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Chairman Inhofe: Our meeting will come to order. The meeting today is going to receive testimonies from two great guys, and it is a really good timing for this event to take place. And they are General John Hyten, Commander of the USSTRATCOM, and General Terry O'Shaughnessy, Commander of NORTHCOM.

This committee’s top priority is to support the effective implementation of the National Defense Strategy. The NDS Commission, which we have had a hearing on already -- I think it leads us in the right direction. It is a blueprint that we are using in this commission. They made it clear that maintaining and modernizing the nuclear deterrent is required. While we ignored the nuclear weapons after the Cold War ended, Russia and China have focused on more and more nuclear programs. We, I guess, assumed that they were not doing anything because we were not doing anything at that time. Nonetheless, we have fallen behind. Now we need to modernize all three legs with the nuclear triad, as well as the warheads and infrastructure in the Department of Energy. We have some questions about that because there is a lot of comments around negating the necessity of the nuclearization modernization that we feel is necessary.
The President and the Department of Defense have also rightly identified space as a warfighting domain that is growing more important every day.

General Hyten, you are a career space professional and your current command both directs and relies upon many space systems every day. I look forward to hearing your views on establishing the U.S. Space Command as a full combatant command and also your thoughts on the new space force. We had a chance to visit in my office, and I appreciate it.

And I have heard that you visited others too. It is kind of a confusing thing when you talk about a space force and you talk also about the combatant command and where the two are similar. So I have some questions along that line.

General O'Shaughnessy, you have operational responsibility for the defense of the United States homeland. What an awesome responsibility that is. The Missile Defense Review recently enumerated a number of challenges to U.S. missile defenses, including cruise and hypersonic missiles. I am interested in your views on the most pressing priorities in the missile defense arena, as well as what we should be doing to address them.

Lastly, General O'Shaughnessy, I am eager to hear your assessment of the ongoing southern border deployment and how that might be affecting our readiness. Some interpretations of what is happening down there say that that could actually
improve our readiness. So I am anxious to hear your views on that.

Senator Reed?
Senator Reed: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to join you in welcoming our witnesses, General Hyten and General O'Shaughnessy. We thank you and your families and the many men and women who serve with you to serve the nation and protect the nation. So thank you very much.

General Hyten, first and foremost, we would like to hear from you about the administration’s decision to withdraw from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty with nothing to replace it. I understand that Russia was in noncompliance and that China also poses a threat, but I believe a better path would have been to continue to pressure Russia back into compliance and ask modifications to the treaty, if necessary.

Treaties are a major component of our security strategy. We build and modernize nuclear weapons, but we also have treaties which prescribe numbers and use. Withdrawing from this treaty puts the extension of New START in 2021 on very shaky ground. I am interested in your views on this matter.

The second issue I am concerned about is Russia’s successful launch of the long-range hypersonic weapon, which I understand will be nuclear-capable. China also has a
multitude of similar systems although not long-range like
those of Russia. I am interested in hearing your thoughts
on the capabilities of our near-peer competition and what we
need to do to counter these capabilities.

The third issue I would like you to address is the
administration’s space force proposal. I understand the
importance of space and the need for additional focus and
resources for that effort. I am also supportive of creating
a full unified command for space. However, I remain dubious
of the need to create an entire new bureaucracy of a
separate service and all that entails. I think it is
inevitable that such a creation will distract rather than
provide focus to the critical mission of space. I know you
have studied this issue closely, and I am interested in your
views on the pros and cons of this proposal.

Finally, General Hyten, you are also responsible for
the synchronization of global missile defense plans and
operations. I would like to hear your thoughts about the
recently released Missile Defense Review and the
Department’s plans for our current missile defense systems
and how to address future threats.

General O'Shaughnessy, your mission is to protect the
homeland, to deter and defeat attacks on the United States
and to support civil authorities in mitigating the effects
of attacks and natural disasters. We saw this demonstrated
in DOD’s support to the States and territories affected by hurricanes and wildfires this past year, and we thank you and your command for your significant efforts.

You are also dual-hatted as the Commander of the North American Aerospace Defense Command, NORAD, which brings unique responsibilities and partnering opportunities with Canada to deter and defend against advancing threats to our nations.

You are also responsible for the operation of our homeland ballistic missile defense system. We look forward to hearing about your priorities for further improvements to the ground-based missile defense system in the context of the Missile Defense Review. This is particularly important in light of the threat from North Korea and potentially Iran.

Lastly, at a time when the National Defense Strategy and our intelligence community’s annual worldwide threat assessment are stressing the absolute necessity of using scarce resources to meet the challenge of near-peer adversaries like Russia and China, the administration is committing significant DOD resources and attention to what the President has taken to calling a national emergency at our southern border. In fact, nowhere in these two documents I have referenced, the National Defense Strategy particularly, are migrant caravans or drug traffickers
crossing our southern border mentioned as threats to our national security. Russia, China, cybersecurity, and a host of other items are in those documents, but nowhere is there a finding that calls for 4,000 active duty troops to be deployed to the southern border. For comparison’s sake, we have approximately 5,000 troops deployed in Iraq. I have yet to hear from a witness before this committee who has not stressed the real threats we face and the need to restore readiness and provide modern facilities for our troops and their families. Instead, DOD is planning to reallocate funding that has been authorized and appropriated for installation commanders’ top priorities in support of a wall that has no connection to a military threat and does not support military effectiveness.

I will also add that is the responsibility of the Department of Homeland Security and Customs and Border Protection, not DOD, to patrol and enforce our borders. If this administration is serious about dealing with the drug epidemic in our nation, then it should properly fund these federal agencies and other associated federal agencies.

General Hyten and General O'Shaughnessy, again thank you for your service, and please pass our regards on to the men and women that you lead. Thank you.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Reed.

Well, General Hyten, we will start with you and then go
to General O'Shaughnessy. Try to keep your statements in the realm of 5 minutes. Your entire statement will be made a part of the record. We will start with you, General Hyten.
STATEMENT OF GENERAL JOHN E. HYTEN, USAF, COMMANDER, UNITED STATES STRATEGIC COMMAND

General Hyten: Thank you very much. Chairman Inhofe, Ranking Member Reed, distinguished committee members, good morning. It is an honor to be here today alongside my friend, General O'Shaughnessy, and a continuing privilege to represent the 162,000 Americans accomplishing the missions of U.S. Strategic Command each and every day.

This is my third year appearing before this committee as the STRATCOM Commander, and I appreciated the opportunities to meet with many of you one on one and to testify before you. So I want to begin by thanking this committee for your enduring support to our national defense.

The last time I testified before the committee, we had begun our 10th consecutive year under a continuing resolution. Not this year, thanks to your leadership. I cannot overstate the importance of an on-time budget. The stability afforded with an on-time budget this year came at a critical time for us and had a positive impact on our modernization efforts and our overall force readiness.

STRATCOM is a global warfighting command, and as part of the joint force, we are responsible for strategic deterrence, nuclear operations, global strike, space operations, joint electromagnetic spectrum operations, missile defense, and joint analysis and targeting. That is
a big portfolio. To execute our assigned missions, the
soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines and civilians of my
command operate globally across land, sea, air, space, and
cyber. Our forces and the strategic deterrence they provide
underpin and enable all joint force operations and are the
ultimate guarantors of our national and allied security.
So the most important message I want to deliver today
is that I am fully confident in our ability to preserve the
peace and decisively respond in any conflict. We are ready
for all threats that exist on the planet today, and no one
should doubt this.
Strategic deterrence is an active mission. It is not a
passive mission. It is dynamic. Our capabilities must
continue to evolve as the global threat environment changes
over time. With this evolution, the adversary’s decision
calculus changes, which drives modification to our own
deterrence approach. Today we are challenged by multiple
adversaries with an expanding range of capabilities, and we
must adapt as well. To effectively deter and respond, if
necessary, in this multi-polar, all-domain world, we must
out-think, outmaneuver, out-partner, out-innovate our
adversaries. Deterrence in the 21st century requires the
integration of all our capabilities across all domains.
For over 2 decades, China and Russia have studied the
way we fight. They study the American way of warfare. They
have watched and learned how we train and fight. They understand the advantages we gain from integrating capabilities across all domains to accomplish our strategic objectives. To counter our long-held advantages, they are actively seeking to exploit perceived vulnerabilities and are directly challenging us in areas of long-held strength. While our advantages are beginning to erode, we have not yet ceded the advantage. So my focus this year is to continue to focus on the operations and modernization of our nuclear capabilities, focus first on the nuclear triad of ICBMs, submarines, and bombers to support a seamless transition as the Department stands up a new space-focused organization and to continue the implementation of my new responsibilities as the nuclear command, control, and communications, NC3, enterprise lead and the operator and architect for this critical capability.

To be successful in everything that we do, we must recapture our ability to go fast, faster than all our potential adversaries. And that is my biggest concern these days. That means we must return to the dynamic that made us the strongest, most technologically advance military in the world. But over my 38 years in military service, I have watched as our nation has collectively developed an increasingly unhealthy expectation of trying to remove all risk from everything that we do. The challenge I have
issued in my command is go break down the bureaucracy, take some smart risks, informed risks, do this within the left and right limits that I established in my commander’s intent, and we have to move fast. It is critical if we are to stay ahead.

So I am very grateful for your support in helping us do just that. I look forward to an on-time budget this upcoming fiscal year so we can sustain the momentum invigorating this Department and our best-in-the-world people, our best-in-the-world commercial sector to go faster and innovate to bring more timely and affordable solutions to our most pressing deterrence challenges. It is critical because nuclear war cannot be won and therefore must never be fought. Therefore, for us to prevent war, we must be ready for war. Success means we have lived up to our motto coined over 60 years ago in Strategic Air Command: Peace is our profession.

Thank you for the opportunity to be here today, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Hyten follows:]
Chairman Inhofe: Well, thank you, General Hyten. An excellent statement.

General O'Shaughnessy?
STATEMENT OF GENERAL TERRENCE J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, USAF,
COMMANDER, UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND AND NORTH AMERICAN AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

General O'Shaughnessy: Thank you. Chairman Inhofe, Ranking Member Reed, and distinguished members of the committee, I am truly honored to appear today as the Commander of the United States Northern Command and the U.S.-Canadian bi-national command, North American Aerospace Defense Command. It is a pleasure to be testifying today alongside General John Hyten who is not only my good friend but someone who I have admired and respected for so many years.

USNORTHCOM and NORAD are two complementary but distinct commands driven by a single unyielding priority: defending the homeland from attack. In this era of rapidly evolving technology and renewed great power competition, the need for an energized and active defense of the homeland cannot be overstated. Revisionist powers, Russia and China, have given every indication that their own security strategies are based on holding the United States at risk with both conventional and nuclear weapons, and they have signaled that we must anticipate attacks against our civilian and defense infrastructure in the event of a conflict.

Russia has modernized its aviation and submarine fleets and fielded long-range cruise missiles designed to evade
radar detection. Russia and China continue their efforts to
penetrate our networks while developing and testing
hypersonic glide vehicles. And both have also established a
noticeably stronger foothold in the Arctic along the
northern approaches to the United States and Canada. As a
result, the strategic value of the Arctic as our first line
of defense has reemerged, and USNORTHCOM and NORAD are
taking active measures to ensure our ability to detect,
detract, and defeat potential threats in this region.

Our adversaries have engaged in deliberate, focused
efforts over a number of years to exploit our perceived gaps
and erode many of the advantages previously afforded by our
geography and technological superiority. As a result, it is
clear that our homeland is not a sanctuary.

Our mission to deter our adversaries is dependent on
our ability to detect and ultimately defeat potential
threats to our homeland. And I am grateful to the committee
for the strong support of USNORTHCOM and NORAD priorities
along those lines of effort. Your support for fielding AESA
radars for our aerospace control alert fighters and
improving the capability and capacity of our missile defense
sensors and interceptors clearly demonstrate our shared
sense of urgency and resolve.

In that same spirit, we must take prudent steps now to
ensure our next generation defensive capabilities, to
include a space-sensing layer of space-based missile defense centers are not late to need. That effort cannot start too soon, given the fact that our adversaries are already developing and testing advanced weapons specifically intended to avoid detection in order to hold targets in the homeland at constant risk.

I sincerely appreciate the committee’s work to provide much needed predictability and stability with an on-time budget in fiscal year 2019. I am also grateful for the committee’s ongoing efforts to ensure that we avoid the devastating deep-cutting impacts that a return to sequestration would bring to the Department of Defense.

USNORTHCOM and NORAD work every day with our partners to keep our citizens safe while confronting the challenges emanating from multiple approaches and in all domains. I especially want to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the amazing men and women in the National Guard who are great partners and critical in our ability to perform our missions. Whether intercepting Russian bombers off the coast of Alaska or providing much needed support to our federal law enforcement partners along the southern border, the airmen, soldiers, sailors, marines, coast guardsmen, and civilians of USNORTHCOM and NORAD are deeply committed to defending our nation, and I am honored to represent them today.
Senators, we have the watch.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General O'Shaughnessy follows:]
Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, General O'Shaughnessy.

You know, General Hyten, there are two areas of disagreement that we have heard among our colleagues in both the House and in the Senate, and you have heard some this morning in our opening statements. But one of them is the significance of nuclear modernization. Now, it is disturbing when we see some of our adversaries, peer adversaries, China and Russia, have actually gotten ahead of us in some areas of artificial intelligence and hypersonics. But in the area of nuclear modernization, I know that Jim Mattis, Heather Wilson, and others have said that is the most significant thing that we could be doing, and yet, some are saying that is an area where we could be making cuts at this time.

I would like to have you start off by addressing that as to do you agree with those who talk about the significance of that program and make your comments on that. And then I will get to the second one.

General Hyten: So it is the most important element of our national defense.

Chairman Inhofe: It is the most important element of our national defense.

General Hyten: And we have to make sure that we are always ready to respond to any threat. I can do that today because I have the most powerful triad in the world. I have
ICBMs, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and bombers that are ready to respond to any threat that comes. And because of the capabilities of each leg of the triad, I have the ability to respond to any threat. We did a Nuclear Posture Review. It was released last year. In it, it validated the need for a triad.

Our adversaries have also recognized the need for a triad. They are beginning modernization of their programs as well. In fact, Russia started their modernization program in 2006. They are about 80 percent through completing the modernization of their triad. They will be pretty close to being through by about 2020, and in 2020, we will still be starting. That is not a good place to be from a national security perspective.

Chairman Inhofe: Well, that is right.

You have actually jumped to the second area of disagreement is on the triad because several people have said that we do not need a triad, all three legs. It could adequately be handled without all three. So just specifically on the triad element of the necessity of the three legs.

General Hyten: So when you look at the threat we face, the threat from the Russian triad, soon the threat from the Chinese triad, threats from North Korea as well, you have to look at the three elements of the triad.
The bombers are our most recallable element. They are the most flexible element of the triad. The bombers can be deployed and recalled by the President, deployed and recalled, before they employ their weapons. They are the most flexible element. We can do almost anything with a bomber.

The submarine is the most survivable element. It allows us to hide from our adversaries and make sure we can respond to any surprise attack.

And the ICBM is the most ready element to respond to a quick surprise attack, and it also creates the most significant targeting problem for an adversary because there are 400 separate targets across the United States. All would have to be independently targeted by an adversary. That targeting problem is hugely problematic and creates a significant advantage for us.

So when you put those three together, you get this great operational capability. But the other thing it provides for us is the ability to respond to a failure in any one of those legs. If you have a technical failure or intelligence failure, I can cover it with another leg, and that has happened during my tenure. And I never have put this nation at risk because I have the flexibility in the triad.

Chairman Inhofe: Yes. General O'Shaughnessy, that is
a big deal to you too.

And we look at what we have done with our aging system. We are talking about now getting into a modernized ICBM. I do not know how long that would take. Some people say all the way through the 20s. At the same time, you have our adversaries who -- they may have been late in starting, but they are starting in a more modernized way. Do you agree with that? And so they become a threat even though right now today they may not be ahead of us in these areas.

General O’Shaughnessy: Chairman, I would agree. And I think as the NDS articulates, the security environment has fundamentally changed and part of it is because of what you alluded to. And I think as we watch both Russia and China create success in some of their weapons programs and advancing the capabilities that they have, they are fundamentally changing not just on the ballistic missile side but, as you mentioned, the hypersonics and also in the cruise missiles. And it is not just the cruise missiles themselves. It is also the platforms that deliver those cruise missiles. They have clearly invested very specifically with the ability to hold our homeland at risk with things like submarines and the bombers that they have modernized with the low RCS cruise missiles that they can then launch. And therefore, we have to also modernize. We have to stay ahead of that advancing threat. And we cannot
1 expect to have success with 20th century technology against
2 21st century threats.
3
4 Chairman Inhofe: Which is what we have had.
5
6 Thank you very much.
7
8 Senator Reed?
9
10 Let me interrupt, Senator Reed, if I might, because we
11 do have a quorum now.
12
13 I will ask the committee to consider a list of 1,818
14 pending military nominations. All the nominations have been
15 before the committee the required length of time. Is there
16 a motion?
17
18 Senator Reed: So moved.
19
20 Senator Fischer: Second.
21
22 Chairman Inhofe: All in favor, say aye.
23 [Chorus of ayes.]
24
25 Chairman Inhofe: No?
26 [No response.]
27
28 Chairman Inhofe: It carries.
29
30 Senator Reed?
31
32 Senator Reed: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
33
34 General O'Shaughnessy, as I have indicated in my
35 opening statement, I have concerns about the use of American
36 military forces along the southern border and a hard time
37 understanding the nature of an emergency that would require
38 military forces when nowhere in the National Defense
Strategy, the worldwide threat statement from the intelligence community, nor the statement from the Commander of SOUTHCOM indicate that migrant caravans of civilians across the border are a military threat. In fact, in your opening statement, you say -- and I quote -- the threats to our nation from our southern border are not military in nature. Close quotes.

So just to be clear, in your professional opinion, does the illegal crossing of the border by civilians represent a military threat?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, first, I would say first that I do think a secure border does reduce threats to the homeland.

Now, specific to your question about is it a military threat that is coming towards us, it is not a military threat, but that is slightly than answering whether the military should be responding to the situation.

Senator Reed: Following up, in your professional opinion again, would a wall be effective in defending a military attack on the United States?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, I would say that border security is national security. I do see that any barrier in place to secure our nation does have some ramifications to our ability to defend against a military threat as well. Right now, there is not a specific military
force from the south that we are trying to take action
against.

In this particular case, though, Senator, I would say
over the last 5 months I have spent a tremendous amount of
time on the border, as you would imagine, working with our
CBP partners. And in all of those trips and discussions, it
has been clear to me that the Customs and Border Protection
personnel very much value the border protection and seeing
it, having the awareness, having some impediments, whether
that be a barrier or wall, et cetera, and then having the
ability to respond to it. And that has been fairly
universal as I have been doing my trips to the border.

Senator Reed: And they are civilian law enforcement
officials who have a law enforcement mission, and the
context of their evaluation is based upon that law
enforcement mission.

General O'Shaughnessy: That is correct, Senator.

Senator Reed: Thank you.

You have mentioned many real threats that have been
articulated in the National Defense Strategy, Russia and
China in particular. Many of them really are not focused on
our southern border but our northern border, the opening of
the Arctic, the operations by both China and Russia in the
Arctic, and also I think maintaining the capabilities of
NORAD. Those are multibillion dollar tasks. Do you think
they are of more military significance than any operation along the southern border?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, what I would say is those threats are very real. Those threats are what we are focused on within both NORTHCOM and NORAD because we do see that the evolving threat, as articulated within the NDS, very much is trying to take advantage of the northern approach. We have vulnerabilities there that we need to continue to close the gap on, and so that is a focus area for us at both NORTHCOM and NORAD.

Senator Reed: Thank you very much, sir. Again, thank you for your service.

General Hyten, I just have a few minutes. But the issue of hypersonic weapon systems are increasingly critical to us. It seems from our perspective that our adversaries are shifting more into the hypersonic realm for many reasons. One reason is that our defense systems were built for ballistic missiles, not hypersonic missiles.

Do you feel that in the short run you can deter these hypersonic vehicles?

General Hyten: So, Senator, the hypersonic activities in both China and Russia are not the majority of their activities right now. The majority are still the traditional ballistic missile, submarine, bomber threats that we can deter.
I also believe that we have the ability to deter any adversary that would deploy nuclear weapons against us. My one concern in this area is that in order to effectively deter, you have to be able to see, characterize, and attribute where the threat is coming from. And as our adversaries are moving into cruise missile technology and hypersonic technology, that challenges our ability to provide those attributes of detection and characterization. We need to move in that area to sense the threat so we can effectively deter it.

Senator Reed: Let me ask a couple questions because my time is running out.

Is your sense that they have, as we have, a legacy system of missiles, medium-range, long-range, intercontinental, but they seem to be moving with great energy into hypersonics. So that could be the weapon of choice in the future.

The second part of that is that, as I understand it -- you can clarify it -- hypersonics are not governed by the INF Treaty so that we could develop hypersonics and still remain within the treaty. So where are they going, and can we do that without leaving the INF?

General Hyten: So they are clearly moving aggressively in the area of hypersonics. Their testing is fully integrated systems, long-range and medium-range, as has been
well documented, as opposed to -- what was the second part
of the question?

Senator Reed: The second part was we can conduct
hypersonic research without violating the INF.

General Hyten: Right. That is correct. So the INF
Treaty says that it covers ballistic missiles, and ballistic
is defined as more than half -- the majority of the
trajectory of the missile is ballistic. And the hypersonic
missiles that we are talking about, less than half of that
trajectory is ballistic. Therefore, they are not covered in
the INF Treaty.

Senator Reed: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Reed.

Senator Fischer?

Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Hyten, in your prepared remarks, you said the
only way to change our strategic deterrent is to convince
our adversaries to reduce the threat and this is not
occurring. China and Russia in particular are not only
modernizing the traditional elements of their own triads,
but they are also building a myriad of additional nuclear
capabilities to threaten the United States.

In your comments to Chairman Inhofe, you explained the
desperate need that we have for modernization and to
continue with our triad, the importance that has for our
national security and for the security of this world.

I would ask you, are you aware of any intelligence or
threat assessment supporting the courses of action that are
called for from some that we need to unilaterally cut our
nuclear forces?

General Hyten: I am not.

Senator Fischer: Is it your view that taking such
actions would make us more vulnerable and reduce our ability
to deter threats?

General Hyten: It would significantly reduce our
deterrent.

Senator Fischer: We are looking at a budget in the
Department for nuclear forces and the plan for
modernization. Some people consider it a wish list just to
give the Department everything that they desire, and no
effort has been made to sort through things to look at what
we truly need to address the threats that we have. And I am
talking about need versus want here.

That is not an accurate statement, is it, that it is a
wish list?

General Hyten: I look at our nuclear capabilities, our
triad, our modernization program as the minimum essential
capabilities required to defend this nation because if we
have to defend against the most existential threat -- and
Russia and China and their capabilities are the most existential threat. So to me that is the most minimum essential capabilities that we have to build, and even at the highest rate, it will still be just roughly 6 percent of the overall defense budget. I think we can afford that security.

Senator Fischer: And do you fully support the Nuclear Posture Review as it was put forward by the Department?

General Hyten: I do, ma’am.

Senator Fischer: And do you truly believe it is needed that we continue on a path forward to reach the goals of that Nuclear Posture Review?

General Hyten: I think it is essential.

And if I could comment on the Nuclear Posture Review, I think it is very interesting to look at our approach defined in the Nuclear Posture Review and our adversaries’ approach. The elements in the Nuclear Posture Review that we have put forth all stay within our treaty responsibilities. We do not recommend developing new nuclear-powered torpedoes, new nuclear-powered cruise missiles. We do not look at anything. We believe that we can secure this nation through the modernization of the triad and the addition of a couple of small elements to respond to specific threats. In that case, it is the low-yield nuclear weapon and the submarine-launched cruise missile. But that is a very measured
response to what our adversaries are doing.

Senator Fischer: I appreciated your very clear and concise explanation of the importance and really the mission of each leg of the triad, and I am very pleased that you made that clear and concise for the record today. Thank you.

I would like to ask you a little bit about the New START treaty. In your opening statement, you note that Russia is also developing and intends to deploy novel strategic nuclear weapons like its nuclear-armed, nuclear-powered underwater, unmanned vehicle and intercontinental-range cruise missile, which Russia seeks to keep outside of existing arms control agreements.

Do you believe that these new systems, if they are deployed, should be counted under a New START treaty limitation?

General Hyten: So the way the New START treaty is defined is that the New START treaty only covers existing weapons when it was put in place in 2011. That means it covers the ballistic missiles, both submarine- and ground-launched. It covers the bombers and the cruise missiles on the bombers, and the platforms that carry them.

There is also a clause in the treaty that says if one of the parties of the treaty sees the development of new strategic arms, they can come to the bilateral consultative
commission and bring those things forward. I have not seen that happen. But we see them developing capabilities outside of that treaty, which is concerning to me.

Senator Fischer: Do you believe a decision to extend the treaty should be made on its national security merits and Russia’s behavior figures heavily into that evaluation with just the example that I gave you, that we need to be looking at these not just to renew a treaty?

General Hyten: I do, ma’am. I want Russia in every treaty. I want Russia in the INF Treaty. I want Russia in the New START treaty. I support those treaties. But they have to be parties to those treaties. It takes two to participate in a treaty at least.

Senator Fischer: And Russia has not been a party to the INF Treaty. Is that correct?

General Hyten: Russia has violated the INF Treaty for 5 years now, and despite our best efforts, we have not been able to bring them into compliance. I have talked about that to the President. I have talked about New START with the President. We all want Russia in that treaty. We want them to participate, but if they will not, we are tying our own hands to deal with the adversaries in the world, including China, who is not part of that treaty.

Senator Fischer: It does not help when your partner in a treaty is not in compliance and we remain in compliance.
General Hyten: Yes, ma'am.

Senator Fischer: Thank you, sir.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Fischer.

Senator Shaheen?

Senator Shaheen: General Hyten, General O'Shaughnessy, thank you both for your testimony this morning and for your service to the country.

I want to begin my questions with you, General O'Shaughnessy, because I understand that part of your responsibilities as the leader of a combatant command is to look at counter-drug operations at our borders. Is that correct?

General O'Shaughnessy: Ma'am, what we do is we do support law enforcement agencies in a supporting role for some of the counternarcotics work.

Senator Shaheen: And have you been made aware of any plans that would take money from what is being proposed already to fund the President’s recent directive to reprogram DOD interdiction funding to pay for a border wall?

General O'Shaughnessy: Ma'am, as you know, with a declaration of a national emergency that is now being considered, the Secretary of Defense and I, actually together with the Chairman, went down to the border this weekend on Saturday in order to see firsthand -- the Secretary to see firsthand both what our troops are doing
now, as well as looking at the border and potential applications of DOD funding for the border, to inform his decisions. Those decisions -- and that is ongoing this week. And so at this time, that is work in progress with the Acting Secretary of Defense.

Senator Shaheen: But do I understand you to say then that plans are being drawn up that would take money from those drug interdiction efforts to use for funding a wall?

General O'Shaughnessy: That is one of the options that is being looked at. It is premature at this time and that work is being done literally as we speak.

Senator Shaheen: Well, as I am sure you are aware, the opioid crisis in the United States has taken tens of thousands of lives. In New Hampshire, we have the second highest opioid overdose death rate in the country. So this is an issue that we care tremendously about. It is my understanding that most of the illicit drugs that come into this country come through ports of entry as opposed to coming across the border in other places. Is that what you have seen?

General O'Shaughnessy: Ma'am, I have seen a little bit of both. And there has recently been a DEA report that talks about the most common method of transportation through the borders is, in fact, through the POEs, but it is most common, not necessarily that all of it goes through there.
It further delineates and talks.

I will give you an example. Just this week, twice I have been to the border. In one of my trips down there, what they talked about was the TCOs that run the migrants coming are the same criminals that also run the narcotics. And what we are seeing now is a coordinated effort, for example, where they will send a large number of migrants through over the border to take the Border Patrol agents off of the line, and then they will use that as an opportunity to bring drugs across the border while the Border Patrol agency are processing the migrants. So it is a coordinated effort here that brings it all together that is very disturbing as we go forward.

Senator Shaheen: And do you agree that it is helpful to have technology and more people at our ports of entry so we can better interdict drugs coming through there?

General O'Shaughnessy: Absolutely, ma’am.

Senator Shaheen: General Hyten, I want to follow up on Senator Reed’s question about hypersonic weapons because I very much appreciated your strong statement that we are in a position to defend this country against all threats. Does that include hypersonic weapons? There have been public reports that we do not have a defense against those hypersonic weapons.

General Hyten: So our defense against hypersonics is
our nuclear deterrent. If somebody attacks us with a nuclear hypersonic capability, we have the ability to respond. Now, it is important for us to be able to track that to understand where it comes from.

So if you look at the way a hypersonic missile works, the first phase is ballistic, but it is a fairly short phase. That phase we will see. We will see the launch. We will be able to characterize it and understand it came from Russia, it came from China. But then from our sensor perspective, it basically disappears and we do not see it until the effect is delivered. We need to build sensors to be able to understand exactly where those things are going so we can better defend ourselves. You cannot defend yourself if you cannot see it.

Senator Shaheen: I am sorry. I did not mean to interrupt. But do we have any sense about how much time we have from the point at which those weapons might be launched until when they might land in the United States?

General Hyten: So it is a shorter period of time. The ballistic missile is roughly 30 minutes. A hypersonic weapon, depending on the design, could be half of that, depending on where it is launched from, the platform. It could be even less than that. So there are a lot of variables into that, but it is more challenging than a ballistic missile.
Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

The United States suspended its obligations under the INF Treaty. There has been some discussion about that. Can you talk about what our next steps might be to improve our position and to strengthen deterrence against Russia, China, and North Korea?

General Hyten: So I think the most important thing we can do is continue to modernize our nuclear triad. As long as we have nuclear capabilities that our adversaries cannot attack, they cannot take out, and they cannot eliminate, we will be able to prevent the use of nuclear weapons on our nation. I remember when I interviewed for this job with President Obama and then I interviewed with Secretary Mattis after he took over, he asked me what is the reason we have nuclear weapons. And I said the reason we have nuclear weapons is to prevent people from using nuclear weapons on us. That is exactly why we have them.

And if you do not have a robust capability and our adversaries do not believe that you are willing to respond, then you run the risk that somebody will take that step across the line that nobody ever wants to experience. That is why we have to make sure we modernize as we go forward.

Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Shaheen.
Senator Rounds?

Senator Rounds: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you for your service.

I want to follow up a little bit with regard to the nuclear triad and what makes it as important to us as it does today. Part of it is the reliability, and when we start talking about the reliability of the nuclear triad, one of the areas that I think we have identified as being in need of updating is the nuclear command and control of the different portions of the triad.

Could you share with us a little bit about, recognizing the setting that we are here, the weaknesses that we are trying to improve upon and include within that a discussion about the cyber threats that are shortcuts and that really do put our systems at risk today?

General Hyten: So one of the interesting things I have observed in my 27 months in command now -- so that is a long period of time, 2 years and 3 months. Not one time in that 2 years, 3 months have I lost connectivity with the nuclear force. Can you imagine any other electronic system in the world where that has happened? That shows you how resilient, reliable, and effective the current command and control system is.

But what concerned me about it is I really cannot effectively explain that to you because it has been built 50
years ago through different kind of pathways, different kind of structures. We look at it hard each and every day, and we know that those things are going to have to be replaced in about a decade. And so the big challenges that we have is how are we going to replace that old, ancient thing that works so well that we know works, but will not work after about another decade. How do we replace that with something that works just as well and with modern technology when we have the cyber threats we have to look at? One of the great things about being so old is the cyber threats are actually fairly minimal.

Senator Rounds: Would it be fair to say that there is not an hour that goes by in which our system of protection of our communication system is not challenged someplace along the pathways?

General Hyten: We see literally thousands, if not millions, of attacks against our systems every day. “Attacks” is defined as an unknown activity trying to get into a network. It may not be an attack, maybe just a curious person. But nonetheless, we look at all of those and make sure we defend those accordingly. So we see that broadly on the network side. It is much more secure on the nuclear side because much of that is closed off to the world.

Senator Rounds: With regard to both hypersonics and
the item of discussion lately, the torpedo, which has been
discussed in terms of the Russian advancements, in both
cases there is a question as to the vector that we receive
them from. Both are capable of movement, changes in
direction, and so forth, which really changes the way that
we defend North America because in many cases, our defenses
have been built on the closest to the most direct route from
our near-peer adversaries into the North American continent.
Can you share with us a little bit about the needs,
first of all, for the space-based capabilities that we are
going to need in order to determine where hypersonics are at
and so forth?
And, second of all, General O'Shaughnessy, I would just
ask, can you share a little bit about the changes within the
threats that a torpedo that could hit along our shorelines
could do with regard to how we have to refocus our North
American defenses as well?
So really two questions, but if you could each.
General Hyten: So real quickly, Senator, when I was a
young officer and the Soviet threat existed, we had big
radars on our southern border. We had a radar in Georgia
and a radar in Texas, Robbins and El Dorado, that were
looking south for threats that we had to worry about.
When the wall came down and Russia became our friend,
we dismantled those radars. So we have no radars that look
We have built radars and we are building a radar in Hawaii, built a radar in Alaska to defend against the Korean threat in particular to make sure we can enable General O'Shaughnessy’s missile defense.

But there are not enough islands in the world to build a radar to defend every avenue. Therefore, we have to go to space, and we can go to space now in an affordable way with distributed constellations that can look down and characterize that threat in a global perspective so we can see them wherever they come from. That is the direction we need to go.

Senator Rounds: All at risk of cyber interference.

General Hyten: All at risk of cyber interference, which is the big challenge of the day.

Senator Rounds: Thank you.

General O'Shaughnessy?

General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, sir. As we talked about earlier with respect to Arctic as the geography is no longer the buffer that it once was, I would say the same thing from the sea. It was a time where we for decades actually used the sea as a moat and really did not have to worry from the threats directly coming against the homeland from the sea.

That has fundamentally changed, as you were mentioning relative to the weapons that are being created.
Therefore, we need to go and invest ourselves in our ability to have, first, the domain awareness. And just as General Hyten had mentioned, you have to see it if you are going to be able to react to it and ultimately defeat it. Right now, we need to invest in the IUSSS, which is our integrated undersea surveillance system, which has atrophied as it relates to the continental U.S. and our ability to defend there. We need to invest in that now to be able to defend against these advanced threats that are coming from the sea.

Senator Rounds: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Rounds.

Senator Blumenthal?

Senator Blumenthal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both for your service and for your very forthright and candid answers at this hearing.

General O'Shaughnessy, is there a national emergency at the border?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, the President has declared a national emergency on the border.

Senator Blumenthal: I am asking you in your military opinion does this nation face a national emergency at the border.

General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, Senator. As the President
has declared that national emergency, he has given guidance and direction down to the Secretary of Defense and then the Acting Secretary of Defense. As that has happened, it has been parlayed to me in the form of an execution order, which makes it very clear to me of my actions that I need to take as a result of the guidance from our senior leadership.

Senator Blumenthal: Did you recommend that he declare a national emergency?

General O'Shaughnessy: Sir, I did not directly recommend either way, although I will say --

Senator Blumenthal: Were you consulted before he did it?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, I will say I have had multiple conversations, numerous conversations directly with the President with respect to the border. In addition, I have had multiple conversations as the Secretary of Defense and Acting Secretary of Defense has gone over to the White House for these conversations that have happened. And I think I feel very comfortable that as the operational commander that our perspective was considered as those decisions were made.

Senator Blumenthal: What is the threat to our national security that justifies declaring a national emergency, General?

General O'Shaughnessy: Sir, what I see from my
perspective is that a secure border will reduce the threats

to the homeland.

Senator Blumenthal: That is a general statement. But

what is it specifically at this moment in time that

justifies declaring a national emergency?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, again I would say that

the President has made that declaration. We are responsible

for that declaration --

Senator Blumenthal: You are saying in fact -- I do not

mean to be disrespectful -- that there is a national

emergency because the President has said there is a national

emergency.

General O'Shaughnessy: No, sir. What I am saying from

my perspective I get my orders from the Secretary of Defense

and the President. Those orders are very clear to me. And

just like any other mission that I am given, when I get that

legal order and I have the troops that are able to enforce

that and take those actions, I do it with the same vigor and

professionalism that I do for my ballistic missile defense,

my operational, legal, et cetera. I take that same look to

the --

Senator Blumenthal: I understand that you follow

orders and you do it well and you are proficient and expert

in your duties. And I commend you. But you did not

recommend that the President of the United States declare a
national emergency, and you have not given me as yet a
specific fact at the border now that justifies declaring a
national emergency.

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, I spent a lot of time
at the border over the last 5 months, had very specific
correspondence with our lead federal agency, in this case the
Customs and Border Protection, as well as with the
Department of Homeland Security and directly with Secretary
Nielsen on a regular, routine basis. I would defer to them
with respect to the characterization of the threat. I will
say we are trying to be a good partner to another lead
federal agency as they take on this challenge.

Senator Blumenthal: I am concerned, General, very
frankly that this administration is politicizing our
military and militarizing our immigration policy, in effect
using the troops under your command as political props both
in terms of declaring a fake emergency but also compromising
our potential security by diverting them away from other
assignments and missions that are absolutely necessary. My
understanding is that these troops were engaged in various
readiness and training exercises at the time they were
deployed. Is that correct?

General O'Shaughnessy: Sir, there have been quite a
few different deployments and units within that, but to your
point, some of them would. I will also say that many of the
units that have deployed, especially the initial salvo that went out, are actually doing exactly what their military skills are. Military police do a military police business. Engineers do an engineering business. In fact, many of them come back and talked about the readiness advantage they have for the way that they have been deployed.

That said, readiness is a key concern of ours and mine in particular, and we will continue to look at the impacts to readiness as we go forward.

Senator Blumenthal: General, recently -- I think last week as a matter of fact -- Under Secretary Rood and Vice Admiral Gilday testified that a minimum of $237 million has been spent so far on deploying both active duty troops and guard personnel at the border. They were unable to provide a total cost estimate for fiscal year 2019 even though those deployments have been extended -- correct me if I am wrong -- through September of 2019. Can you give us a cost estimate?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, I will confirm that the deployments have been extended through September of 2019.

The cost estimate -- specifically on the title X side, which is the part that is under my command and control -- was at the $132 million through the 31st of January of this year. We will continue to work with OSD who is ultimately
the one who is running the calculations with respect to the

cost.

Senator Blumenthal: In connection with the declaration

of national emergency and the diversion of money that is

necessary to build the wall, have you made a recommendation

as to military construction projects within your command

that would be stripped of funding to fund the wall?

General O'Shaughnessy: Sir, the actual funding is

being worked by the Secretary of Defense as we speak. I did

go down to the border to the El Paso area with the Secretary

just this last weekend so he would have an understanding

both of the military aspects of what our troops are doing

right now, as well as be able to talk to the Customs and

Border Protection that the folks actually doing the mission

there and be able to take that into his calculations as this

week he determines the funding that might be applied toward

resourcing a wall or other efforts on the border.

Senator Blumenthal: So the money that will be taken

from military construction projects under your command has

not yet been determined as to what specifically and where it

will come from.

General O'Shaughnessy: That is a true statement, sir.

Senator Blumenthal: Thank you.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Blumenthal.

Senator Ernst?
Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you, gentlemen, for being here today. We truly do appreciate it. I appreciate for both of you your extreme professionalism in a very difficult time. So thank you very much for stepping up. I do appreciate it.

General O'Shaughnessy, let us go back and visit a little bit about the National Guard. You happened to mention it in your comments. And this morning we had our National Guard breakfast caucus. A lot of our adjutant generals are here in town today and really excited to be here and speaking with all of their elected representation.

Can you talk a little bit about how the National Guard fits into the overall force structure here in the United States and what type of missions are they engaging in?

General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, ma'am. Thanks for the opportunity to highlight the great partnership we have with the National Guard. And I will say certainly from the NORTHCOM and NORAD perspective, they are absolutely integral and core to every single mission that we do within our commands. And it goes all the way from whether it is the aircraft that are sitting, as we speak right now, across both the CONUS as well as in Alaska or whether it goes to the command and control that is part of that, whether it is the ballistic missile defense that we have in place. Every mission set that we have right now the National Guard is
actively employed in doing that. And frankly, I can just
tell you plain and simply we could not do our mission set
without the National Guard and their contributions.

Senator Ernst: And we appreciate that very much. And
we want to utilize them as much as we can. We do know that
there are a number of troops that have been activated or
mobilized for work down on the southern border. We know
that to be true.

And I would just state that having served in the
National Guard and responding to a number of different
mobilizations, whether it is hurricane relief, whether it is
working in flood situations, or whether it is down on the
border, that our troops are actively engaging in their MOS
specific skill sets. So if you are a heavy equipment
operator, you are out there driving a dozer or you are
operating. If you are a truck driver, you are driving. You
are actually doing those skills that have been assigned to
you. So thank you for highlighting that. I think it is
great for our readiness to actually be able to engage in our
MOSs. So thank you for that.

I also want to go back. We have talked a lot with
General Hyten about modernization and our nuclear
capabilities, but let us focus a little more with you. And
what do you see the most pressing modernization requirements
for NORTHCOM?
General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, ma'am. Thank you for the opportunity to highlight this. It is actually fairly similar. The first thing is domain awareness. Over the years, we have just let atrophy our ability to understand and see what is happening in and around our nation. It was done at the time for the right reasons because we had a sanctuary. We had the ability to not have more advanced sensors and more advanced capabilities. But now that it has fundamentally changed based on the security, based on our potential adversaries, our peer strategic competitors that now have the ability to reach out and hold us at risk, we need to fundamentally relook at the way that we are maintaining our domain awareness. And that cannot be done with one single widget, one single particular program. It is going to have to be a family of systems. It is going to have to include both terrestrial based capability and a reassertion of technology in terrestrial based. It is going to have to include some air domain advances in technology and capability. But it is also absolutely going to have to include space. And we really need to accelerate our work to put sensors in space that can help us understand the domain both on the sea and in the air of the threats that are coming towards our homeland.

In particular, the Arctic is an area that we really need to focus on and really look at investing. That is no
longer a buffer zone. We need to be able to operate there. We need to be able to communicate there. We need to be able to have a presence there that we have not invested in in the same way that our adversaries have. And they see that as a vulnerability from us, whereas it is becoming a strength for them and it is a weakness for us, and we need to flip that equation.

Senator Ernst: Yes. And you mentioned the Arctic, and I am sure that my colleague, Senator Sullivan, will have a lot of great questions there.

But when we talk modernization, have we identified a system to replace the aging northern warning system?

General O'Shaughnessy: Ma’am, we have a study that is going on right now. It is a bi-national study. It is being done by our Air Combat Command within the United States Air Force, as well as with Canada, that is going to help us. But I will tell you that north warning system right now -- the last hardware insertion of technology was 1985. That needs to be invested in, and again, it needs to be part not just of advancing that but also doing the all-domain awareness in addition to the terrestrial based.

Senator Ernst: Yes, I appreciate that.

And, General Hyten, thank you so much for hosting me last year at STRATCOM. I really appreciated the tour and the time you took to educate me on your mission set there.
Can you talk a little bit about the move that is ongoing at Offutt Air Force Base?

General Hyten: Senator, I am glad to be able to sit here and say we are actually getting ready to move into the building. It has been a long time. It is a couple years late. The Guard did an amazing job. We brought in over 20 engineering and installation squadrons from the Guard to help us recapture some schedule. They saved over $70 million of the taxpayers’ money, and they saved us probably more than that in schedule. So we are getting ready to move in. I think we will be able to start next week, and I hope to have the opening ceremonies this October. And that will be a big day because we will be able to do our mission even better. That will become the hub of nuclear command and control.

Senator Ernst: Outstanding. Gentlemen, thank you both so much for your leadership.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Ernst.

Senator Heinrich?

Senator Heinrich: General O'Shaughnessy, forgive me for jumping back and forth between Intel and this committee this morning. There is a little bit of something going on over there as well.

I wanted to return to something that Senator Blumenthal came up and just make sure I have the correct information
that you were not consulted by the White House before the
decision to use military construction dollars to pay for the
national emergency.

General O'Shaughnessy: No, sir. That was not my
response. Specifically, we have been in dialogue. I have
been in dialogue with the President all the way down for
multiple occasions, to include in coordination with the
Secretary of Defense. And the actual decision of how that
funding will be placed is actually what the Secretary of
Defense is actually working through literally right now.

Senator Heinrich: Were you consulted before the
announcement?

General O'Shaughnessy: With multiple dialogues talking
about the border, talking about the situation that we see.

Senator Heinrich: Is that a yes?

General O'Shaughnessy: Our ability to have the
operational perspective known was absolutely present.

Senator Heinrich: My question is were you consulted as
to using military construction dollars as the source of
funding to pay for the national emergency efforts?

General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, in fact, with the
Secretary of Defense.

Senator Heinrich: That is a decision you support.

General O'Shaughnessy: I gave my best military advice
to the Secretary of Defense, to include going down,
physically going down, with him to the border to make sure he understood the operational perspective.

Senator Heinrich: If those dollars do flow to that priority rather than what they were appropriated for and authorized for, what impact of the cancellation of some of those construction projects have whether it is for military housing or air traffic control improvements or even runway upgrades? What impact would that have on military morale?

General O'Shaughnessy: I think right now, Senator, that is premature. I think as we look at it, that is exactly the types of things that the Secretary is looking at. He is looking at it from what is the right balance, what is the right use of those funds, and in fact, what would the correct funds be, appropriate funds, to use given the direction that he has been given.

Senator Heinrich: Given the Constitution, I would suggest that is a job for Congress.

General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, sir.

Senator Heinrich: General Hyten, DOD’s initial requirements for plutonium pits are to produce 30 pits per year at Los Alamos by 2026. Are you and NNSA still laser-focused on making that happen?

General Hyten: We are laser-focused on 30 by 2026 and 80 by 2030, and my requirement is that. I never said where they had to be done, but if we do not get 30 in Los Alamos,
Senator Heinrich: If personnel and scientific expertise were shifted from one place to another during that effort, what would be the potential impact for the near-term goals?

General Hyten: So I have told the Secretary of Energy, as well as the Administrator of the NNSA, that we cannot move anything out of Los Alamos into Savannah River that would take our eyes off of the 30 in 2026. And I am going down to Los Alamos and sending my people down to Los Alamos to make sure that that focus is always there because, again, if we cannot get to 30 by 2026 at Los Al, we cannot get there at all.

Senator Heinrich: Well, I appreciate your focus on this effort. It is very welcome, and you are always welcome at Los Alamos, as you know.

I also understand that the administration, General Hyten, is currently reviewing whether it will seek to extend the New START agreement that limits U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear weapons to 1,550 treaty-accountable warheads with additional limits, obviously, on delivery vehicles. Is that information accurate? Is that correct?

General Hyten: We are looking at that. The President asks me about that every time I see him. It is high on his mind. Again, the issue there is the efforts that Russia has
going on right now that are not elements of the New START. The torpedo, the cruise missile, the hypersonics all are not part of that treaty. We believe that we would like to have all nuclear weapons as part of a future strategic arms treaty. That is my desire. So I want Russia in that treaty. I want Russia in the INF Treaty, but if they will not participate --

Senator Heinrich: I share that sentiment and certainly hopefully we can move to a world where there is control on more weapon systems rather than simply getting rid of the tools that we have to, in theory, get something that is perfect and more inclusive.

Does New START provide significant benefits to U.S. national security interests? And if so, what would those be?

General Hyten: So no treaty is perfect, and New START is certainly not perfect. But what it gives me at STRATCOM, it gives me two very important things. Number one, it puts a limit on the basics of their strategic force. So I understand what the limits are and I can position my force accordingly so I can always be ready to respond. And maybe as important, it also gives me insight through the verification process of exactly what they are doing and what those pieces are. Having that insight through my forces and our partners is unbelievably important for me to understand
what Russia is doing. But we do not have insight into all
the other things that are going on right now. That will be
the challenge.

Senator Heinrich: If we were to lose that insight
without gaining more global insight, would that be a step
forward or a step back?

General Hyten: That is the balance that will be in the
decision that the country has to make as we go forward on
the benefits of New START. I would like everything on the
table.

Senator Heinrich: Thank you, General.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Heinrich.

Senator Sullivan?

Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, gentlemen, thanks for your exceptional service of
both of you and all the hard work you are doing.

I want to talk about the Arctic and missile defense,
but I actually wanted just to add a little bit to the
exchange you had with my colleague, Senator Blumenthal, who
I have a lot of respect for and work with on a lot of
issues.

But, General O'Shaughnessy, let me ask. How many
Americans were killed by drug overdoses last year? Do you
know?

General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, Senator, I do. 72,000 in
the last year and 70,000 the year before.

Senator Sullivan: So more than all the men and women killed in the Vietnam War just last year, 72,000 Americans.

General O'Shaughnessy: That is correct, sir.

Senator Sullivan: And that is opioids, heroin, meth.

How much of the heroin in America comes from Mexico?

General O'Shaughnessy: Sir, there is a significant portion that comes up through the southern approaches.

Senator Sullivan: The number I have heard is over 90 percent.

General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, sir.

Senator Sullivan: Okay. So if that is not an emergency, 72,000 dead Americans killed by opioids and heroin in 1 year, I have no freakin’ idea what an emergency is. So that is just my view on that. Do you have any comment on that? Is that an emergency, 72,000 dead Americans?

General O'Shaughnessy: Sir, I would say that clearly this is a national issue that we have to take on with a whole-of-government approach.

Senator Sullivan: Yes, okay. Thank you.

Let me talk about the Arctic. By the way, General O'Shaughnessy, I really want to commend you. You are by far and away the NORTHCOM Commander who has actually put this on the radar as a serious issue. Just today in your testimony
about so many of the threats operating both in the Arctic and passing through I think is a wakeup call. This committee has been doing a lot of work in that regard. Let me ask a couple issues with regard to capabilities.

The Russians have a fleet of polar icebreakers. It is 40. They are building 14 more, including nuclear-powered icebreakers, weaponized icebreakers. We are finally getting our act together on that. Last year’s NDAA authorized six. This past appropriations bill recently signed by the President has about close to $700 million on the first one. But do we have the required capabilities to answer the Russian and, by the way, Chinese challenge in the Arctic? And if so, what more capabilities do we need?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, you started with icebreakers, and I will highlight that as well. On paper, we have four icebreakers. In reality we have one that is actually a polar level.

Senator Sullivan: We have two and one is broken.

Right?

General O'Shaughnessy: Two. They are sister ships. We have one that is cannibalized and one that is --

Senator Sullivan: They were commissioned in the early 1970s.

General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, sir. They are 43 years old.
Senator Sullivan: Have you ever seen those icebreakers?

General O'Shaughnessy: I have been on the Polar Star.

Senator Sullivan: They are a disgrace to the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States. Are they not?

General O'Shaughnessy: Yes, sir. And just this year alone, for example, as the Polar Star was going down to Antarctica, she had multiple major casualties to include a propeller shaft seal that went out that ended up in flooding. Its incinerator actually caught on fire. So there was a fire and flooding on that ship.

Senator Sullivan: Yes. I commend the men and women of the Coast Guard who try to keep that ship afloat, but it is a disgrace. You put men and women wearing the uniform of our nation on a ship that is that old and dangerous. But I interrupted you. Please go on.

General O'Shaughnessy: So in that regard, we are working closely with the Coast Guard and, of course, the U.S. Navy who is helping the Coast Guard get the six icebreakers, at least three that will be polar-capable icebreakers. And those are absolutely critical for us even within the Department of Defense even though it is ultimately for the Coast Guard to be able to clear the access for us to be able to have operations in the Arctic.
So that is a high priority for us in U.S. Northern Command.

Senator Sullivan: Let me ask another question. Again, this committee has focused a lot on the Arctic, which I appreciate in a bipartisan way. We mandated this strategy that had to come out of DOD. 2 years ago we mandated the concept of a strategic Arctic port. The Secretary of the Navy recently testified that we need a strategic Arctic port to protect our interests in the Arctic. Do you agree with him?

General O'Shaughnessy: I had a conversation with the Secretary of the Navy just last week on this regard. Clearly what we need -- I will use an example. We have a requirement for fuel north of Dutch Harbor. Right now we do not have access to that. Nome, if we were able to make Nome a deepwater port, would serve that requirement.

Senator Sullivan: So you think we need that the way he said that?

General O'Shaughnessy: I think we need to ultimately have the ability to have the infrastructure to allow us to do the operations. A deepwater port would certainly be part of that going forward.

Senator Sullivan: General Hyten, let me ask you. You have been a great advocate on missile defense. The Trump administration recently put out its Missile Defense Review. The President actually announced it at the Pentagon with the
Vice President and SecDef, the Secretary of Defense.

Again, this committee has been doing a lot of work in regard to that.

Do you agree with the priorities outlined in the Missile Defense Review? And can you just briefly talk about what other areas we need and how Alaska is the cornerstone of our nation’s missile defense in terms of LRDR radar, missile fields, and other areas that we need to continue to build on?

General Hyten: So I agree with the findings of the Missile Defense Review. The thing I liked most about the Missile Defense Review it was not just a ballistic missile defense review. It was a missile defense review looking at the entire spectrum of capabilities that we have to have not just against ballistic missiles but all the missile threats that we face. It talked about getting left of launch, as well as the response after the launch.

When you look at Alaska, all you have to do is look at a globe and look at where Korea is and look at where the United States is and you understand how important Alaska. That is why we are putting the long-range discrimination radar in Alaska. That is why that is going to be a critical portion.

I continue to look at the radar architecture and be concerned about vulnerabilities in that architecture. That
is why I think we need to augment the ground element, as General O'Shaughnessy talked about earlier with the space element, and then defend that space element as well. That will allow us to see, characterize, and hopefully discriminate the threat so we can make more efficient use of our interceptors in Alaska.

Senator Sullivan: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Sullivan.

Senator Peters?

Senator Peters: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, gentlemen, thank you for your testimony.

I want to pick up on a comment made by my colleague, Senator Sullivan, about the Coast Guard icebreakers, and I would be remiss if I did not take this opportunity to mention we have a very aging fleet in the Great Lakes as well. In fact, I was on a Coast Guard ship earlier last week, and it was well over 50 years old. You can only keep those things running so long and you start running out of bubblegum and tape and you need to have it replaced. And so hopefully we will be able to recapitalize that fleet in a much broader way.

General O'Shaughnessy, you have a very big responsibility and an important one with a very large AOR. I am sure you have a lot of sleepless nights thinking about
various threats. What do you believe is the most significant threat to your AOR? We have heard a number of different ones here today, but I am just curious as to the one that you think most about.

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, I think right now it in the near term is Russia. As we look at the advancement that Russia has made, it is not only the capability and the capacity that they have, but it is also the investments they made, the training they are doing, and the patterns of behavior that clearly show they intend to not only hold us at risk but in conflict, they would actually take action on the conventional side as well as on the nuclear side potentially. And it is not just a cyber threat. This is a kinetic threat with the cruise missiles that we talked about. And we need to invest in our ability to defend if we are going to be able to maintain our ability to defend. And that is something that I think we need to have a sense of urgency on.

Senator Peters: Well, I appreciate that. And that is our number one threat to the homeland in your estimation. However, we just recently deployed troops to our southern border. And then as you know, as we have talked about here, we have a national emergency that was declared on February 15th.

My question to you, General, is we sent troops to the
border last October and into November. Could you tell us how the threat environment has changed from November to February? Have you seen an increased threat?

General O'Shaughnessy: Well, first, I would say for the specific clarification of the threat we rely on our Customs and Border Protection personnel in close cooperation with them. So I would defer the specifics of that actual threat to them.

What I will say it is a dynamic that we are seeing where the response that we did in October was to a very large caravan, and we were tasked to do a request for assistance from the Department of Homeland Security to respond very rapidly. And we did so. And I am very proud of the response that was made with our military members taking the orders they were given, the mission that they were given, and executing it with the professionalism that you would expect of our military members.

Senator Peters: I apologize, General. But just from that point forward, what has happened since then to now? What have you seen?

General O'Shaughnessy: Sir, we have seen the caravans are not as large, but they are still out there. And I would use the example of a couple weeks ago where we had to respond to Eagle Pass where we had migrants show up there where the Customs and Border Protection asked for our
assistance again to be able to harden the port of entry and
provide them assistance in their ability to respond.

Senator Peters: Well, I think we all agree that border
security is incredibly important. I do not think you will
find any disagreement with anybody on this committee. I sit
on the Homeland Security Committee as well. It is clearly a
nonpartisan issue. We all believe that borders must be
secure. It is a fundamental aspect of our government to
keep the homeland safe.

The question is usually how do you do that in the most
effective way and understand that we have to do it in a way
that is respectful of taxpayer dollars as well. And so that
I think is really the crux of what we are deciding right
now.

You mentioned that you were part of the consultation
with the administration as to the need for a national
emergency. I would assume, because of your repeated trips
down to the border, you have seen significant gaps from
Customs and Border Patrol. However, as you mentioned
earlier in your testimony, the DEA has come up with a report
that shows that most of the drugs, for example, that are
coming across the border are coming through ports of entry.
They are not folks walking across the open desert, and if
they are, there are probably much more effective ways to
track those folks down either with unmanned aerial vehicles,
sensors, National Guard troops. And I understand those National Guard troops use Department of Defense drug interdiction program money to go down there. And yet now I hear that that drug interdiction money may be diverted to something else.

Could you explain why you think drug interdiction money is simply not an effective way of dealing with drugs coming across the border and we should look at other avenues?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, what I would say is that we have been in consultation with the Secretary of Defense on exactly these issues. With our role within USNORTHCOM, we have JTF-North, for example, that is dedicated to the counternarcotics mission. That gets funding through the 284 money that you are alluding to. That is something that we are articulating up to the Secretary of Defense with the aspect of saying we want to preserve that ability for that particular program, as just an example of what the inputs the Secretary of Defense is getting as he works through what is the appropriate way to work the funding and what is the report and response from the Department of Defense to this demand signal.

Senator Peters: So you are recommending that that money stay in place. That would not be diverted.

General O'Shaughnessy: I am talking about very specifically the USNORTHCOM perspective of a very small
sliver of the overall funding piece that needs to be considered within the broader context of the requirements that the Secretary of Defense has been given.

Senator Peters: Great. Thank you.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you.

Senator Hawley?

Senator Hawley: General Hyten and General O'Shaughnessy, thank you for being here. Thank you for your exemplary service, and thank you for the service of the men and women under your respective commands.

General Hyten, I want to go back and talk about something you have touched on several times already this morning, the need for the modernization of our nuclear arsenal. And I want to focus in on, in particular, one aspect of that as it relates to low-yield tactical nuclear weapons.

We know that Russia and China, our two peer or near-peer competitors, have been investing significantly in these types of weapons. Russia, for instance, in anti-ship cruise missiles, nuclear torpedoes, nuclear depth charges. China, other nuclear weapons designed for regional conflict like the DF-21, DF-26 ballistic missiles. And for these reasons, of course, the Nuclear Posture Review that was released last February called for us, the United States, to deploy new low-yield tactical warheads.
Can you explain? Do you agree with that assessment by the Nuclear Posture Review? And can you explain why this type of weapon might be important given the strategic choices that we are now facing?

General Hyten: Senator, I do agree with the Nuclear Posture Review. I had a lot of input into creation of those recommendations. The thing I liked best about the Nuclear Posture Review and our National Defense Strategy is it is a threat-based document. And when you have a threat specifically in Russia, which is my biggest concern, with low-yield nuclear weapons where they have deployed an order of magnitude more of those than we even have in our inventory, we need to be able to quickly respond to that and provide the President a spectrum of options in order to do that. Now, we have low-yield nuclear weapons in the air leg of our triad, but not in another leg of our triad. And I talked about the attributes before about timely, responsive. We want to make sure the President always has a responsive option to respond.

So we are recommending that, but it is important to note that is inside the New START treaty. Russia is building those outside the New START treaty. We are going to take missiles off of the submarines, take big weapons off the submarines, put little weapons on the submarine, put it back on. We will still have 1,550 deployed nuclear weapons,
but the total yield will be smaller. I do not think that is
escalatory in any way. I think that will allow the
President to have options to manage the threat effectively.

Senator Hawley: Thank you for that.

I wonder if you could go on, General Hyten, and just explain how it is that deploying new low-yield nuclear weapons can, if we do it effectively, if we do it right, actually reduce the risk of nuclear conflict.

General Hyten: Because the adversary watches exactly what we have and then they look for gaps. And if they think they can deploy a nuclear weapon and get away with it, they very well may do that. The Russian doctrine is escalate to win, and if they execute that doctrine as they have said -- and I have to believe them at their word -- if they execute that doctrine as they have said and they may consider if something is going bad on the battlefield somewhere to deploy a low-yield nuclear weapon and the United States will not respond because if we do that, we have to respond with a high-yield nuclear weapon, they might take that chance. But if they see we have a low-yield nuclear weapon, they will not go that direction. That is the whole theory of deterrence is if they see an effective response to that, they will not use that weapon.

Senator Hawley: Given that, what role, General, what place do you think that the use of these tactical low-yield
nuclear weapons ought to have in our own sort of strategic doctrine? I think you have touched on it, but explain a little bit more.

General Hyten: So the most important thing to realize is they are deterrent weapons. The first use of a deterrent weapon is to make sure the weapon is not used against you. Now, in order for that to happen, the adversary has to look at that and see a rational response. That would be the second priority is to use that in response to that option. But the goal of that weapon is to make sure that weapon is not used on you.

Senator Hawley: This is particularly important, is it not, General, as we face peer competitors, near-peer competitors who may well have significantly larger conventional military forces than we do so that we do not find ourselves in a position where a disadvantage that we may have with conventional forces tempts aggression. Is that fair to say?

General Hyten: So I never want to be at a disadvantage in any element of our architecture. I mean, I think it was Senator Inhofe, Senator Reed talked about disadvantages or places our adversaries are ahead of us. As far as I am concerned, that should never happen in the United States of America. But it is happening. So I never want to be there. On the conventional side, we are still the most
dominant conventional force on the planet. And if we can move our capabilities into an operation, we will dominate the battlefield today. That is where the threat of a low-yield nuclear weapon becomes at risk because an adversary may see the opportunity to deploy conventional forces and have that short-term advantage, but eventually that advantage will turn and that is where that escalation risk exists and we have to be able to respond.

Senator Hawley: Very good. Thank you so much, General.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Hawley.

Senator Kaine?

Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thanks to our witnesses.

I want to return -- I am sorry that Senator Sullivan left. I want to return and say that 72,000 deaths, overdose deaths, is an emergency. 40,000 people died in 2017 by gun violence in the United States, murders and suicides. That would seem to me to be an emergency.

The question is not whether 72,000 drug deaths or 40,000 gun deaths are an emergency. The question is should we allow a President to unilaterally declare an emergency and to take $6 billion out of the Pentagon’s budget to apply to a situation, General O'Shaughnessy, that you said the
threats to our nation from our southern border are not military in nature. So the question that Congress and the Senate is going to grapple with in the next couple weeks is will we allow a President to declare that drug overdose deaths are an emergency, but the threat is not military and still will take $6 billion out of the defense budget to deal with it because if we set that precedent, I could certainly foresee a day when a President is going to say 40,000 gun deaths a year are an emergency, and why do we not take the money out of the Pentagon budget to deal with that? If we let the President take $6 billion out of the Pentagon’s budget to deal with a non-military threat of drugs, then you guys are going to see money taken out of your budget for other emergencies as well. And that is the vote that we are all going to be casting in the next couple of weeks.

General O'Shaughnessy, I applaud the honesty of your written testimony. It is 23 pages of testimony. The first section of it is threats, five pages. You identify six threats, nothing to do with the southern border. The second section is defending the homeland, eight pages of testimony, four different domains. The last is southern approaches, and you acknowledge that it is not a military threat. And you focus in your three paragraphs of testimony on illegal narcotics.

So the question we are going to have to vote on is do
we want the President to take Pentagon money for a threat
that you acknowledge is non-military in nature.

The President proposes $6 billion. The first chunk is
$2.5 billion of drug interdiction money. And the Pentagon
account on drug interdiction does not have $2.5 billion in
it. Right now, an ABC news this morning article -- one of
the two Pentagon funds the Trump administration plans to tap
to help secure the southern border after declaring a
national emergency has nowhere near the $2.5 billion that is
projected for use. It has $85 million, not $2.5 billion.
It has $85 million that is available. And so the Pentagon
is saying that they are going to have to reprogram or shift
money from other accounts into the account to make the $2.5
billion.

I gather, General O'Shaughnessy, from your testimony
earlier you do not yet know where the Pentagon plans to find
the money to shift into the drug interdiction account to
then take to use for the President’s emergency. Is that
correct?

General O'Shaughnessy: That is correct, Senator. That
is beyond the purview of USNORTHCOM. That is something that
OSD is working with the joint staff.

Senator Kaine: Within the Pentagon but not NORTHCOM.

General O'Shaughnessy: That is correct.

Senator Kaine: Secondly, I want to make sure I
understand your testimony. So that is the $2.5 billion.

The $2.5 billion to be taken is a fund that has $85 million in it. And so there is apparently an attempt to shift other Pentagon monies into it. We do not yet know where it will come from.

The second chunk is $3.5 billion out of MILCON, military construction, projects. General O'Shaughnessy, in NORTHCOM I gather there are ongoing military construction projects as well as projects that you would like to do that either are further out or not yet funded. Correct?

General O'Shaughnessy: That is a true statement, Senator.

Senator Kaine: And I gather from your testimony you have not yet been asked to provide a list of NORTHCOM MILCON projects that you would propose or you would recommend to be reduced, eliminated, or delayed. Is that correct?

General O'Shaughnessy: We are actually working very closely with the Secretary of Defense’s office with respect to the prioritization of that, not necessarily specifically related to this issue, but we have had communication with them with our prioritization of those MILCON dollars.

Senator Kaine: I want to make sure I understand this. Obviously, NORTHCOM is always going to have a list of MILCON projects because we are working on the NDAA and that will be in it. So you will always have a list. But have you been
asked specifically in connection with this proposal to take
$3.5 billion out of MILCON, give us your recommendations as
the NORTHCOM Commander about projects that should be
reduced, eliminated, or delayed?

General O'Shaughnessy: Again, Senator, I believe that
is the process that is actually ongoing this very week, and
that is why I was really pleased that the Acting Secretary
of Defense took the time to go down, see firsthand, and then
have a personal insight as he works through those very
difficult challenges and decisions that he will make as he
ultimately responds to the direction of the President.

Senator Kaine: Have you made recommendations or not?
Has NORTHCOM made recommendations about MILCON projects that
should be reduced, eliminated, or delayed?

General O'Shaughnessy: We have not specifically to
this particular effort as of yet, but it is still premature
and pre-decisional at this point.

Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Kaine.

Senator Blackburn?

Senator Blackburn: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you all for being here.

I know that the hypersonics have been discussed. And,
General Hyten, I wanted to come back to that issue. It is
important to us in Tennessee because of Arnold Air Force and
the work that has been done there. They have been really a
key contributor, if you will, to our nation’s aerospace
program. They are very important to us in Tennessee, and we
are pleased that they are there. And you have discussed
some of the program and the advances there, the operational
capabilities.

But I want to come back to one thing that they have
mentioned a couple of times, and it is having both the
talent and the numbers of individuals to really push forward
into the hypersonics and into that capacity and, General
O'Shaughnessy, as you said, 21st century warfare and having
what is there. So let us take just a minute and focus on
the talent and the numbers to deliver on that mission.

General Hyten: So, Senator, Arnold Air Force Station
is a treasure to this country. The wind tunnel capabilities
that they have there are unique, and they allow us to do
things that we really cannot do anywhere else.

We have a challenge at Arnold and a challenge across
our DOD labs and across our Department of Energy labs in
attracting, recruiting, and retaining the kind of
engineering talent that is required to move these kind of
programs forward.

What I have learned, though, is when you can explain to
the youth of America the kind of work that you can do by
coming to places like Arnold, they will come. They will
come because they love to do that kind of fascinating work. That is the same with Los Alamos or Livermore or Sandia or Rome Labs or any of our national labs. The key is then to be able to retain them because they will be trained and they will learn unique skills and they can go out and do anything. So we have to make sure that we have the compensation that matches their talent, that we compete with the civilian sector in doing that. But the most important thing is we can provide them fascinating work.

The one challenge I would say that we have to work at together -- and the Department of Defense is looking at this; Congress is looking at this -- is the time it takes some of these employees to get their clearances has been very de-motivational for new employees and it is causing some of them to leave because it takes years in some cases for them to get the high level security clearances to work those issues. Now, the Secretary, Secretary Mattis, now Secretary Shanahan, have looked at this issue directly, and they are working it directly with the broader government. But that is an issue that we want to continue to take on.

Senator Blackburn: Kind of in the same vein, let us talk about USSPACECOM and that capacity, that mission, the transition of that mission. How are you approaching this so that going from STRATCOM to SPACECOM that is a seamless transition, and that we keep our focus on those threats that
are coming to us that we are going to need to -- the adversary threats we will need to address?

General Hyten: So two pieces of the answer to that question, Senator, is that, number one, I am still the senior military person in space still serving active duty. And so I care desperately about space. But as the Commander of Strategic Command, space will never be my number one priority. In fact, right now it is about number three. The nuclear modernization and operations is number one. Nuclear command and control is number two. Space is my third priority. And the importance of space in today’s day and age, that is not good to have that priority. So we need a command that focuses on that and the commander of that command, whoever that person is, he or she must have a focus on space 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. And that is why we are standing up a Space Command.

One of the ways we are going to make sure we do that because I was around when we transitioned the old U.S. Space Command to U.S. Strategic Command in 2002 -- now we are kind of going back the other way. And I watched us almost break the space mission when we did that because we just haphazardly slapped billets and said these 500-plus billets are going to move from Colorado to Omaha, and I will just say the people did not come with them automatically.

So we are going to continue to perform a lot of the
mission for Space Command in the STRATCOM headquarters. It will be Space Command East. Omaha is east in this case if it is in Colorado. If it is in Florida, it will be Space Command West. If it is in Alabama, it will be Space Command West. Wherever it ends up, we are going to continue to support that because we do not know the final destination of where that is going to be. So we cannot break the mission because we have threats to deal with today. So we will make sure we cover both of those issues in dealing with the standup of Space Command.

Senator Blackburn: My time has expired. And I am going to submit for the record a QFR for you on supply chain integrity dealing with the space systems. And I thank you each for your service and for being here today.

General Hyten: Thank you, ma’am.

Chairman Inhofe: Without objection, it will be part of the record. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]
Chairman Inhofe: Senator Warren?

Senator Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you both for being here today.

Senator Heinrich asked about New START, and I just want to go back and dig a little deeper, if I can, on that.

General Hyten, in March 2017, you testified in front of the House Armed Services Committee, and you said -- and I quote here -- I have stated for the record in the past and I will state again that I am a big supporter of the New START agreement. Is that still your view?

General Hyten: It is still my view. I have said it multiple times. I am a big supporter of the New START agreement. I want ideally in my view all nuclear weapons to be part of the next phase of New START and not just the identified weapons that are in the New START treaty now.

Senator Warren: I understand you would like to see an expanded New START. Can you just say a word about why you think New START is so important?

General Hyten: It gives me two things at STRATCOM. Number one, it gives a cap on their strategic baseline nuclear weapons and their ballistic missiles, both submarine and ICBM, as well as their bombers so I understand what that is. And also, just as important, it gives me insight through the verification regime to their real capabilities.

The INF Treaty, for example, does not have a verification
regime anymore. The New START treaty does, which gives me insight into the Russian capabilities. Those are hugely beneficial to me. They just have to be balanced against all the other things Russia is doing outside of the treaty.

Senator Warren: Right.

Actually can you just say a word more about that, about the inspection process and what benefit that gives to the United States?

General Hyten: So both Russia and the United States, as party to that treaty, have the ability to declare a New START inspection. The Russians can land in our country, and I get a notification that they landed at a port of entry somewhere. San Francisco is one that they land at frequently. And then once they land there, they can declare wherever they want to go in this country to look at our nuclear force. We have the same ability in Russia to land at a port of entry in Russia and then go wherever we want to look at their capabilities. They open it up to verify that the right number of weapons are there, the right kind of weapons are there. That gives us insight into those capabilities, gives them insight into our capabilities and improves our overall strategic stability.

Senator Warren: And so I presume, based on what you have said, that if we either lost that capacity or the capacity was greatly diminished, that you would like to try
to find another way to be able to conduct that same kind of
inspection and know what is going on.

In this setting, how confident are you that we could
replace those inspections, the data exchanges, and the
notifications that are now in New START with other
verification tools in a timely and cost effective manner?

General Hyten: So we have very good intelligence
capabilities, but there is really nothing that can replace
the eyes-on/hands-on ability to look at something. And so
we have to do that. But there are elements that they have
that are not elements of the New START treaty that we do not
have this insight into.

Senator Warren: I understand that you want to see this
expanded. I am just trying to hang onto what we have got
and then talk a little bit about the expansion.

Let me just ask, in your view would it be easier or
harder to provide an effective deterrent without a
verifiable arms control agreement such as New START in
place?

General Hyten: So I believe in any situation I can
foresee in the next 10 years I can provide an effective
defense as long as I have a capable triad with the weapons
that we have defined. I get concerned 10 years and beyond
that with torpedoes, with cruise missiles, with hypersonics
that they could go a completely other direction that we
would have difficulty. But I do not have any problem standing here and saying I can defend this nation today and I think the commander after me can, but I worry about the commander after the commander after the next.

Senator Warren: So the question I am trying to ask, though, is it easier or harder when you have got the tools available to you in New START.

General Hyten: Today it is absolutely easier.

Senator Warren: That is the part I am going for. So this is a part of what you are able to accomplish.

Do you support the extension of New START?

General Hyten: So I have stated for the record in the past -- I have not changed my opinion -- I support New START, but you have to have a partner that wants to participate in New START.

Senator Warren: I know.

General Hyten: It is going to be like INF. We have to have a partner that can participate. It is a two-party treaty. And if the Russians continued to build the capabilities outside the New START treaty that are not accountable and will not come to the table under the treaty -- there is an element of the treaty that says if there is a new strategic arm that appears, they should bring that to the table and discuss it. If they will not do that, then that causes me to have concerns.
Senator Warren: And I appreciate that. I think you are exactly right when you identify who is going to come to the table. As you know, New START expires in just 2 years. The administration has already ripped up another nuclear arms treaty with Russia, the INF Treaty, and it appears to be running out the clock on the New START without any plans for a follow-up agreement. If this happens, this is going to be the first time since 1972 that there are no arms control agreements between the United States and Russia.

My view is we have a moral and strategic responsibility to do everything in our power to prevent a new nuclear arms race, and at a minimum I think that means working with Russia to try to get back to the negotiating table, try to get them back into compliance with the INF Treaty and working on a New START treaty. This just seems to me to be common sense arms control and to make America safe.

General Hyten: So I pay close attention to what the State Department is doing, and they are reaching out to the Russians and the Russians are not answering favorably.

Senator Warren: Well, I hope we can get them to the table, and I am glad to hear that you are in favor of that. Thank you.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Warren.

Senator Cramer?

Senator Cramer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you, Generals, both of you, for your service and for your testimony today.

Since we talked a couple of weeks ago, General Hyten, I have completed my tour of bases in North Dakota. I went to all of them. And I want you to know that while Minot and Grand Forks were grateful, the Cavalier was especially grateful that you asked specifically about them, and it was very encouraging I will tell you. I am new to this committee, as you know, and I have sat through enough briefings that have made me adequately frightened, but I feel much better having gone to the bases, including our National Guard ISR and Global Hawk bases. It is fantastic.

With regard to modernization, General Hyten, I agree with you, that one of the things that concerns me is not so much a capability of modernizing, but the speed with which we are able to do it. When we think about the history of 60 years ago being able to build in 5 years, not just develop but create, produce hundreds of ICBMs, I do not even know if we could do that today. The timeline scares me.

Do you have any specific thoughts on the bureaucracy itself and how we can improve the bureaucracy and then, as I always like to say, what we as policymakers can do to help either knock down the hurdles or send the right signals so that we can meet the timeline that is facing us?

General Hyten: So, Senator, thanks for going to Minot,
Cav, and Grand Forks. They are pretty special places. And when you see the people, you should feel very, very good about this country. They are amazing people.

But when you look at the challenges that we face in the future, I think Senator Peters asked General O'Shaughnessy what kept him awake at night, and General O'Shaughnessy answered Russia. What keeps me awake at night mostly is actually ourselves because somehow we have lost the ability to go fast. I do not know where we lost that, but somewhere we lost the ability to go fast, and we better regain that because right now we are dominant. And I can guarantee you today that STRATCOM can keep this nation secure, but we have to make sure that is the case. So we have to figure out how to go fast again. And so I can give you a lot of recommendations. I will be glad to do it offline, but I will give you one here.

The one recommendation I have is that we have to, once again, empower the people that actually build stuff. We have to empower in the military the 06 program directors. That is colonels and Navy captains that actually build things. Over the last 25 years, we have taken all the authorities away from them, and in many cases, they are not even staying in the military anymore. They go out to do other things in industry. But those engineers that want to go build things -- that is what built this amazing force
that I get to command today. So we have to go back again
and do everything we can to empower down at that level them
to make the decisions, how to spend the money, how to
deliver the capability, how to test the capability, all
those kind of issues because they will do it more
efficiently than when they have to go through 18 layers of
bureaucracy above them.

And, oh, by the way, if they do fail, we will fire them
and find somebody else. That is the other thing that is
beneficial about having the authority in the right place.
Now you know who is responsible. So right now, it is almost
impossible to tell who is even responsible because there are
so many layers of bureaucracy.

Senator Cramer: So can Congress do something about
that or is this --

General Hyten: Congress has started down that path.

Your committee, as well as the House Armed Services
Committee, in the last 2 years have made significant
improvements in moving things back from the Office of the
Secretary of Defense back down to the services. I have now
watched the services both on the Air Force and the Navy
side, which are mostly in my command -- I do not watch the
Army as close -- move things back out again to the 06’s. So
continuing that process, continuing to look at that through
this committee and to push those authorities back down -- I
think that is the biggest thing that would help.

Senator Cramer: General O'Shaughnessy, could you comment on, I guess, the same basic principles within the context of your command because, again, having been in Grand Forks and Cavalier and even Fargo, frankly, with the Happy Hooligans and their ISR work, I find some of the greatest innovators in the world, and I just want them to be empowered.

General O'Shaughnessy: I absolutely agree with everything General Hyten said. And as you alluded to, I think we have to change the way that we are thinking about advancing our capabilities, and we cannot go about it the way that we have in the past if we are going to keep pace with our adversaries.

Senator Cramer: Maybe in the remaining seconds, General O'Shaughnessy, I would ask for one clarification with regard to the debate about the southern border and your role in advising or in providing consultation to the President. Do you feel like you and the others, but you specifically, have been adequately listened to and that the information and intelligence and insights that you provided to the President and the others around him have been appropriately taken in and considered before making this whole-of-government decision?

General O'Shaughnessy: Thank you for asking that,
Senator. Yes, I do I believe for a variety of forums, whether it be directly with the President or whether it be through the Secretary of Defense with the Chairman, whether it be actually going hands-on and actually seeing what is going on there. I feel very comfortable that the best military advice from USNORTHCOM has been put forward and has been in the proper forums.

Senator Cramer: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Cramer.

Senator Duckworth?

Senator Duckworth: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you so much for your time today and your testimony and your willingness to answer extensive questions.

General Hyten, in your testimony, you discuss the effectiveness of our legacy nuclear command, control, and communication systems and the need to pursue updates to meet evolving needs.

Can you discuss the implications of building a new system in light of the rapidly changing technologies like AI, quantum computing, and machine learning? And also could you elaborate, to the extent that you are able to in an open setting? Are we building an adaptable architecture with the workarounds necessary to adapt a future tech and
modernization?

General Hyten: So, Senator, over the last 6 months, I have dug into that very deeply, much deeper than I would ever expect a combatant commander to have to do that. That is because on the 3rd of October, the Secretary of Defense put me in charge of the nuclear command and control enterprise. And I am responsible for operations requirements and system engineering of that enterprise now. And so I felt the need to go out and look at how we are doing today, and I understand that pretty well. But then I have to define now how we are going to do it in the future in this very challenging cyber threat environment that we are walking into.

So I have some ideas. I have formed those ideas as I have gone through. Basically the broad-based structure of that idea is to develop a number of pathways for a message to get through that is nearly infinite that nobody can ever figure out exactly where it is or deny the ability for that message to get through. That is the way to do things in the future, and I think we will have the means to do that. We would have to talk about it on a much more classified level to get into the details.

So I have gone out to industry. I have gone out to the federally funded research and development corporations, and I have asked them to come in with ideas. Just last week,
they delivered those ideas to me. We are going to now
evaluate those ideas and come up with a broad-based set of
mission needs that we need to explore, and then I will work
back with industry to figure out how to do that. And then
the services, the Army and the Navy in this case, will
actually build them.

Senator Duckworth: Have you thought about also going
out to some of our national laboratories? I know they fall
under the DOE, but in Illinois, we have both Fermi Lab and
Argonne with quantum computing capabilities, currently
pretty high up on the spectrum of quantum computing
capabilities. But without major investments, we are going
to fall behind in that.

General Hyten: You bet. And I have gone to the
national labs. I went to the national labs, the federally
funded research and development corporations, the university
affiliated research corporations, all those elements looking
for best ideas. And I did that individually because I found
when I brought everybody together in a room, the answer
ended up looking like it used to, and when I kept everybody
separately everybody had very, very innovative answers. So
now we are going to have to figure out how to capture this
innovation and move forward effectively. But I had reached
out to the DOE labs, as well as the UARCs and FFRDCs.

Senator Duckworth: Thank you.
I also want to delve a little deeper with both of you into something General O'Shaughnessy mentioned in his written testimony. General, when discussing the potential cumulative effects of Chinese and Russian advanced technologies such as hypersonics and cyber efforts -- and you have mentioned them here -- you said -- and I quote, -- collectively these advanced technologies could be capable of creating strategic effects with non-nuclear weapons potentially affecting national decision-making and limiting response options in both peacetime and crisis.

Now, we are very focused and we have had quite a discussion today on nuclear strategic deterrence at the moment which, to be clear, I do not have a problem with that. I, in fact, do think we need to modernize our nuclear arsenal. But my concern and question for you both is around our own non-nuclear strategic deterrence.

Would you increase investments on our end whether in hypersonics, cyber, conventional prop, global strike weapons, other new technologies in an effort to reach a level providing a credible deterrent against Chinese and Russian nuclear activities as we suggest they may be attempting with us? And how do we balance that with the real need to continue our investments in the nuclear realm?

General O'Shaughnessy: One, thanks for the opportunity to respond to that question because I think it is right in
line with the NDS, and as the NDS has articulated, the changing security environment -- one of the things that has really fundamentally changed is the strategic deterrence as it applies to the conventional aspect. And so as we look at that, as General Hyten mentioned, the cost imposition -- in other words, we have to be able to impose a cost if we are going to be able to deter. But also especially on the conventional side, you have to be able to actually deny them their objectives. And so it is a combination of both of those together, imposing costs, denying their objectives, and then be able to credibly communicate that to them so they understand from a deterrence standpoint that it absolutely is not even worth going down that path.

So in order to do that, though, it is going to take an investment in just the areas that you mentioned. We have to have our own hypersonic capability and we also have to have the ability to defend against those advanced threats.

Senator Duckworth: And we are able to reach those capabilities if we make these investments?

General O'Shaughnessy: If we make those investments is the key part of your statement. Yes, ma'am.

Senator Duckworth: General Hyten?

General Hyten: And I agree with General O'Shaughnessy. I think one of the most important things you said, though, is that you recognize that strategic deterrence in
the 21st century is wholly different than it was in the 20th century. It is not just about nuclear weapons. It is multi-polar now. It is not just the Soviet Union. It is Russia, China, North Korea. You have to worry about all the domains. You have to worry about nuclear, space, cyber, and conventional. And you have to figure out how to integrate all those together.

At STRATCOM, we formed an academic alliance with 35 different universities to try to get them to start thinking about what is really needed in order to do this, not just on the technology side, but a policy and a strategy side as well.

Senator Duckworth: Thank you, General.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Duckworth.
Senator Perdue?
Senator Perdue: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
And thank you, gentlemen, for being with us today.
General Hyten, I love the way you summarize this.

Every time you come before us, you just get right down -- you do what my wife asked us to do when we were raising kids: major on the majors. And thank you for that. But recap triad, command and control, Space Command are your top three priorities. I want to focus on the first one.

You are facing five threats across five domains. I
could not agree more that it is an integrated effort now. It is not just about the nuclear capability. Given that, though, the most salient comment I have heard today is we have lost our ability to go fast. And I lived in Asia. I worked in China a good bit in my career. And I can tell you they can beat us to the core on every single development with our technology, with their technology. It does not matter.

I want to focus on one part of our nuclear triad. I want to get to a second question very quickly. The Ohio class has served us well for decades, 4 or 5 decades in many cases, but it is aging. And I know we have got the Columbia class coming. Secretary of Navy Spencer said recently the Columbia class submarine is the most important acquisition program the Navy has today. Do you agree with that, sir?

General Hyten: I do. And I cannot tell you how thankful I am for Secretary Spencer and CNO Richardson both making that statement and putting that as a priority.

Senator Perdue: So we are going to procure, as I understand the schedule, the first Columbia class in fiscal year 2021, and it will take us to fiscal year 2031 before that first delivery will be taken in the first, I guess, trial will be done on that boat. Is that right?

General Hyten: Operational capability by then.

Senator Perdue: So how long does it take China to do
the same thing?

General Hyten: Actually on the submarine side, it has been taking about just as long.

Senator Perdue: But that is going to change between that and 2031.

General Hyten: That will change because you understand that we are experienced in submarines and China is still fairly new in developing those capabilities.

Senator Perdue: Can you give us an update on the development of that Columbia class effort, and is 2031 still an appropriate date to expect on that?

General Hyten: So I have done a deep dive look into every element of the triad, again kind of an odd thing for a combatant commander to do, but it is because I am so concerned about it I wanted to look in depth into that issue. So I have gone with Admiral Caldwell, the head of Navy nuclear reactors, up to the shipyard at Electric Boat and done a deep dive.

And when I went through that -- I have to be honest, Senator -- I was very concerned because there was so little margin in the overall schedule. And then over the last year, as the Navy has informed you guys, we have had some issues with welding --

Senator Perdue: The missile silo in particular.

General Hyten: It is the missile tubes, absolutely.
And because of that, a lot of that margin that was not too much before is even less now. It is still on the positive side, but if you are 10 years away and you are eating margin and not putting margin in, that causes me concern.

Senator Perdue: Can you take a question away for the record to help us understand what we could do to shorten that gestation period?

General Hyten: You bet. I would be glad to come and talk to you or take it for the record, either one.

Senator Perdue: And I would like an update on the Hong 20. This is the new long-range nuclear bomber which is effectively -- we will go to China now -- their first true triad capability, if I understand that correct.

General Hyten: Absolutely. And that discussion is better to have in a classified setting.

Senator Perdue: I appreciate that and I look forward to that.

General O'Shaughnessy, I was just at the southern border. I agree with everything you just said. I know you were just there. I personally believe that we have got a human tragedy going on on the border with people coming from all parts of the world, not just Central America. But the bigger crisis is the drug traffic that is coming through there.

The first thing I want to get on the record, though,
there have been three places where a wall has been built: California, Arizona, and Texas. And in those areas, the numbers I see is that human traffic across those borders where that barrier is in place dropped 95 percent. Do you agree with that?

General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, I do. And I will just add again within the last week, I have been twice to El Paso meeting with the Secretary Chief, meeting with the individual Border Patrol agents, and they confirm exactly that. When a barrier is in place, as long as it has cover -- in other words, you are actually having some sensing of it -- and you have the ability to respond to it, it totally changes the flow and they can funnel it into the areas that they want to. And CBP personnel to a person talked about the effectiveness that is part of their family of systems.

Senator Perdue: Sir, thank you for your troops' help down there. I saw some of those troops and the support that they are giving CBP is really remarkable.

I was in the McAllen sector in Texas. It is the most active sector we have now. So what we are doing is put barriers up. We pushed the activity to other sectors. So I went to what I think is the most active sector. They were telling me that an individual coming across -- the two cartels in Mexico that are at war controlling that particular sector are very powerful. They pay $8,000 per
person to the cartel to come through. The people that were
arrested the night I was there -- on patrol were the CBP --
had no money in their pocket, not a dime. They each had a
burner phone with one number in it, and it was for a support
person in the U.S. that was part of the infrastructure here.
My question for you is, can the U.S. military on the
drug side of this -- if it is a $2 billion business with
regard to human traffic, it is more than $30 billion just in
that sector for drugs coming through. There was more
fentanyl coming through that sector last year, enough to
kill every man, woman, and child in America.
My question, sir, is what can the U.S. military do
there that is within the realm of your responsibility as
protectors of our country?
General O'Shaughnessy: Sir, thank you for the question
and to allow us to highlight some of the efforts that are
ongoing and will continue.
Our JTF-North is actually about 190 individuals that
are focused just exactly 100 percent on this. Some of the
things we are able to provide are -- especially important is
the intel aspect, understanding the networks. We understand
networks. We have been doing this for decades overseas. We
understand how to get to the networks and then partner with
our law enforcement agency partners to be able to actually
get after those networks in ways that they may not have
worked their way through. And so it has been very powerful having our intel folks as part of this.

We also bring unique military capability that we are applying, whether it is the use of our Fort Huachuca unmanned aerial systems or whether it is our ground sensor platoons that deploy in there for training. Those are all additive to the capability to partner with our law enforcement agencies that have proven to be quite effective and really from the dollar perspective of what we spend and what we get out of them, a very effective use while getting training. Our ground sensor platoon that deploy there -- they are doing exactly what they are going to be asked to do if they deploy over to the Middle East, et cetera, and they are doing it in an environment with a thinking adversary that really allows them to get ready and increase their readiness in the way that we are currently applying them.

Senator Perdue: But with all of that activity, CBP and the military, all of our U.S. activity, with all our technology and everything else, we are only interdicting about 10 percent of the drugs coming in. Is that correct, sir?

General O'Shaughnessy: That is roughly correct, and it obviously depends exactly what you are talking about.

Broadly that is a correct number, sir.

Senator Perdue: Thank you, sir.
1  Thanks, Mr. Chairman.
2  Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Perdue.
3  Senator Jones?
4  Senator Jones: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5  And thank you for being here today and for your service and for all of those behind you for their service.
6  I apologize for not being here as much, but we have several hearings going on today.
7  General Hyten, I know there has been a lot of questions and answers about the INF Treaty and the pullout of the INF Treaty. So I will not kind of rehash all of that.
8  What I would ask, though, have we done everything that you would advise in order to bring Russia to the table on the INF Treaty?
9  General Hyten: So I think that is a very difficult question for me to ask because I do not have the whole picture. I do not know everything the State Department has done. I understand my discussions with the President. I understand that the State Department has worked that issue. So as far as I know, we have done everything humanly possible to try to bring Russia back into that. Every time I talk to the President about it, I want Russia in that treaty, but if they will not comply, then you do not really have a treaty.
10 So from my perspective, I think we have done everything
humanly possible, but I would say that there is still time
that Russia could come to the table and still participate in
that treaty. I would hope that that would happen, but I do
not think that is very likely right now.

Senator Jones: Do you have any specifics that you
would recommend that have not been tried already?

General Hyten: I was thinking about that as you went
through the question, Senator, and I cannot think of a -- I
think you just have to ask again and again. I think we have
shown the intelligence to our NATO allies. You have seen
the NATO allies come out and understand that that system
that is in violation of the treaty is in violation of the
treaty. I think all our NATO allies agree with that. For
whatever reason, Russia does not want to play in that
situation, and if they do not want to come to the table,
they are not going to come to the table.

Senator Jones: Thank you for that.

So, General O'Shaughnessy, obviously there has also
been a lot of questions and answers about the border and the
national emergency. And I think you testified earlier that
whenever there is something coming from the President -- I
think your testimony was when you get a legal order from the
President, you act. And my question is, with regard to the
national emergency declaration, did you or anyone on the
staff that you know of evaluate the legality of the order
regarding the national emergency on the southern border?

General O'Shaughnessy: Sir, that is beyond the purview of NORTHCOM I would say.

Just for clarity, though, since the actual declaration of a national emergency, there has been no specific tasking that has come down to NORTHCOM post that declaration. What we have is we are actually executing those orders and direction that we were given prior to that declaration that those troops are now showing up on the border, but that order was given and the request for assistance was given from the Department of Homeland Security to the Department of Defense prior to that declaration.

Senator Jones: All right. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I think that is all I have. Thank you very much.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Jones.

Well, first of all, thank you very much, both of you, for the very concise way in which you answered some pretty difficult questions, and I appreciate that very much.

Was there anything else that you would like to bring up that you did not have the opportunity to do for clarification? Either one of you.

General Hyten: So, Senator, I would like to -- you mentioned a few things at the beginning that you wanted to
make sure we address today. And I went down the list just a minute ago. We have talked about everything on your list except the space force, and I would just like to make a few comments on that.

Chairman Inhofe: Okay. I do appreciate that. In fact, both of you may want to do that because my question was there is confusion out there when we are talking the space force, where that fits in all of this. And the two of you would be the logical ones to ask. Thank you very much.

General Hyten: So, Senator, the space force is structured to be the organize, train, and equip element for our space capabilities. Right now, the space capabilities are broadly in the Air Force, but they are also across the Army, the Navy, and other defense agencies as well. When we look at the problem, there are really two issues.

After Goldwater-Nichols, the military services are now responsible for organizing, training, equipping forces but not fighting. The fighting is done in the combatant commands. General O'Shaughnessy and I represent the combatant commands. So we are responsible for fighting. That is why, in response to the questions earlier, the need to stand up a U.S. Space Command focused on the warfighting problem in space is what that command is doing, which leads to the question, are we properly organized to do the organize, train, and equip mission for the space mission?
And the President has said because of the importance of that warfighting domain, we are not. And we should consolidate all of those capabilities from across the Department into a single space force.

And I give the President and the Vice President big credit for not creating a department of the space force at this time, but putting that capability in the Air Force because I was very concerned about creating excess bureaucracy. So was the President. So was the Vice President. And by creating a department of the space force, it is just not sized right now in order to do that. It will be some day, but it has just not reached that point right now.

But the legislative proposal should come to you shortly. There will be some issues we will have to work out with you, and we will work those together. But I just want you to know that I support the concept of the space force inside the Air Force that the President is now pushing.

Chairman Inhofe: Yes, you are right. I had brought that up both in my opening statement, as well as initial questions. And my concern was that we wanted two things answered before you actually get into a new bureaucracy. One is what the costs are going to be. One would it be more efficient. And I think you have answered both of those. I appreciate that very much.
Senator Cotton?

Senator Cotton: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, gentlemen.

I apologize for my tardiness. It has been a fun-filled morning of committee hearings all across the Senate.

General Hyten, each leg of our nuclear triad has its own value. Is it fair to say that our ballistic missiles have strength in numbers?

General Hyten: That is one of the big values of our ballistic missiles. 400 ballistic missiles create a huge targeting problem for the adversary. The only way to get after 400 hardened nuclear missiles is with a whole bunch of incoming weapons, and if you decide to attack those, then you pretty much are guaranteeing that we will attack back. That is deterrent in a nutshell, and that creates a huge element of our deterrent process.

Senator Cotton: Sometimes referred to as a missile sink for the enemy?

General Hyten: It would be a missile sink. It would be a weapons sink. It would be a very, very difficult target to impact.

Senator Cotton: I have heard proposals from some in Congress and Washington suggesting that we ought to eliminate our Minuteman 3 fleet and cancel the replacement for that fleet. If we were to take that step to
unilaterally cut over 400 ballistic missiles and command centers, would it not be like giving the Russians and the Chinese 400 free warheads to target something else in the United States or around the world?

General Hyten: I do not understand how, with the threats that we face today, which are growing, not shrinking, we would make a decision today as a nation to lessen our overall strategic deterrent. That makes no sense to me, and my best military advice is that we do not do that.

Senator Cotton: One common argument I hear in defense of that position is why do we spend so much money on weapons we never use. It is not that much money. It is only 3 to 6 percent of the defense budget, depending on where we are in the cycle. Would you not say, though, that we have been using our nuclear weapons every single day for 74 years?

General Hyten: We use them every day. And, Senator, the people that say that -- I actually find that a little bit insulting because the men and women who go to work every day underneath the water, underneath the ground, in the air that provide that strategic deterrent -- they are doing the mission every day. It is the most active mission. Strategic deterrence is not a passive mission. Deterrence does not exist just because you have 1,550 deployable nuclear weapons under the New START treaty. You have to do
that mission every day, and that is what the men and women
of my command do. And they are proud to do it. And so it
is an active mission, one of the most active missions that
we have. When you send a nuclear submarine out with 160
sailors on board, do you think they are thinking to
themselves this is a passive functional mission? No. They
are an active warfighting mission.

Senator Cotton: And the whole point of our nuclear
deterrence, of the way we use that force is not to launch
and detonate those missiles, but to stop our adversaries
from launching and detonating theirs to begin with.

General Hyten: Secretary Mattis asked me what is the
use of nuclear weapons. Why do we have nuclear weapons?
And the answer is to prevent others from using nuclear
weapons on us. But in order to do that, you have to be
ready. It is the Washington analogy. The best way to avoid
war is to be prepared for war. If you are not prepared, you
run the risk of an attack.

Senator Cotton: And if Russia or China or perhaps
Russia and China combined had clear, demonstrable nuclear
overmatch against the United States, there is no doubt who
would win if there were, in fact, a nuclear exchange. What
impact would that have on the conventional forces and the
strategic thinking of those nations as against the United
States and our allies?
General Hyten: You know, in my opening statement for the record, I said that nuclear war cannot be won. Therefore, it must never be fought. Therefore, we must be ready to fight it every day. That is the way I look at it. That is a complicated thing for some people to understand, but if you are not ready, somebody could take a step over the line. If there is an overmatch, somebody could think they could get away with it, and that could create the worst day in the history of the world, the worst day in the history of our country. We never want that to happen. In order to do that, I believe in peace through strength, not peace through unilateral disarmament.

Senator Cotton: If you were sitting in your position or in the head of state position in a country like Japan or South Korea that depends on the extended deterrence of the United States and the United States weakened its nuclear triad or even eliminated one of their legs, what kind of influence would that have on your thinking?

General Hyten: What I would be concerned about from a U.S. perspective is that would cause some of our allies to decide they need their own nuclear deterrent. One of the goals we have as a country is to eliminate the proliferation of nuclear weapons, not just in our adversaries, but around the world. A world with fewer nuclear weapons is a better world. But we have to be able to defend ourselves. And so
we want our allies to understand that we can defend them too. That is what extended deterrence is all about, and that means you have to be ready to support their contingencies as well.

Senator Cotton: Thank you, General.

I understand that some opponents of our nuclear force or critics of it say that we should not start a new arms race or be engaged in an arms race. I will simply observe, based on what you have said here today, that it is much cheaper to win an arms race than it is to lose a war.

General Hyten: Yes, sir.

Chairman Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Cotton.

I thank both of you. I will repeat what I said earlier. This has been a really enlightening session, and you have been the right ones to be here. So thank you very much.

We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:35 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]