

Advance Questions for General Peter J. Schoomaker, USA (Ret.)
Nominee for Chief of Staff of the Army

Defense Reforms

More than a decade has passed since the enactment of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986 and the Special Operations reforms.

The goals of the Congress in enacting these defense reforms, as reflected in section 3 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act, can be summarized as strengthening civilian control over the Military; improving Military advice; placing clear responsibility on the combatant commanders for the accomplishment of their missions; ensuring the authority of the combatant commanders is commensurate with their responsibility; increasing attention to the formulation of strategy and to contingency planning; providing for more efficient use of defense resources; enhancing the effectiveness of military operations; and improving the management and administration of the Department of Defense.

Do you agree with these goals?

Answer: Yes, the Goldwater-Nichols act has significantly improved our joint operations. The reforms initiated by Goldwater-Nichols have been irrefutably validated in the crucible of war.

Do you believe that legislative proposals to amend Goldwater-Nichols may be appropriate? If so, what areas do you believe it might be appropriate to address in these proposals?

Answer: Although amendment proposals may be appropriate, such proposals should take into account the lessons learned by all since Goldwater-Nichols was implemented. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Defense to examine other legislative and regulatory reforms that might improve capabilities and enhance readiness. Several areas might be appropriate to address:

- The role of Joint Forces Command has evolved significantly since Goldwater-Nichols was passed. Goldwater-Nichols refinements might ensure that clear authorities support the role we intend for Joint Forces Command.
- It may be possible to revise the planning, programming and budgeting system from a budget driven process to a policy/planning driven process.
- Acquisition reforms should continue to take advantage of new business cycles and models critical for technology.
- Any changes to the national security structure that better integrate the economic, political, information, and military instruments of power might also help solidify interagency "unity of effort."

What do you consider to be the most important aspects of these defense reforms?

Answer: These reforms have significantly clarified operational chains of command and working relations among the military services to enhance and synchronize joint operations.

Most importantly, they have clearly communicated the intent of Congress and the President that our warfighting efforts must be increasingly joint.

Do you believe that the role of the Chiefs of Staff and the Combatant Commanders under the Goldwater-Nichols legislation is appropriate and the policies and processes in existence allow that role to be fulfilled?

Answer: The general framework established by the Goldwater-Nichols is appropriate and existing policies and processes allow that role to be fulfilled. If confirmed, I would like to study in greater depth whether the Act strikes an appropriate allocation of roles between the combatant commanders and the needs and constraints faced by the service chiefs. Combatant Commanders are often driven by a near-term operational horizon, while the services must consider longer periods associated with the research and development, acquisition and professional development cycles. This leads to natural tensions that might be rectified through clarification of roles and relationships.

Relationships

Section 162(b) of title 10, United States Code, provides that the chain of command runs from the President to the Secretary of Defense and from the Secretary of Defense to the commanders of the combatant commands. Other sections of law and traditional practice, however, establish important relationships outside the chain of command. Please describe your understanding of the relationship of the Chief of Staff of the Army to the following offices:

Secretary of Defense

The Secretary of Defense, as the head of the Department of Defense and the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense, issues guidance and direction to the Military Departments. If confirmed, I will be responsible to the Secretary of Defense and his Deputy, through the Secretary of the Army, for the operation of the Army in accordance with such directives. As a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, I will serve as a military adviser to the Secretary of Defense as appropriate. I will cooperate fully with the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the Army properly implements the policies established by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. In coordination with the Secretary of the Army, I will communicate with the Secretary of Defense in articulating the views of the Army.

The Under Secretaries of Defense

Answer: Acting on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, the Under Secretaries perform responsibilities that require them, from time to time, to issue guidance—and in the case of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, direction—to the Military Departments. If confirmed, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, I will communicate with the Under Secretaries in articulating the views of the Army. I will work closely with them to ensure that the Army is administered in accordance with the guidance and direction issued by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. (Note: all the USDs and ASDs may issue instructions to the Secretaries of the Military Departments if the SECDEF authorizes them

to do so.)

The Assistant Secretaries of Defense

Answer: The Assistant Secretaries of Defense have functional responsibilities that, from time to time, require the issuance of guidance to the Military Departments. If confirmed, I will, in coordination with the Secretary of the Army, communicate with the Assistant Secretaries of Defense in articulating the views of the Army. I will cooperate fully with them to ensure that the Army is administered in accordance with guidance promulgated by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Answer: The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is the principal military adviser to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense. Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the President and the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman plans the strategic direction and contingency operations of the armed forces; advises the Secretary of Defense on requirements, programs, and budgets identified by the commanders of the combatant commands; develops doctrine for the joint employment of the armed forces; reports on assignment of functions (or roles and missions) to the armed forces; provides for representation of the United States on the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations; and performs such other duties as may be prescribed by law or by the President or Secretary of Defense.

In conjunction with the other members of the Joint Chiefs, the Chief of Staff of the Army assists the Chairman in providing military advice to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense. If confirmed, as a member of the JCS, it would be my duty to provide frank and timely advice and opinions to the Chairman to assist him in his performance of these responsibilities. If confirmed, in addition, upon request, I will as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff provide my individual military advice to the President, the National Security Council, and the Secretary of Defense. As appropriate, I will provide advice in addition to or in disagreement with that of the Chairman's. I will establish and maintain a close and professional relationship with the Chairman and will communicate directly and openly with him on policy matters involving the Army and the Armed Forces as a whole.

The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Answer: The Vice Chairman of the JCS assists the Chairman in providing military advice to the Secretary of Defense and the President. If confirmed as a member of the JCS, it would be my duty to ensure that the Vice Chairman is provided my frank views and opinions to assist him in his performance of his responsibilities.

The Secretary of the Army

Answer: If confirmed, my relationship with the Secretary of the Army would be close, direct, and supportive. Within the Department of the Army, a large part of my responsibility as Chief of Staff would be to serve as the Secretary's principal military adviser. My responsibilities would

also involve communicating the Army Staff's plans to the Secretary of the Army and supervising the implementation of the Secretary's decisions through the Army Staff and Army commands and agencies. In this capacity, my actions would be subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of the Army. In my capacity as a member of the JCS, I would also be responsible for appropriately informing the Secretary of the Army about conclusions reached by the JCS and about significant military operations, to the extent such action does not impair independence in the performance of duties as member of JCS. I anticipate that I would at all times work closely and in concert with the Secretary of the Army to establish the best policies for the Army in light of national interests.

The Under Secretary of the Army

Answer: The Under Secretary of the Army is the Secretary's principal civilian assistant and performs such duties and exercises such powers as the Secretary of the Army prescribes. His responsibilities require him, from time to time, to issue guidance and direction to the Army Staff. If confirmed, I will be responsible to the Secretary of the Army, and to the Under Secretary through the Secretary of the Army, for the operation of the Army in accordance with such directives. I will cooperate fully with the Under Secretary of the Army to ensure that the policies established by the Office of the Secretary of the Army are properly implemented. I will communicate openly and directly with the Under Secretary of the Army in articulating the views of the Army Staff, Army commands, and Army agencies.

The Assistant Secretaries of the Army

Answer: The Assistant Secretaries of the Army have functional responsibilities that, from time to time, require the issuance of guidance to the Army Staff and to the Army as a whole. If confirmed, I will establish and maintain close, professional relationships with each of the Assistant Secretaries to foster an environment of cooperative teamwork between the Army Staff and the Army Secretariat as we deal together with the day-to-day management and long-range planning requirements facing the Army.

The General Counsel of the Army

Answer: The General Counsel is the chief legal officer of the Department of the Army. His duties include coordinating legal and policy advice to all members of DA regarding matters of interest to the Secretariat, as well as determining the position of the Army on any legal questions or procedures other than military justice matters assigned to The Judge Advocate General. If confirmed, I will establish and maintain a close, professional relationship with the General Counsel to assist him in the performance of these important duties.

The Chiefs of Staff of the other Services

Answer: If confirmed, as a member of the JCS, it would be my duty to engage in frank and timely exchanges of advice and opinions with my fellow Service Chiefs in their roles as members of the JCS. I look forward to developing strong working relationships with these colleagues, many of whom I know from previous service.

The combatant commanders

Answer: Subject to the direction of the President, the combatant commanders perform their duties under the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense, and are directly responsible to the Secretary of Defense for the preparedness of their commands to carry out missions assigned to them. As directed by the Secretary of Defense, the Military Department Secretaries assign all forces under their jurisdiction, except those forces necessary to perform the missions of the Military Departments, to the combatant commands to perform missions assigned to those commands. In addition, subject to the authority, direction, and control of the Secretary of Defense and the authority of combatant commanders under Title 10, United States Code, section 164(c), the Military Department Secretaries are responsible for administering and supporting the forces that they assign to a combatant command. If confirmed, I will cooperate fully with the combatant commanders in performing these administrative and support responsibilities. I will establish close, professional relationships with the combatant commanders and communicate directly and openly with them on matters involving the Department of the Army and Army forces and personnel assigned to or supporting these commands.

Qualifications. What background and experience do you have that you believe qualifies you for this position?

Answer. I have been associated with the U.S. Army since birth and have experienced literally every aspect of Army life, as a dependent of a professional army officer through the post WWII, Korean War, and Vietnam eras, to Army ROTC in college and my own 31½ years of active service and 2 ½ years of retired status. I believe that my active military service, including duty in Armor, Armored Cavalry, Infantry, and Special Forces units, assignments in PERSCOM, on the Army Staff, as an Assistant Division Commander, and as an Army MACOM Commander provide solid Service experience. As one of the initial Joint Service Officers designated in 1987, I have extensive joint experience including numerous real world joint contingency operations and command of both the Joint Special Operations Command and the United States Special Operations Command. All of this provides me with the experience, knowledge, and insight necessary to successfully meet the challenges facing the Army today. My recent experiences working on critical and timely defense issues as a consultant to the Defense Department have afforded me with a unique perspective that I believe will be valuable in discharging the duties of Army Chief of Staff.

Major Challenges

In your view, what are the major challenges confronting the next Chief of Staff of the Army?

Answer: If confirmed, my fundamental challenge will be to help the Army -- and the Nation -- understand what it means to be an Army at war. This is a war that reaches to the furthest corners of the World -- a war for the very survival of our way of life. As the President has stated, "this is a different kind of war against a different kind of enemy." Being an Army at war means that we must be prepared to question everything -- take

nothing for granted. We must rigorously assess our priorities, our processes, and our programs to ensure we can meet the needs of the Nation in this war.

If confirmed, what plans do you have for addressing these challenges?

Answer: My first act would be to get out and assess the situation – talk to the Army’s soldiers, their families, and the combatant commanders they serve. We need to figure out -- as an Army at war -- what needs to change and what needs to continue. We may need to adjust our priorities. We may even need to change the culture – in a world where the strategic environment is transformed, we should be prepared to even reexamine our fundamental way of thinking. At the same time, our Army needs to celebrate its victories. A lot is right with the U.S. Army. We need to remember that.

Most Serious Problems

What do you consider to be the most serious problems in the performance of the functions of the Chief of Staff of the Army?

Answer: The most serious problem is closely related to our greatest challenge: the functions of the Chief of Staff of the Army are designed for a peacetime, more predictable environment than the one we face today. We need responsive, adaptive processes and organizations to support an Army at war.

What management actions and time lines would you establish to address these problems?

Answer: If I am confirmed, I will work closely with the Secretary of the Army and -- through him – OSD, to identify solutions. I will quickly evaluate our current organizational structure and realignment plans to look for ways to promote unity of effort and enhance efficiency and effectiveness. I am confident that the Army has the human talent to solve virtually any problem when provided clear guidance and a sound organizational framework.

Principal Role of the Army

What do you see as the principal role for the U.S. Army in terms of our overall national security?

Answer: The Army’s mission is to provide prompt and sustained land forces for joint operations.

What roles should the Army play in contingency, humanitarian, and peace operations?

Answer: The Army provides the Nation, the President, and the combatant commanders a unique set of core competencies and capabilities to fulfill whatever missions and tasks the Joint Force is assigned. Army forces play a vital role in providing the security and stability necessary to make contingency, humanitarian, and peace operations feasible.

Is there unnecessary redundancy between Army and Marine Corps ground combat forces, particularly between Army light divisions and Marine Corps divisions?

Answer: No. The Army and the Marine Corps each possess unique competencies with respect to basing, staging, employment, and sustainability. This range of competencies provides the Combatant Commander a broad range of operational options. This combination of service capabilities maximizes their total complementary and reinforcing effects, while minimizing their relative vulnerabilities.

Some believe that the Army and the Marines are competing for the same declining mission area -- the contingency forces role -- and that each is pursuing capabilities that the other service already possesses. What is your view of this observation?

Answer: It is not at all clear to me that the contingency forces role is declining. The Army and the Marine Corps each possess unique competencies with respect to basing, staging, employment, and sustainability. Their combination maximizes their total complementary and reinforcing effects, while minimizing their relative vulnerabilities.

Army Role in the Joint Force

The U.S. military fights as a joint force and strives to achieve realistic training for military operations. The Army provides trained and equipped forces for joint military operations.

How do you believe the Army can best contribute to improved joint military capabilities while preserving its service unique capabilities and culture?

Answer: The Army can best contribute to improved joint capabilities by developing its force with a joint perspective from the very beginning, transforming from our past practices of de-confliction to greater joint interdependence. Force development begins with an appreciation of the future operational environment -- that appreciation must be co-developed with the joint community. It then proceeds to development of operational concepts -- those concepts must be fully nested in joint operational concepts. Finally, that *inherently joint* Army concept drives every dimension of our force: doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leader development, people, and facilities.

Vision for the Future

What is your vision for the Army of the future?

Answer: The current Army Vision is generally well accepted. If confirmed, one of my first tasks will be to assess the current state of the Army and its environment, identify major issues and challenges, and capture ideas that confirm or refine our strategic direction. I will assess the plans in place to achieve our vision and determine if they warrant modification or prioritization changes.

What foundations would you establish, if confirmed, to facilitate the attainment of that vision?

Answer: If confirmed, one of my first tasks will be to assess the current state of the Army and its environment, identify major issues and challenges, and capture ideas that confirm or refine our strategic direction. The assessment I make at that time will determine the foundations needed to facilitate attainment of that vision.

Joint Experimentation

The Army has conducted a wide range of experiments to identify the path forward toward a digitized force, but has done much less with regard to transformation to the Objective Force. In the arena of joint experimentation, while the Army has participated in a few joint experimentation activities over the last couple years, it is clear that more joint experimentation is necessary to meet future operational challenges.

What is your view of the need for joint experimentation and how do you see the Army participating in future joint experimentation activities as we move into the 21st century?

Answer: Concept development and experimentation are inextricably linked. The Army was the first Service to co-sponsor a joint wargame (Unified Quest 03) with Joint Forces Command, and I support future joint co-sponsorship. The Army must increasingly integrate its experimentation with the joint experimentation effort and the DOD Transformation Roadmap.

Do you believe that Army experimentation has been sufficient in support of transformation to the Objective Force?

Answer: There are many kinds of experiments – game seminars, modeling, computer simulation, and live experiments on the ground. All of these supported development of the Stryker Force. Army experimentation, particularly computer simulation, was critical in achieving the Milestone B decision of the Future Combat Systems acquisition strategy.

Missile Defense

Do you consider missile defense to be one of the Army's core missions?

Answer: Yes -- missile Defense has been an Army core competency for 47 years and the Army currently operates the Nation's only deployed ballistic missile defense system, Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3). Missile defense is essential to effective land operations.

What is your view of the proper relationship between the Army and the Missile Defense Agency?

Answer: The Missile Defense Agency should continue to develop and produce boost and mid-course phase missile defense systems and transfer proven capabilities to the appropriate Services for fielding and operations and sustainment.

What do you think the Army's responsibilities are or should be with respect to development, procurement, and operation of missile defense systems?

Answer: My current assessment is that the Army, in its role to provide force and asset protection to the Combatant Commanders, should retain development, procurement, integration and operation responsibilities of all ground-based terminal phase air and missile defense systems.

Transformation

Secretary Rumsfeld has established transformation of the Armed Forces to meet 21st Century threats as one of the Department's highest priorities and has stated that only weapons systems that are truly transformational should be acquired. Over the past several years the Army has terminated or restructured over 77 programs to fund its Transformation initiative.

How would you assess the level of risk to our forces of foregoing or curtailing current acquisition programs in favor of future transformation? Can we afford this risk considering the current level of global threats?

Answer: We must always find the right balance between maintaining readiness and combat overmatch in the near term and ensuring them – through transformation -- for the future. We are fighting today and have just demonstrated that we have effective capabilities near term. But we should anticipate that our adversaries will adapt and – knowing that – failure to transform would constitute the ultimate, non-affordable risk.

In the allocation of limited resources, how would you prioritize among the current force, the interim force (Stryker Brigade Combat Teams) and the Objective Force?

Answer: If confirmed, I would prioritize resources to maximize our effective combat capability and capacity over time. Establishing the Army's priorities will involve the balancing of competing demands with existing resources. As we seek this balance now and in the future, we must ensure that we maintain the current readiness of our forces.

What is your vision for the Army and Army Transformation?

Answer: The vision and current direction of Army transformation efforts appear to me to be on track. I will continuously review Army progress and direction in this effort as one of my highest priorities.

Does your vision of Army transformation include a shift of force structure from conventional forces, including battalions, brigades and divisions, to more Army unconventional forces?

Answer: Over the past few years, the Army has realigned over 18,000 spaces to meet the increased requirement for special operations, chemical/biological, military police, and other

similar capabilities. If confirmed, I will continually assess the Army's force mix, to include the Reserve Component, and make prudent and appropriate adjustments over time.

Do you believe the Army should be reorganized from its current division-based structure to a larger number of smaller tactical units so as to field corps-based joint task forces as some reformers have advocated?

Answer: At this time, I have not formed any specific conclusions on this issue. I will entertain all ideas as we look for ways to increase the capability and capacity of our forces.

Low Density/High Demand Forces

In your professional judgment, how would you address the Army's problem with low-density units such as military police, civil affairs, and others, which are in extremely high demand in this new strategic environment?

Answer: It takes years to build a new capability, particularly the soldiers and leaders with the appropriate skills. If we are confident that the new strategic environment will increase the demand for these units long term, then we should move expeditiously to adjust our force structure to match the demand.

Are there functional changes among the active and reserve components that you believe should be made?

Answer: The role of the Army's Reserve Components has already changed significantly. Today, what was once a "force in reserve" has become a full partner in our daily operations providing critical specialized capabilities and augmentation. This is an enormous cultural change for our Army that must ensure that the duration and frequency of deployments is appropriate for citizen soldiers and properly manage the effort to ensure predictability.

Special Operations Forces- Conventional Forces Relationship

Operations conducted in Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere have demonstrated the effectiveness of Special Operation Forces in addressing threats posed by terrorists and other adversaries.

What, in your professional judgment, is the appropriate relationship between Special Operations Forces and conventional forces?

Answer: The Army will continue to need to take advantage of the synergy generated by blending the unique capabilities of SOF with the traditional war fighting capabilities of conventional forces. The nature and scope of this relationship will vary according to each mission situation. SOF is inherently joint and with the Army becoming increasingly joint in its perspective, I believe that the future will see much greater synergy achieved in this area.

How can transformation support the relationship between SOF and conventional Army forces so that SOF can continue to focus on unique missions, and develop specialized capabilities? What missions or equipment, if any, should conventional Army forces adopt from SOF?

Answer: Army conventional forces are capable of assuming certain missions currently performed by Special Operations Forces in the areas of counter drug activities, humanitarian de-mining activities, and the training of foreign conventional forces. Furthermore, Special Operations Forces possess a number of attributes such as agility, versatility, and deployability that are being designed into the materiel and leader development capabilities of our future force as a whole. Together, these initiatives will allow Special Operations Forces to better focus on maintaining proficiency in their unique core competencies. Additionally, we must continue to migrate equipment, tactics, techniques, and procedures from SOF to the Army conventional forces when appropriate.

What role, if any, can the Special Operations Command's development and acquisition capability play in Army and DOD efforts to transform?

Answer: The Special Operations Command is the sole unified command with internal responsibility for planning, programming, and budgeting of military forces as well as the authority for the development and acquisition of special operations-peculiar equipment, materials, supplies, and services. This has allowed the command's Directorate of Advanced Technology to concentrate on areas that show potential benefit to the SOF operator in the near to mid-term. We should look carefully at the techniques and processes they have used to determine if there are opportunities to make the Army process more effective and efficient. And, as I indicated above, we must continue to migrate equipment, tactics, techniques, and procedures from SOF to the Army conventional forces when appropriate.

Special Operations Forces - Relationship between Army and SOF component

What is your understanding of the relationship between the Chief of Staff of the Army, the U.S. Special Operations Command, and the U.S. Army Special Operations Command (USASOC)?

Answer: USASOC is the Army component of the U.S. Special Operations Command and has the responsibility to train, equip, deploy and sustain Army special-operations forces. The Chief of Staff of the Army is responsible for the organization, equipping, and training of forces for the conduct of prompt and sustained combat operations on land. In this capacity the Army is responsible for resourcing USASOC to the extent outlined in the Joint Strategic Capabilities Plan.

Do you believe that the Army currently provides the proper level of support to USASOC in equipment (airframes, etc.), facilities, personnel billets, and services? If not, what would you recommend, if confirmed, to increase the level of attention to USASOC requirements?

Answer: Within current resource constraints and operational needs, I believe that the Army currently provides sufficient personnel assets, rotary wing aircraft and equipment to USASOC. I believe conventional Army forces can further assist Army Special Operations Forces by assuming or augmenting certain traditional SOF missions on a case-by-case basis.

Special Operations Forces - Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations

Given the current operational and personnel tempo for Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations, do you believe that we have sufficient personnel for those mission?

Answer: It is not clear to me that current levels can be sustained indefinitely. An increase in requirements beyond current levels may require two-year involuntary mobilizations. If confirmed, I look forward to working with all of the Combatant Commanders to develop long-term, cohesive, and sustainable force levels.

Do you believe that the mix between active and reserve components in those areas is adequate? If not, what remedies would you propose?

Answer: I do not believe the PSYOP/Civil Affairs force structure is appropriately balanced. For example, the Active Component Civil Affairs skill sets are focused on the tactical level and lack certain civilian-acquired functional specialties – such as Rule of Law, Public Health, Governance, Economics, and Infrastructure – that reside only in the Reserve Component. The planned increase in Active Component Civil Affairs structure is encouraging, and if confirmed, I will devote special attention to ensuring the Army achieves the proper balance of PSYOP and Civil Affairs force structure.

Comanche

In the fiscal year 2004 budget request, the Army restructured the Comanche helicopter program and requested an additional \$1.7 billion to cover increased research and development costs.

Do you support the continued development of the Comanche helicopter effort as restructured? If so, why?

Answer: The RAH-66 Comanche armed reconnaissance helicopter is a critical component of the Army's future force. The Army recently conducted a comprehensive system of systems review of this program both to restore full confidence in the program and to ensure that it is properly aligned with the Future Force. The restructured program is fully funded and incorporates an evolutionary acquisition strategy entailing a spiral development of capabilities in three blocks with a coherent testing program to support key decisions. If confirmed, I will conduct my own assessment and work hard to ensure that the Comanche program continues forward on a solid path.

Army Science and Technology

The Army Science and Technology program has successfully transitioned a number of Future Combat Systems technologies to the System Development and Demonstration phase.

What do you see as the role that Army Science and Technology programs will play in continuing to develop Objective Force systems?

Answer: The primary focus of Army Science and Technology (S&T) will be to develop and demonstrate Future Force technologies. These technologies must increase speed of strategic deployments, enhance tactical agility once deployed, assure networked connectivity for joint, relevant situational awareness and increase precision for decisive results. Achieving these capabilities will require sufficient resourcing, disciplined management, synchronized development of warfighting concepts, and effective experimentation.

Reserve Deployment and Mobilization

Leaders of the United States Central Command have indicated that Reserve modernization policies and systems must be adapted to the more fluid force deployment and employment model expected to be used in the future. They have characterized current Reserve force management policies and systems as “inefficient and rigid,” and indicated that critical combat support and service support forces were late in arriving in theater as a result of the current cumbersome mobilization and deployment system.

What are your views about the optimal role for the Reserve Component forces in meeting combat missions?

Answer: If confirmed, this is an area that I want to assess. The Army National Guard and Army Reserve have been integrated into the planning and execution of all recent military operations and have been an essential element to success. RC forces have been very successful in meeting many of their assigned combat missions and they are regularly employed to meet long-term, predictable requirements such as peacekeeping missions. The Army is currently doing a thorough analysis of the appropriate mix of active and reserve forces in order to increase our agility and flexibility. I intend to monitor this analysis and assess its findings closely.

What is your opinion about the sufficiency of current Reserve force management policies?

Answer: We are at war, and the reserve components are being called upon in ways and at levels not envisioned in the previous defense strategies that guided their resourcing and structure. I am also aware that the Secretary of Defense recently issued guidance to the Services to reduce the need for involuntarily mobilization, including the complete elimination

of the need for involuntary mobilization during the first 15 days of a rapid response operation. I support the Army's examination of ways to streamline the mobilization process and believe that it warrants consideration of changes to mission profiles and structure as well as methods to provide reserve components with greater peacetime training opportunities and increased levels of modernization.

Do you support assigning any support missions exclusively to the Reserve?

Answer: There are some capabilities for support missions that should remain primarily in the Reserve Components to prevent the inefficient use of resources. An example is mortuary affairs units, which are primarily needed during combat operations and do not need extensive training time to prepare for their wartime missions. The Army is currently studying proposals to improve the readiness of Reserve Component units that fulfill support mission requirements to ensure they can meet Combatant Commander deployment requirements.

Unit Manning System

The Army has undertaken a Unit Manning Initiative aimed at improving combat readiness and cohesion while setting conditions for improved soldier and family well-being. Previous attempts to achieve this goal have not succeeded, and the Army has instead relied on an individual replacement system.

Do you support the implementation of the Unit Manning Initiative?

Answer: I support any innovation that produces higher levels of readiness and combat effectiveness. The primary goal of the Unit Manning Initiative is to increase unit readiness and unit cohesion by synchronizing the unit and soldier lifecycles. My experience confirms the soundness of this approach.

If so, what factors do you believe will make this attempt at Unit Manning succeed where others have failed?

Answer: Fundamentally, this effort will succeed because we are now an Army at war. This is not simply an effort to save money or cover a rotational presence. To meet our current and projected level of commitments, we must increase our collective combat readiness. The unit manning initiative would be a significant step in our effort to do this.

Prevention of Domestic Violence

The tragic murder-suicide deaths at Fort Bragg in June and July 2002 and a subsequent report identified several problems affecting the ability and willingness of soldiers and their families to seek assistance in coping with domestic problems. An important issue identified in the report was that soldiers and their spouses may be reluctant to seek assistance out of fear that it would adversely affect how they are regarded within their commands. The report indicated that mental health services are flawed because they inadvertently discourage soldiers and their families from seeking help when

problems arise.

If confirmed, what steps would you take as Chief of Staff of the Army to address the problems relating to domestic violence identified in the report related to the Fort Bragg tragedies?

Answer: I believe that the Army must strive to eliminate domestic violence by creating a culture within the Army that focuses on supporting and encouraging prevention efforts. From personal experience, I know that the Army has long had a number of solid programs in the soldier and family support arena. I also know that the Army has recently improved those programs by providing additional trained professionals, making these services more accessible, and implementing innovative initiatives like the Deployment Cycle Support plan.

Recruiting and Retention

The ability of the Armed Forces to recruit highly qualified young men and women is influenced by many factors, and is critical to the success of the All Volunteer Force.

What do you consider to be the most important elements of successful recruiting for the Army?

Answer: Recruiting success is a function of the successful integration of the three recruiting drivers that we can influence: marketing, recruiting incentives, and the size of the recruiting force. With a stable, predictable and effective advertising program, supported by critical recruiting incentives, the Army has been able to reduce the recruiting mission for active Army recruiters and return vital manpower to the force for other critical needs.

What are your views about direct recruiting for Special Forces duty of civilians with no prior active-duty military service?

Answer: Thus far, the effort to recruit Special Forces soldiers from the general population is encouraging. The success rate for these new soldiers through basic combat training, infantry advanced individual training and specialized preparatory training is very high. Owing perhaps to a higher academic standard for candidates enlisted directly from civil society, these young soldiers complete the initial phases of Special Forces Assessment and Selection at a higher rate than recent in-service candidates. I participated in the SFQC graduation ceremony for the first soldiers recruited in this manner and I was very impressed with them. Only time will tell how they will do on the operational detachments, but I'm optimistic. While these preliminary observations are encouraging, and the program is quite popular among Recruiting Command's target market, I would like to await further maturity of the preliminary data.

What initiatives, if any, do you support to improve the retention of highly experienced officers and non-commissioned officers?

Answer: Enhanced pay raises, retention bonuses for selected specialties, and changes in the retirement system have led to increased levels of satisfaction and increased retention rates. I support these initiatives, and I encourage Congress to continue funding these critical programs.

Duty in Korea

The Commander, United States Forces Korea, has noted that a DoD survey conducted in 2001 indicated that Korea was selected as the least desirable military assignment, and expressed concern about what have been described as some of the worst living and working conditions in the military.

What are your views about the adequacy of the living and working conditions in Korea?

Answer: If confirmed, I intend to assess the conditions in Korea first hand. Among some of the initiatives I would consider would be MILCON programming levels, barracks upgrades, and the Land Partnership Plan.

Given the conditions experienced by soldiers stationed in Korea, do you consider the special pays and allowances associated with duty in Korea to be adequate?

Answer: I have not made any specific conclusions regarding this issue. If confirmed, I would work to ensure that special pay and allowances associated with duty in Korea and other overseas locations are fair and adequate.

What measures do you think need to be taken to improve quality of life and conditions for troops stationed in Korea?

Answer: I believe the Army should provide our soldiers adequate living and working conditions and good telecommunications infrastructure to maintain contact with their families. I understand that substantial funding has already been programmed to accomplish this task and if confirmed, I would reinforce this effort.

Congressional Oversight

In order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of the Congress are able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information.

Do you agree, if confirmed for this high position, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of the Congress?

Answer: Yes

Do you agree, when asked, to give your personal views, even if those views differ from the Administration in power?

Answer: Yes

Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the Chief of Staff, Army?

Answer: Yes

Do you agree to ensure that testimony, briefings and other communications of information are provided to this Committee and its staff and other appropriate Committees?

Answer: Yes