partners on the ground, largely.  
7 And so, it does create a significant challenge, and we have  
8 done all we can do today to deal with that challenge, as  
9 well as develop the capabilities we'll need tomorrow.

10 But, I can assure you, personally, that that has been  
11 exactly where General Thomas has suggested it should be, at  
12 the top of our list for current emerging threats in the  
13 current fight.

14 Senator Heinrich: Well, I have to say, I've been  
15 pleased to see the Pentagon respond so quickly with  
16 investments in laser technologies and other systems to  
17 address urgent needs like this one. Will you continue to  
18 support the Pentagon's use of rapid acquisition authorities  
19 provided by this committee to field new technologies, like  
20 laser and high-power microwaves, to help counter those  
21 drones and swarms?

22 General Dunford: I will, Senator. I think that having  
23 that capability has been one of the bright spots in what has  
24 been a largely criticized acquisition process.

25 Senator Heinrich: Yeah. I would agree. And I think

1 that directed energy on both of those fronts is a potential  
2 game-changer for what's a rapidly developing situation, with  
3 drones, in particular.

4 I want to return, real quickly, to an issue that  
5 Senator Kaine brought up earlier with regard to Puerto Rico.

6 And you mentioned throughput. And one of the things that I  
7 understand is a bottleneck with throughput right now in that  
8 emergency response, is the number of radars that are down,  
9 and the fact that planes are landing -- C-130s, et cetera --  
10 on VFR, if there's not radar, at various airfields. Does  
11 DOD have a role in restoring the radar at those airfields?  
12 Is that DHS? And what can you tell us about the --  
13 hopefully, the easing of that bottleneck, which really  
14 limits how much we can get in there on a reasonable time  
15 period?

16 General Dunford: Senator, we do have the capability  
17 and are, right now -- again, that's our priority, is focused  
18 on making sure the airfields can operate. A piece of their  
19 ability to operate will be those expeditionary radars that  
20 we have, and we could provide, as required, on a short-term  
21 basis. The responsibility is primarily DHS, but, at this  
22 point, we're not trapped in, you know, bureaucratic  
23 niceties. What we're trying to do is make sure that we get  
24 the people of Puerto Rico the support they need, when they  
25 need it. And the key thing that needs to be done right now,

1 as you're suggesting, is -- all the other support they need  
2 can't come in until we get the ports and airfields open.

3 Senator Heinrich: Exactly right.

4 General Dunford: And so, that's why Northern Command  
5 has placed that at the top of the list of support we're  
6 providing.

7 Senator Heinrich: Thanks. Thank you very much,  
8 General Dunford.

9 Senator Reed [presiding]: On behalf of Chairman  
10 McCain, Senator Perdue, please.

11 Senator Perdue: General Dunford, thank you for being  
12 here today. Thank you for your -- you and your family, for  
13 your service.

14 I want to remind the committee that the first ship was,  
15 I believe, the USS Mercy in Port au Prince after the  
16 earthquake. And I want to thank the military, on the record  
17 here, for always being the first in crisis like this in  
18 Puerto Rico.

19 I want to highlight again a quote that was already  
20 referred to by the Chairman this morning, because, I think  
21 in February you called out this crisis. We have a global  
22 security crisis, but we have a debt crisis. And the two,  
23 right now, are -- and you're the first one, I believe, to  
24 call this out -- your quote was, "Without sustained,  
25 sufficient, and predictable funding, I assess that, within 5

1 years, we will lose our ability to project power, the basis  
2 of how we defend the homeland, advance U.S. interests, and  
3 meet our alliance commitments." Wow. Sir, you -- that's a  
4 few months forward. Do you still stand by that assessment?

5 General Dunford: Senator, I do. And, you know, if I  
6 could just make a quick comment, I know, many times, the  
7 perception is that military leaders will never be satisfied  
8 with "good enough," and they'll always want more. And so,  
9 somehow maybe people aren't looking at those comments with  
10 the seriousness that I intended them to be. I would not  
11 have made those comments without having gone on a long  
12 journey of analytic rigor to really, truly be able to  
13 quantify exactly what I'm talking about. I think we shared  
14 with you, Senator -- because of your interest, we've shared  
15 with you some of the results of our work. But, those words  
16 are backed by a fairly exhaustive analytic effort that shows  
17 specific capability areas where we are in the process of  
18 losing our competitive advantage. And, in the aggregate,  
19 when you go out 4 or 5 years, the loss of our competitive  
20 advantage in those specific areas means we will not be able  
21 to project power when and where necessary to advance our  
22 interests. That does two things. It ought -- not only  
23 affects our response to crisis, but it increases the  
24 probability there will be a crisis, because it'll have an  
25 adverse effect on a deterrent capability of the U.S.

1 military.

2 I believe that one of the things that deters others  
3 today from a conventional conflict is their knowledge that  
4 we do have a competitive conventional advantage over any  
5 adversary today, and we can project power when and where  
6 necessary to advance our interests. Were we to lose that, I  
7 believe that there would be an increased possibility of  
8 conflict, particularly against our peer competitors.

9 Senator Perdue: Well, that's the question I have today  
10 for you, sir, is -- you know, if you look at the latest  
11 estimate, back in 2011, then-Chairman Gates, Secretary of --  
12 or Secretary of Defense then -- made the estimate, based on  
13 a bottoms-up estimate from the military, on needs, and that  
14 estimate was, in today's dollars, for 2016, about \$753  
15 billion. Last year, we actually appropriated 623 only.  
16 That's all of category 050, I believe. This year, it's  
17 going to be a little bit greater than that, 677 or  
18 thereabouts, but we're still significantly less than just  
19 what Secretary Gates wanted, back then, for 2016. That was  
20 before ISIS, Crimea, Ukraine, Syria, Iran, North Korea, and  
21 on and on and on, with Russian and China's growing  
22 capabilities.

23 Sir, my question -- and, oh, by the way, you mentioned  
24 3 to 7 percent. I don't disagree with that. I don't know  
25 what the need is, but I know that we are at a low point

1 right now, historically. I can look at the history. We've  
2 averaged, over the last 30 years, after Vietnam, 4 percent.  
3 We're now at 3 percent. That 100 basis points is \$200  
4 billion. So, anyway you look at it today, my estimate is  
5 somewhere between 150 and 200 that we are short today, even  
6 with being \$89 billion above the BCA.

7 Sir, my question is, How do you determine the  
8 priorities, going forward, with that kind of shortfall?  
9 Because we -- every dime that we're spending on the military  
10 today, and on our veterans, and on all domestic  
11 discretionary spending -- let me say this again -- every  
12 dime that we spend on our military and our veterans today,  
13 by definition, is borrowed money. In the last 8 years --  
14 and it's projected the next 10 years will be similar --  
15 we've borrowed 35 percent of what we spend as a Federal  
16 Government. Twenty-five percent of that spending is  
17 discretionary, and military is part of that.

18 Sir, given all of that -- you and Secretary Mattis have  
19 talked about the first step in the strategy is filling the  
20 hole -- are we onboard doing that now, with the  
21 appropriation this year? And what does the next 2 or 3  
22 years look like, in terms of trying to catch up with a  
23 number of years, not just the last 6 or 8, but a number of  
24 years -- 20 years, even -- this investing in the military?

25 General Dunford: Thanks, Senator. The way that we

1 have characterized it in our recommendations is that we have  
2 readiness challenges. That's been described as the filling  
3 of holes. We have lethality challenges. And, by that, we  
4 mean areas like electronic warfare, cybercapability, our  
5 strike capability that needs to be improved. And then  
6 there's a capacity issue. And ideally, we'd be addressing  
7 all of those. We'd be addressing the current readiness of  
8 the force that we have. We'd be improving the capabilities  
9 we need for tomorrow. And we'd be increasing the capacity  
10 of the force to meet the overall requirements that we have.

11 So, the way we've chosen to prioritize it is to make  
12 sure that we, number one, make sure that the men and women  
13 today in those units that we're deploying have the  
14 wherewithal to accomplish the mission with minimal loss of  
15 life or equipment. That's job one. The second thing we're  
16 doing -- and you saw this in the last 2 years -- is starting  
17 to make increased investments, number one, in our nuclear  
18 enterprise, because deterring nuclear war is job-one for the  
19 Department, and then addressing some of these deficiencies  
20 in cybercapabilities, electronic warfare, ballistic missile  
21 defense, which was spoken about.

22 What we have not done is come in with a recommendation  
23 to increase the size or the capacity of the force, because,  
24 in my judgment, we should not do that unless we can do it in  
25 a balanced way. And there is no way, with the current level

1 of resourcing we have, and the projected level of  
2 resourcing, that we can grow the force in a balanced way.  
3 So, I think we're forced to fill the holes, address the  
4 readiness, and then do what we can to invest in the  
5 capabilities that we need to maintain competitiveness today  
6 and tomorrow.

7 What I don't see in the near term, our ability to  
8 really grow the force to get after the dynamic that has been  
9 discussed a bit this morning, where we have fewer ships than  
10 are necessary even to do ballistic missile defense on a day-  
11 to-day basis in the Pacific. And that's the challenge that  
12 we have. And that's kind of the three ways we think about  
13 it.

14 Senator Perdue: Yes, sir. Thank you.

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 Senator Reed: On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator  
17 Warren, please.

18 Senator Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 General Dunford, good to see you here.

20 So, I want to ask you about the nuclear deal between  
21 the United States, the five partner nations, and Iran that  
22 has placed Iran's nuclear program under verifiable limits  
23 and unprecedented inspections so that it cannot develop a  
24 nuclear weapon. The Trump administration has already  
25 certified twice to Congress that Iran is complying with this

1 agreement. If President Trump does not certify again by  
2 October 15th, he risks blowing up this agreement, and Iran  
3 may restart again building a nuclear weapon.

4 Now, when asked about the Iran nuclear deal in January,  
5 Secretary Mattis told this committee that it is, quote, "an  
6 imperfect arms-control agreement." But, he also said,  
7 quote, "When America gives her word, we have to live up to  
8 it and work with our allies."

9 General, do you agree with that?

10 General Dunford: Senator, I do. And my  
11 recommendation, the previous two times, was informed by that  
12 and the fact that the intelligence community had determined  
13 that there was not a material breach to the JCPOA. And so,  
14 what I recommended is that we focus leveraging our partners  
15 that were part of that agreement to deal with those other  
16 challenges that we know Iran poses, whether the terrorist  
17 threat, the maritime threat, and so forth.

18 Senator Warren: Well, you know, this is always the  
19 issues. Iran supports terrorism, engages in human rights  
20 abuses, works to develop ballistic missiles. But, I think  
21 it's easier to counter Iran's destabilizing behavior if it  
22 has no nuclear weapon than it would be to keep Iran in check  
23 if it had access to a nuclear bomb.

24 So, the question I have is, aside from the current  
25 nuclear deal, at this time are you are aware of any

1 alternative binding diplomatic agreement that would prevent  
2 Iran from developing a nuclear weapon?

3 General Dunford: I am not, Senator. I would  
4 highlight, though, the one thing we all have to come to  
5 grips with is, there is a sunset --

6 Senator Warren: Yes.

7 General Dunford: -- to the current JCPOA, and that  
8 that needs to be addressed in the near term.

9 Senator Warren: It certainly does. But, for right  
10 now, it appears that the Iran deal is working. There is no  
11 viable alternative, and it sounds like we need to keep  
12 enforcing this deal, to keep us all safe.

13 I want to ask you another question, and that is about  
14 North Korea. You know, most of the time, the discussion  
15 centers on the role of China. But, I want to ask about  
16 Russia's relationship, which is also critical to influencing  
17 the North Korean regime. Russia has completed a railroad  
18 linking the two countries. A ferry now operates between  
19 Russia and North Korea. Vladimir Putin wrote off 90 percent  
20 of North Korea's \$11 billion debt to Russia. State  
21 Department estimates that North Korea sends about 20,000  
22 workers to Russia annually, which produces foreign currency  
23 that Kim Jong Un desperately needs. And while we're trying  
24 to pull the international community together to try to  
25 persuade North Korea to stand down on nuclear weapons,

1 reports emerged last week that fuel shipments between Russia  
2 and North Korea are increasing.

3 So, General Dunford, I want to ask. Beyond our  
4 existing sanctions and authorities, what more should we be  
5 doing to counter Russia's support for North Korea?

6 General Dunford: Senator, I do believe that the  
7 solution to what's going on with Russia and China is  
8 diplomatic, at this point, and economic, to the degree that  
9 sanctions and second- and third-order sanctions can be  
10 implemented. I don't think there is, at this point, a  
11 military dimension to the challenge of getting better  
12 cooperation from Russia and China, but I do believe that the  
13 things that Secretary Tillerson has proposed to do, and what  
14 Secretary Mnuchin has implemented over the past couple of  
15 months, may be affecting the calculus of Russia and China,  
16 although I think we're a long way from determining whether  
17 or not the path we're on will result in peaceful  
18 denuclearization, which, of course, is what we all want to  
19 see.

20 Senator Warren: So, let me ask you -- to put this  
21 question, though, in a larger frame -- you know, Russia  
22 seems to intervene, in a lot of places, in opposition to the  
23 United States -- Syria, Afghanistan, North Korea. Can you  
24 just say a word about how you see Putin's larger strategy,  
25 here?

1           General Dunford: I think that if you -- there's very  
2 few places that I could look at in the world, Senator, where  
3 U.S. and Russian interests align. And I think, in many  
4 cases, what they're trying to do -- if you start in Europe,  
5 their primary focus is to undermine the credibility of the  
6 NATO alliance. If you look across the Middle East, they're  
7 trying to undermine the partnerships that we have, and erode  
8 the confidence in our partners of the U.S. commitment to the  
9 region. And I think, by the same token, they're trying to  
10 play a spoiler role and achieve undue influence in the issue  
11 on the Korean Peninsula that you spoke about a minute ago.  
12 So, I can't think of too many places where Russia is playing  
13 a helpful role right now, from the Maghreb to the Middle  
14 East to North Korea.

15           Senator Warren: No. I just think it's so critical, as  
16 we talk about our alliances around the world, that we  
17 recognize exactly this point, that Russia's doing everything  
18 it can to break up those alliances, to sow discord in those  
19 alliances, and the importance of our keeping them together,  
20 and the importance of holding Russia accountable for what  
21 it's doing with North Korea.

22           General Dunford: Senator, if I could just make a quick  
23 comment on that.

24           Senator Warren: Please.

25           General Dunford: I mean, we -- when we developed the

1 national military strategy that we have right now, we  
2 determined that the strength of the U.S. military was our  
3 allies and partners and the network we've built up since  
4 World War II. Not only Russia, but others, recognize that  
5 that's our source of strength. And so, there's a concerted  
6 effort to undermine those allies and partners. And so, what  
7 we should be doing at this point is doubling down our  
8 efforts to maintain strong alliances and partnerships,  
9 because that is the key to success.

10 Senator Warren: Good. Thank you very much, General.

11 Senator Reed: On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator  
12 Sullivan, please.

13 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 And, General, congratulations to you, sir, and your  
15 family, for your decades of exceptional service. I look  
16 forward to supporting your swift reconfirmation.

17 I wanted to turn to an issue that you and I have talked  
18 a lot about in the NDAA. I had a provision in there this  
19 year that talked about the -- our FONOPs policy and how we  
20 should be looking at regular, routine, and, if possible,  
21 with allies -- so, in some ways, our FONOPs, particularly in  
22 the South China Sea, are no longer newsworthy. Can you  
23 elaborate a bit on the Department's FONOPs policy and if  
24 this differs from the previous administration? For example,  
25 you know, it was reported that Admiral Harris essentially

1 had to get individual FONOPs approved by the NSC one at a  
2 time under the Obama administration. What's the strategy  
3 right now under the Trump administration? And how does that  
4 differ?

5 General Dunford: Senator, thanks. That is a good  
6 question. Secretary Mattis, when he came in, in early  
7 February, we went to him with a couple of individual Freedom  
8 of Navigation Operations that you spoke about. And he said,  
9 "Hey, look, I -- how about giving me a full strategy that  
10 lays this thing out now for a long period of time and talks  
11 about the strategic effect we're trying to achieve?" You  
12 spoke about partners, you talk about being routine and  
13 regular. And so, those are the things that Secretary Mattis  
14 directed. After that, Admiral Harris developed a long-term  
15 plan for Freedom of Navigation Operations, and that's what  
16 we're implementing right now, is a strategic approach to  
17 Freedom of Navigation Operations that does, in fact, support  
18 our overall strategy in the Pacific, as well as the specific  
19 mission, which is to ensure that we fly, sail, and operate  
20 wherever international law allows. And we continue to  
21 validate those claims where we see international airspace,  
22 for that matter, or the maritime domain.

23 Senator Sullivan: So, those are going well, regular,  
24 routine, with our allies, if possible, not micromanaged from  
25 the NSC?

1           General Dunford: That's right. And, Senator, in  
2 candor, we still, and always will, take into account what  
3 else is happening --

4           Senator Sullivan: Sure.

5           General Dunford: -- in the strategic environment,  
6 whether it's U.N. General Assembly or some other event.  
7 But, we do have a base plan from which we're operating right  
8 now in a healthy dialogue, I believe, between the Commander  
9 the Secretary of Defense.

10          Senator Sullivan: Let me turn to missile defense.  
11 We've had a lot of questions today, I think. Is it safe to  
12 say that the administration views a much more robust missile  
13 defense as a key part of our strategy with regard to North  
14 Korea or Iran with regard to rogue nations like those two  
15 countries that are trying to acquire intercontinental  
16 ballistic nuclear missiles?

17          General Dunford: No question, Senator.

18          Senator Sullivan: So, you mentioned the NDAA does a  
19 lot. We do. But, I think there's more that we should be  
20 doing. Does the administration have plans to, at least from  
21 a supplemental perspective or working with the Congress,  
22 beefing up our missile defense? I think it's something we  
23 all agree -- it's very bipartisan, by the way -- that we  
24 need to be doing. What are more specifics, General, you can  
25 share with us on what we need to be doing? And how can

1 Congress support you?

2 General Dunford: Sure. Senator, we did do exactly as  
3 you suggest, and we've submitted it. And if you don't have  
4 a copy of that, I'll make sure you get one. But, we looked  
5 at additional radar systems. We looked at THAAD systems,  
6 Patriot systems. As you know, in the NDAA, there's  
7 additional interceptors -- additional 21, I think is the  
8 number that I recall, that are in there. All of those  
9 issues are part of it. We did an immediate, kind of,  
10 supplemental for -- just as you're suggesting -- for  
11 ballistic missile defense. I think it was maybe the first  
12 or second week of August, to make sure it was in time for  
13 the budget cycle.

14 So, I think what you have outlined in the NDAA,  
15 combined with the supplemental that the administration has  
16 put together, will meet the immediate needs. But, of  
17 course, we need a long-term strategic approach to ballistic  
18 missile defense. And buying the same capabilities that we  
19 have today into the future is not to be the solution as the  
20 threat adapts. And I know you've received some of the  
21 classified briefings on the adaptations of the threat, which  
22 means that our ballistic missile defense capabilities also  
23 have to adapt.

24 Senator Sullivan: Well, we want to work with you on  
25 that. I think it's an area -- like I said, a bipartisan

1 cooperation in the Congress -- which is new, but important  
2 development, and we want to work with the administration on  
3 that.

4 Let me end, just a final question. I really want to  
5 applaud you and General Mattis, the entire administration --  
6 Secretary Tillerson -- on the North Korea strategy. I think  
7 what you're trying to achieve, your focus on it --  
8 importantly, your frequent and constructive engagement with  
9 Congress, asking us to play our part, have also been very,  
10 very -- an important element of that strategy.

11 I also believe that -- you talk a lot about credible  
12 military operations, and that, to me, is an effective  
13 element of our diplomacy -- effective diplomacy, which I  
14 think we're starting to see a lot of progress in that realm.

15 If one of the options was a preemptive or preventive  
16 ground war on the Korean Peninsula, like the Gulf War in  
17 1990 or 2003 that was launched by the U.S., my view is, that  
18 would require an AUMF from the Congress. And,  
19 constitutionally and politically, this would help our policy  
20 with regard to leverage, with regard to the ability to show  
21 the world that the American people were behind that. Do you  
22 agree with that? And is that something that the  
23 administration is starting to talk about? I've raised it  
24 with a number of folks. I think it's an important issue.  
25 We want to be supportive. I think you're getting bipartisan

1 support for what the strategy is. But, that kind of issue,  
2 to me, is something that we need to be prepared to discuss.  
3 Do you have a view on that, General?

4 General Dunford: Senator, I think what I'd do is  
5 probably narrow my view to the scenario you're describing.  
6 I would want to have the full-throated support of the  
7 American people, in the form of the Congress, if we did  
8 something like you're suggesting.

9 Senator Sullivan: Right. And I used that language  
10 very carefully. I know the President has a lot of authority  
11 to react, to take action, particularly if we're attacked.  
12 But, I'm talking about a ground war, a la 1950, launched by  
13 the United States, although, in 1950, as you know, there was  
14 no congressional authorization. I think that's an important  
15 topic. I think it gives us leverage. And I'm glad to see  
16 that you believe that, for something like that, you would  
17 want that. And I don't want to put words in your mouth.

18 General Dunford: No, no.

19 Senator Sullivan: It's an important --

20 General Dunford: Senator, I think -- again, we know,  
21 from history, that we are going to be much better -- a much  
22 better degree of success if we have the full-throated  
23 support of the American people when we go to war. You --  
24 what you're suggesting is going to war. And --

25 Senator Sullivan: Correct.

1           General Dunford:  And if we're going to conduct a major  
2 war, then having the full support of the American people, in  
3 the form of the Congress, I think is something we need to  
4 have.

5           Senator Sullivan:  Thank you.

6           Thank you, General.

7           Senator Reed:  On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator  
8 Nelson.

9           Senator Nelson:  General Mattis -- General Dunford, you  
10 have, certainly, my confidence in you.  And the reason I  
11 said "General Mattis," I also have that confidence in  
12 General Mattis.  And I also have that confidence in General  
13 Kelly.  Is there something about marines that inspires  
14 confidence?

15          General Dunford:  Senator, in my current assignment, I  
16 don't think you want me to answer that question, do you?

17          [Laughter.]

18          Senator Nelson:  No.

19          General Dunford:  Thank you, sir.

20          Senator Nelson:  Vladimir Putin cannot beat us on land.  
21 He can't beat us on the sea.  He can't beat us under the  
22 sea.  He can't beat us in the air.  And he can't beat us in  
23 space.  But, he can beat us in cyber.  Do you want to  
24 comment on that, how our forces are organized to deter and  
25 counter?

1           General Dunford: Thanks, Senator. I mean, I would  
2 agree with your assessment that the most significant threat  
3 in cyberspace we face today, the most advanced capabilities,  
4 are the Russians. That's our assessment. I would argue,  
5 though, that it's not only his cybercapability. The one  
6 thing that the Russians have effectively done is combine  
7 that cybercapability with political-influence operations,  
8 economic coercion, information operations, electronic  
9 warfare, and even military posturing. If you take those  
10 four or five things, and you look at the centralized  
11 command-and-control system that Russia has, even playing an  
12 overall weak hand, as you've described each of the domains  
13 where we have dominance, even with an overall weak hand,  
14 they have been able to effectively advance their interests  
15 without going to war. And I do believe that that's an area  
16 that, not only should we be focused on in the Department, in  
17 our recent global campaign plans now have added what I call  
18 "competition -- adversarial competition short of armed  
19 conflict" as being an area that is included in our campaign  
20 plans. But, I also believe we need to take a look at that  
21 from a whole-of-government perspective, as well, in order to  
22 be competitive.

23           Senator Nelson: Absolutely. Because you know what he  
24 can do in the next election. He doesn't -- and the  
25 newspapers have reported that he's already in several

1 States' registration records. All he has to do is,  
2 particular critical precincts, go in and eliminate every  
3 tenth voter. You can imagine the chaos that would occur on  
4 election day if the voters get there and, "I'm sorry, Mr.  
5 Jones, you're not registered." That would be significantly  
6 disruptive to our infrastructure and to the underpinnings of  
7 our country, a free and fair election.

8 The President's budget makes significant funding cuts  
9 in the Department of State and USAID. Does that make sense  
10 to you?

11 General Dunford: What I can say is, Senator, that  
12 there's no challenge that I'm currently dealing with that  
13 the primary factors in our success won't be diplomatic,  
14 economic. And certainly, even in our campaign in Iraq and  
15 Syria, USAID plays a critical role in the stabilization to  
16 secure the gains that our partners are making on the ground  
17 in Syria and Iraq, as one example. But, every place I've  
18 been over the past 15 or 16 years in Iraq and Afghanistan, a  
19 key partner has been USAID.

20 Senator Nelson: Well, and as you all -- as military  
21 commanders, you also project American power in the forms of  
22 using so many of our other agencies of government so that  
23 you become, not only a warrior as a military commander, you  
24 become a diplomat, as well, utilizing those other levers of  
25 power. We've seen that used very effectively by your

1    respective commanders in Africa; likewise, again, in Latin  
2    America.  And if you don't have those other agencies -- and  
3    I just mentioned two:  State and USAID -- it clearly clips  
4    your wings in being able to function as a military  
5    commander.  Any further comment on that?

6           General Dunford:  Senator, I think I'd probably just  
7    reinforce the one point, that today any of our military  
8    commanders, to be successful, have got to achieve unity of  
9    effort with the other government agencies that are on the  
10   ground.  And you mentioned two, but, if I think of our  
11   Afghanistan experience, the FBI was there, the DEA was  
12   there, Customs Border Police was there.  So, I agree with  
13   the thesis that the challenges that we face today are  
14   complex contingencies, and they require elements of all of  
15   our government in order to be successful.  And so, trying to  
16   draw a distinction between the security of our Nation in one  
17   department is not possible today.  You know, many  
18   departments in our government are all involved in the  
19   fundamental task of government, which is security.

20           Senator Nelson:  And, General, thank you also, to your  
21   family, for the sacrifices that they have made over the  
22   years in allowing him to continue to serve his country, and  
23   for you all continuing to serve the country in the role that  
24   you have, which is substantial.

25           Thank you.

1 Senator Reed: On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator  
2 Graham, please.

3 Senator Graham: Thank you, General Dunford, for your  
4 service.

5 Why should I vote for you?

6 General Dunford: Senator, over the past 2 years, I  
7 think I have provided best military advice --

8 Senator Graham: Okay. You've got me.

9 [Laughter.]

10 Senator Graham: In the next 2 years, don't you agree  
11 that sequestration needs to be fixed or we're going to go  
12 backwards?

13 General Dunford: It does, Senator.

14 Senator Graham: Do you agree with me, if you don't  
15 reform entitlements over the arc of time, there is no money  
16 left to do anything, other than entitlements?

17 General Dunford: Senator, I've seen the math, and  
18 we're headed towards a situation where it's going to be very  
19 difficult.

20 Senator Graham: Yeah. So, entitlement reform is  
21 necessary to keep a strong military.

22 I want to look at the threats going forward in the next  
23 2 years. Do you agree that there must be a credible  
24 military option on the table when it comes to North Korea?

25 General Dunford: I do, Senator. And I've personally

1 conveyed that to our -- to China and to our allies in the  
2 region.

3 Senator Graham: Do you agree with me that Iran has  
4 taken the money from the Iranian nuclear agreement and done  
5 more damage with it than good?

6 General Dunford: There are indicators that some money  
7 that was freed up as a result of JCPOA has been put back  
8 into malign activities. And certainly, I'd be hard-pressed  
9 to find anything that Iran does that is good.

10 Senator Graham: So, the goal of the agreement was to  
11 get them back into the family of nations. Would you say,  
12 thus far, that has not been achieved?

13 General Dunford: Iran is not part of the family of  
14 nations today, Senator.

15 Senator Graham: Yeah. Okay. Syria. Do you agree  
16 with me that, if we leave Assad in power, it's going to be  
17 very difficult to end this war?

18 General Dunford: Senator, I have looked at Syria, as  
19 you can imagine, pretty hard, and I think addressing the  
20 grievances of the civil war are going to be necessary to  
21 have a stable political construct.

22 Senator Graham: Okay. In terms of Russia over the  
23 last 6 months, have they gotten better, worse, or about the  
24 same?

25 General Dunford: In Syria, Senator?

1 Senator Graham: Anywhere.

2 General Dunford: I --

3 Senator Graham: Everywhere.

4 General Dunford: They certainly haven't gotten any  
5 better anywhere.

6 Senator Graham: Okay. There may be evidence that  
7 Russia was more deeply involved in sending out fake news  
8 during our last election. Does that trouble you?

9 General Dunford: It troubles me, Senator, although I  
10 don't have any unique insight into it.

11 Senator Graham: Okay. Afghanistan. The recent  
12 decision to add more capability with rules-of-engagement  
13 changes, do you think that is necessary to be continued?

14 General Dunford: I think it is necessary, Senator, and  
15 I think it will help to get the Afghan Security Forces to  
16 reverse the trends of the last 2 years, casualties and the  
17 lost ground that they have experienced. I think what this  
18 additional effort will allow us to do is provide more  
19 effective advisory effort, down to the tactical level, with  
20 the Afghans, and also better leverage the air support that  
21 we have. And we have increased the air support, as well.

22 Senator Graham: And there is a new emphasis on  
23 Pakistan, where they need to be a better part of the team?

24 General Dunford: That's exactly right, Senator.  
25 There's a key assumption in our -- in the President's South

1 Asia strategy that Pakistan cannot continue to be a  
2 sanctuary for Haqqani, the Taliban, and others in our -- and  
3 we have success.

4 Senator Graham: Would you agree with me that we have  
5 to have very skilled ambassadors representing our country in  
6 both Pakistan, Afghanistan, and India to get a good outcome,  
7 militarily?

8 General Dunford: I would agree, Senator. And I was  
9 very encouraged -- and I think you were on the committee --  
10 that we confirmed Ambassador Bass to go to Afghanistan.  
11 I've got a good experience with him in Turkey. I've watched  
12 him deal with difficult situations. So, I think we have the  
13 right man headed to Afghanistan.

14 Senator Graham: So, in Iraq, it's just a matter of  
15 time til we clear ISIL out of Iraq. Do you agree with that?

16 General Dunford: I believe the Iraqi Security Forces  
17 are on a pretty good trajectory right now to clear out ISIS.

18 Senator Graham: As you look forward in Iraq, if the  
19 Iraqis would accept a follow-on force, do you believe it is  
20 in our national security interests this time to leave some  
21 troops behind to continue to work with the Iraqis?

22 General Dunford: I do, Senator. I think there's a  
23 large recognition, both in Iraq and certainly for the  
24 coalition partners that are there, that continued training  
25 of the Iraqi Security Forces is going to be necessary for

1 them to become self-sustaining. Obviously, the decision is  
2 going to have to be a political decision between the Iraqi  
3 government and the U.S. Government, but, from a military  
4 perspective, I certainly believe that that's necessary.

5 Senator Graham: And finally, do you agree, if the  
6 world is seen as capitulating to Kim Jong Un -- the United  
7 States, but the world at large -- that the Iranians will  
8 watch and have a different view of where they should be  
9 going?

10 General Dunford: I think all of the -- all the nations  
11 that, you know, I would consider adversaries or potential  
12 adversaries will watch closely what's happening on the  
13 Korean Peninsula.

14 Senator Graham: And finally, it's the policy of this  
15 administration to deny the North Korean regime the ability  
16 to develop an ICBM with a nuclear weapon on top to hit the  
17 American homeland. Not contain it, but deny it. Is that  
18 correct?

19 General Dunford: That is the articulated policy of  
20 President Trump. Yes, Senator.

21 Senator Graham: Do you agree with that policy?

22 General Dunford: I do, Senator.

23 Senator Graham: Thank you. And I look forward to your  
24 service for the next 2 years. Our men and women in the  
25 military could not be finer hands. Thank you and your

1 family.

2 General Dunford: Thank you, Senator.

3 Senator Reed: On behalf of Chairman McCain, let  
4 recognize Senator Blumenthal.

5 Senator Blumenthal: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

6 General Dunford, first of all, thank you for your  
7 service, and to your family, as well.

8 I would like to focus just briefly on Puerto Rico. You  
9 were asked about it earlier. Is there more that the  
10 Department of Defense can do to provide assistance in the  
11 midst of this humanitarian crisis, which involves not only  
12 human suffering, but also the interruption, for some period  
13 of time, of communications, of travel, logistics, the  
14 lifeblood, in terms of infrastructure, of the island? Is  
15 there more that the military can do?

16 General Dunford: Senator, if there is, we'll be doing  
17 it. We're in a constant -- first of all, I couldn't agree  
18 with you more. And we've watched the tragedy unfolding over  
19 the last few days. The last update I had, not just to come  
20 over here, but just because that's how constant we're  
21 getting updated, was an update on our efforts in Puerto  
22 Rico. To date, what they've identified are the things that  
23 would allow us to open airfields, open the ports, and get  
24 that immediate electricity, fresh water, and food to the  
25 people in Puerto Rico. But, if there is more that needs to

1 be done, I can assure you that Secretary Mattis has placed  
2 Puerto Rico as a priority for all of us. And General  
3 Robinson is in constant contact with FEMA, as well as  
4 officials in Puerto Rico, to make sure the Department is  
5 leaning forward in providing all the support that they need.

6 Senator Blumenthal: The National Guard of Connecticut,  
7 and, I think, of other States, have been involved in  
8 transportation. The airfields are now open to military  
9 aircraft and relief flights. Do you anticipate that  
10 military aircraft can and will be used more extensively in  
11 this effort?

12 General Dunford: I do, Senator. That's absolutely  
13 part of the plan, particularly, again, for generators,  
14 water, food, those kind of immediate needs.

15 Senator Blumenthal: Would you anticipate that the  
16 Corps of Engineers can play a role in opening some of the  
17 ports, perhaps some of the other means of transportation  
18 that could be involved?

19 General Dunford: Senator, I don't know whether it  
20 would be specifically the Corps of Engineers or some of our  
21 combat engineers, but I do believe that the military is  
22 uniquely capable of helping to clear the debris and get the  
23 airfields -- repair the airfields and get them up and  
24 operating. And I can assure you, whatever capabilities are  
25 required in that regard, whether they're resident inside the

1 Corps of Engineers or resident in some of our other  
2 operational units, we'll make sure the right capability is  
3 at the right place.

4 Senator Blumenthal: And the Department of Defense is,  
5 indeed, leaning forward and prepared, ready, able, and  
6 willing to provide whatever assistance is necessary.

7 General Dunford: Absolutely, Senator. These are  
8 Americans, and we're going to do everything we can to help  
9 them out.

10 Senator Blumenthal: And they are Americans.

11 General Dunford: They are Americans, Senator.

12 Senator Blumenthal: Let me ask you about the recent  
13 exercises conducted by Russia -- I think they were called  
14 Zapad -- Zapad, "West" -- with Belarus. Are there any sort  
15 of lessons or other intelligence that we've gained that you  
16 can discuss in this forum from having observed those  
17 exercises?

18 General Dunford: Senator, it would probably be -- if  
19 you don't mind, I'm reluctant to discuss it in public. I  
20 was just with a meeting of all 29 NATO Chiefs of Defense  
21 last weekend. This, as you can imagine, was one of the  
22 topics. And then I came back out through Norway with my  
23 Norwegian counterpart to talk more specifically about  
24 challenges in the northern flank of NATO and some of the  
25 things we've seen in the exercise. But, I can assure you we

1 watch very carefully what the Russians have done during the  
2 Operation Zapad to make sure that we understand where they  
3 are, in terms of capability development, and what the  
4 implications are for NATO security and for U.S. security.

5 Senator Blumenthal: And, despite the Russian efforts  
6 to drive wedges in our NATO alliance among our allies, would  
7 you say that the NATO alliance is in good health right now?

8 General Dunford: Senator, I would. And I certainly  
9 now have probably a 5-year perspective, from two out of my  
10 last three assignments, directly involved with NATO. And I  
11 would even say, in the last year -- a year ago, there was a  
12 strong debate inside of NATO about 360-degree security and  
13 almost a different view from those nations that viewed the  
14 south and the terrorist threat as being the priority and  
15 those nations that viewed Russia as being a priority. And I  
16 think, over the past year, with some very strong leadership  
17 -- and I think the Secretary General has been a part of that  
18 -- I feel much better today about the cohesiveness of NATO  
19 and about the recognition that it's not either/or of those  
20 threats, it's both, in that nations need to make the  
21 significant contributions to prepare us for both of those  
22 challenges. So, I think the overall health of NATO is  
23 actually, I would assess, to be very strong.

24 Senator Blumenthal: Thank you.

25 My time is expired, but I just want to say, I will be

1 strongly and enthusiastically supporting you for another  
2 term. And again, my thanks for your service, and as well to  
3 your family.

4 Thank you.

5 General Dunford: Thank you, Senator.

6 Senator Reed: On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator  
7 Shaheen, please.

8 Senator Shaheen: Well, thank you.

9 I think I'm the last one, so hopefully we will be  
10 quick.

11 General Dunford, thank you, to you and your family, for  
12 your willingness to continue to serve in this role. I think  
13 it's fair to say that there is a lot of support on this  
14 committee for your nomination.

15 On Friday, it was reported that the KC-46 Arrow  
16 Refueling Tanker Program was hit with three category-1  
17 deficiencies, including one that was reported as possibly  
18 jeopardizing the willingness of the Air Force to accept the  
19 aircraft from Boeing. How concerned are you about those  
20 deficiencies? And are you worried that we won't be able to  
21 take delivery of those aircraft by the scheduled time of  
22 spring of 2018?

23 General Dunford: Senator, what I am concerned about is  
24 the delivery of the tankers and the capability that that  
25 would imply, the capability gap. I think if you had the

1 transportation commander here -- General McDew -- today, he  
2 would talk to you about tankers are being one of his more  
3 significant challenges in meeting all of our requirements.  
4 So, I'm not familiar with the details of these deficiencies,  
5 in that it hasn't been translated into time for me at this  
6 point. But, I think, with regard to the capability itself,  
7 that is one of the more critical capabilities in a joint  
8 force, and all of our plans are based on our ability to meet  
9 this requirement.

10 Senator Shaheen: Well, absolutely. And I -- I'm sure  
11 -- I assume you would give us your commitment that you will  
12 follow up and find out how serious those deficiencies are,  
13 and whether they jeopardize the schedule timeframe for  
14 delivery.

15 General Dunford: I will, Senator.

16 Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

17 You talked about the importance of electronic warfare,  
18 and of coordinating those efforts. And also, there have  
19 been several back-and-forths about Russia and its hybrid  
20 capabilities and how important that is to the -- its current  
21 capacity to engage. Can you talk about how the military is  
22 looking at our electronic and cyber tools, and how we're  
23 working with other departments within the Federal Government  
24 -- Treasury, State -- to coordinate those efforts?

25 General Dunford: Right. Senator, you know, obviously,

1 primarily focused on defending the information technology of  
2 the Department, as well as select industrial pieces that  
3 support the Department. So, that's our primary focus. And  
4 then defending the Nation, which includes a suite of  
5 offensive capabilities. So, being able to exploit in  
6 cyberspace, being able to conduct offensive operations and  
7 defensive operations, are all a piece of it.

8 But, with regard to collaboration and cooperation, the  
9 one area that Admiral Rogers and his team are very focused  
10 on is, when a vulnerability is identified, the sharing and  
11 the action taken to address those vulnerabilities is an  
12 important piece. And that's going to require not only, as  
13 you suggest, great cooperation within the government -- and  
14 I think we're in a pretty good place in that regard -- but  
15 it's also going to require great public/private cooperation,  
16 as well, so that, when that assistance is offered, it's  
17 accepted and there's a degree of trust that what we're  
18 trying to do is actually help them mitigate the risk of  
19 vulnerabilities. That's probably one of the key areas of  
20 cooperation.

21 And, as you know, Senator -- you've paid close  
22 attention to this issue -- there's always a debate about  
23 what agency within our government is best capable of  
24 performing what mission. I think that dialogue will go on  
25 for many years to come, and we're always refining it. And

1 we should be. We shouldn't be comfortable or complacent  
2 that we have it exactly right. And that dialogue is  
3 ongoing, not only about the organizational construct of  
4 Cyber Command itself, but also the Department's role within  
5 the broader government effort.

6 Senator Shaheen: I certainly agree with that.  
7 However, I do think it's important for us to have someone  
8 within the administration who is the point person on  
9 cyberactivities. Is there somebody that you're aware of  
10 who's actually the person in charge of those activities?

11 General Dunford: Senator, I can't say that there is.  
12 It doesn't mean that there isn't. I'm not aware of somebody  
13 right now in the administration who's designated. I  
14 probably, and incorrectly, have a decidedly DOD perspective  
15 right now. But, I'll certainly find out.

16 Senator Shaheen: Well, thank you. I think it's --  
17 says something that, as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs,  
18 you're not aware of who the person is who's in charge.

19 You also talked about the importance of our alliances  
20 and partnerships, and how that contributes to how Russia and  
21 our other adversaries view the strength of the United  
22 States. Do you have any sense of what the reaction would be  
23 among our partners with the JCPOA if the United States were  
24 to abrogate our commitments under that treaty?

25 General Dunford: Senator, I don't have any unique

1 insights into that, but I certainly know what everybody else  
2 knows from the open source. And I don't think there would  
3 be unanimity of those who were part of the JCPOA, were we to  
4 walk away.

5 Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

6 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 And again, thank you for your willingness to continue  
8 to serve.

9 General Dunford: Thanks, Senator.

10 Senator Reed: Thank you.

11 On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator Peters, please.

12 Senator Peters: Thank you, Senator Reed.

13 General Dunford, again, thank you for your testimony  
14 here today. Thank you for your service to our country.  
15 But, I also want to -- just wanted to thank you for your  
16 thorough answers that you always give to our questions.  
17 They're very candid. And not only your willingness to  
18 answer those questions here in a formal setting, but you've  
19 always been accessible to us on a one-on-one basis to answer  
20 specific questions. And I appreciate that immensely.

21 General Dunford, I know that the Department is  
22 concerned about the geopolitical implications of megacities,  
23 including the growth of cities of over 10 million people. I  
24 spoke with Admiral Harris about this when he testified  
25 earlier this year. Admiral Harris testified that there are

1 ten megacities in the world, with eight of them in the  
2 Pacific Command area of responsibilities. And these  
3 locations are ripe to become geopolitical hotspots, given  
4 the number of people involved and some of the unique  
5 political contexts that they -- are associated with them.  
6 So, the ability of the services to operate in these very  
7 dense urban environments are going to become increasingly  
8 important, both in contingency in conflict as well as  
9 humanitarian assistance. We have particular concerns about  
10 Seoul, given the threats of -- that are now associated with  
11 North Koreans' action. And Seoul is obviously one of those  
12 megacities that we need to be concerned about, and also  
13 raises a host of other issues when it comes to dealing with  
14 that. If you could address plans that we have for dealing  
15 in megacities, how you plan to deal with that issue, and are  
16 there needs for us to invest additional training and -- not  
17 only of the soldiers and marines, but also developing  
18 tactics and procedures that we need to go forward that we  
19 should be assisting you in, from a congressional  
20 perspective.

21 General Dunford: Senator, I could. And I think the  
22 core of what we're doing to prepare for that is found in our  
23 exercise and our experimentation program, and it also  
24 reflects in the priorities that we'd have for innovation.  
25 And so, if you take a look at our Exercise and

1 Experimentation Program, it is focused on our ability to  
2 deal in a very complex, dense urban terrain. I think all of  
3 us have looked at the demographics. We've looked at where  
4 people will live. We looked at where the sources of  
5 conflict will be and -- in preparing ourselves accordingly  
6 to do that.

7       There are some unique challenges in megacities.  
8 Command and control is one of those challenges.  
9 Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance is one of  
10 those challenges. Minimizing collateral damage while  
11 delivering effective fires are one of those challenges. And  
12 those are all areas within the Department that we are  
13 working on.

14       Senator Peters: And then, please let us know if  
15 there's anything else we can do to help you provide the  
16 resources necessary, because I think it's obvious that's  
17 going to be an area that we're going to have to be dealing  
18 with in the future, without question.

19       General Dunford: Thanks, Senator.

20       Senator Peters: When you were asked a previous  
21 question about things not to assume in the future, where at  
22 the top of the list was our ability to dominate in space --  
23 and so, I'd like you to talk a little bit about that, and  
24 particularly what we're seeing with the Chinese that seem to  
25 be developing -- at least evidence suggests that they're

1 developing as many as three different ASAT capabilities and  
2 have conducted multiple tests in space of direct ascent ASAT  
3 systems. They also established a new service a few years  
4 ago to make that capability even more robust. You could  
5 address how concerned we should be and, from a congressional  
6 perspective, do we need to be putting more resources into  
7 this critical area.

8           General Dunford: Senator, thanks. When we fielded  
9 the current space capabilities, we didn't field them with  
10 resilience to the current threat in mind. And so, they are  
11 vulnerable to the threats that you spoke about. And not  
12 only the Chinese, but the Russians and others, recognize  
13 that. Even North Korea has a nascent anti-space program  
14 that's there. And if you look at our dependencies in space,  
15 whether it's the timing of our systems, global pre-  
16 positioning, our command-and-control systems militarily, or  
17 the dependence on our economy on space capabilities, the  
18 vulnerabilities in space, which we really identify in the  
19 budget as a need for increased resilience in space to those  
20 threats, the vulnerabilities have significant implications,  
21 not only from a military perspective, but from a commercial  
22 perspective, as well.

23           So, certainly part of the -- part of our budget is  
24 designed to enhance our resilience in space, and also  
25 enhance the redundancies in the access that we have to a

1 wide range of space capabilities so that we minimize the  
2 threat that you've identified.

3 As a result of that analysis and recognition, probably  
4 the last 3 years, you have seen increased requests from the  
5 Department for space-related capabilities. Again, my  
6 priority, at this point, would be on space resilience, but  
7 there's a wide range of other capabilities we need, as well.  
8 And that, again, is informed by the developing threat --  
9 military threat to space capabilities that we have.

10 Senator Peters: And, if I may add, the point that you  
11 made, it's not just our military satellites. We need to be  
12 working with some of our commercial suppliers of  
13 communication satellites and other space technologies. We  
14 should be stepping up our activities working with the  
15 commercial sector, I would assume?

16 General Dunford: Absolutely, Senator. In fact, one of  
17 the areas that we believe there's some potential is to  
18 better leverage commercial activities -- for example, to  
19 expand our intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance  
20 capability.

21 Senator Peters: Great. Thank you, General.  
22 Appreciate it.

23 Senator Reed: General, thank you for your service --  
24 selfless service, the Marine Corps and to the Nation. And  
25 thank your family for their service alongside you.

1           And, on behalf of Chairman McCain, I would declare the  
2 hearing adjourned.

3           Thank you.

4           [Whereupon, at 12:36 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25