

**HEARING TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATIONS
OF: GENERAL CLAUDE R. KEHLER, USAF,
FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF
GENERAL AND TO BE COMMANDER, UNITED
STATES STRATEGIC COMMAND; AND GEN-
ERAL CARTER F. HAM, USA, FOR RE-
APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GEN-
ERAL AND TO BE COMMANDER, UNITED
STATES AFRICA COMMAND**

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2010

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:33 a.m. in room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, Senator Carl Levin (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Bill Nelson, E. Benjamin Nelson, Webb, Udall, Hagan, Begich, Burris, Manchin, Coons, McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Thune, LeMieux, and Brown.

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

Majority staff members present: Madelyn R. Creedon, counsel; Richard W. Fieldhouse, professional staff member; Michael J. Kuiken, professional staff member; Gerald J. Leeling, counsel; Jason W. Maroney, counsel; Robie I. Samanta Roy, professional staff member; and William K. Sutey, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: Joseph W. Bowab, Republican staff director; Adam J. Barker, professional staff member; Daniel A. Lerner, professional staff member; Richard F. Walsh, minority counsel; and Dana W. White, professional staff member.

Staff assistants present: Jennifer R. Knowles, Kathleen A. Kulenkampff, and Brian F. Sebold.

Committee members' assistants present: Christopher Griffin, assistant to Senator Lieberman; Carolyn Chuhta, assistant to Senator Reed; Jeffrey Fatora, assistant to Senator Bill Nelson; Gordon I. Peterson, assistant to Senator Webb; Jennifer Barrett, assistant to Senator Udall; Roger Pena, assistant to Senator Hagan; Lindsay Kavanaugh, assistant to Senator Begich; Nathan Davern, assistant to Senator Burris; Joanne McLaughlin, assistant to Senator Manchin; Halie Soifer, assistant to Senator Coons; Anthony

Lazarski, assistant to Senator Inhofe; Lenwood Landrum, assistant to Senator Sessions; Clyde Taylor IV, assistant to Senator Chambliss; Jason Van Beek and Ryan Nelson, assistants to Senator Thune; Erskine W. Wells III, assistant to Senator Wicker; Brian Walsh, assistant to Senator LeMieux; and Brandon Aitchison, assistant to Senator Brown.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN, CHAIRMAN

Chairman LEVIN. Good morning, everybody. The committee meets this morning to consider the nominations of General Robert Kehler, U.S. Air Force, to be Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, and General Carter Ham, U.S. Army, to be Commander of the U.S. Africa Command. We give both of you a warm welcome.

We also have a warm welcome for two new colleagues, I believe, who are with us this morning. Senator Coons is with us this morning, from Delaware. A warm welcome to you, Senator. Senator Manchin is not here, but I expect that he will be here. Senator Burris, still with us.

General Kehler and General Ham, each of you have long and distinguished careers in the United States military and it's a real pleasure to have both of you with us today. As you and we all know, without the strong and continuing support of your families that your military careers would not be possible. So we thank each member of your families for the sacrifices that they have made and will continue to make when you assume the commands for which you have been nominated.

General Kehler, you're well suited to be Commander of U.S. Strategic Command. You've spent your entire career in space and nuclear assignments, and that includes 2½ years as the Deputy Commander of the Strategic Command. As you well know, Strategic Command is a challenging command with a global reach and a large number of challenging mission areas, including the following:

Ensuring the United States has access to and freedom of action in space and cyber space; maintaining a reliable nuclear deterrent and being prepared to respond if deterrence fails; providing targeting and other support to U.S. Joint Force Commanders; synchronizing global missile defense plans and operations; coordinating regional efforts to combat weapons of mass destruction; planning, integrating, and coordinating intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, ISR, assets in support of strategic and global operations; and guiding the implementation of the New START Treaty when it's ratified.

On the subject of the New START Treaty, I would note that there have been multiple hearings and briefings on the new treaty. Hundreds of questions for the record have been answered. A robust budget request for the nuclear weapons complex has been submitted to Congress. It's now been a year since the United States has gone without a replacement for the expired START Treaty and thus no ability to implement the new and important inspection and verification regimes of the New START Treaty, and we'll be asking General Kehler for his views on that new treaty.

Much of the technical superiority of U.S. military forces is reliant on space systems. While these systems provide significant advantages, they also present the potential for significant vulnerability.

Strategic Command helps to ensure that the global access to these important systems is maintained and sustained.

One of the newest and most challenging areas of responsibility for the Strategic Command is the area of cyber operations, protecting and defending Defense Department networks and cyber assets and, if directed, engaging in offensive cyber operations. Strategic Command must also plan and be prepared, if called upon, to assist other government agencies with the defense of their networks.

There are many issues which remain unresolved in this area, in which you will be involved, General, and we look forward to your views on these issues, including the questions of authorities, responsibility, and rules of engagement.

General Ham, you've had a distinguished career in the Army and we thank you for your willingness to serve our country over the last 3½ decades. If confirmed, you will be only the second Commander of the U.S. Africa Command, AFRICOM, and you will be forced to balance the requirements of continuing to stand up this nascent geographic combatant command, as well as play a supporting role in advancing U.S. policy objectives on the continent of Africa.

General Ham, the challenges facing AFRICOM are staggering: terrorism and violent extremists in Somalia and West Africa, conflicts between state and non-state actors that rage across borders, fragile governments that lack the capacity to project their presence beyond the bounds of their capitals, illicit arms smuggling routes, nations where peacekeeping or peace-enforcing forces are the best and sometimes the only hope for security and stability. So we look forward to hearing your views on these and other matters.

At present, one of the most pressing concerns in the view of members of this committee is the evolving threat posed by certain Al Qaeda and Al Shabab elements in Somalia, including the stated desire of these elements to attack the United States. In addition to Somalia, there are a number of other areas where the committee will be eager to learn of your views, including: the January 2011 referendum in Sudan; the threat posed by Al Qaeda in an organization known as Al Qaeda in the Lands of the Islamic Maghreb, or AQIM; ongoing atrocities being conducted by the Lord's Resistance Army; potential areas for expanded military-to-military relations with a number of key country in Africa.

One area where you will be working together is in combatting the regional spread of weapons of mass destruction. You'll be working together on those, on that issue; and, with the support of this committee, the Cooperative Threat Reduction, or CTR, program now has the authority to make a more global approach to combatting weapons of mass destruction, including identifying issues and actions in Africa.

Strategic Command's responsibility for coordinating both regional and global approaches to combatting WMD and the CTR program's new authorities should result in a more comprehensive, coordinated approach to dealing with these challenges.

Senator McCain.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

Senator MCCAIN. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and let me thank our distinguished witnesses for joining us this morning and for their service to our Nation. I'd also like to join the chairman in welcoming our two new members, Senator Coons and Senator Manchin. We look forward to working with you.

I say to the witnesses, if confirmed, your respective commands will prove critical in countering a variety of strategic, asymmetric, and terrorist threats to the United States. General Kehler, the Strategic Command is responsible for ensuring freedom of access to space and cyber space and coordinating global missile defense plans and operations. The missile threat from rogue nations like Iran and North Korea is increasing. But equally worrisome is China's growing air and conventional missile capabilities. According to the U.S. China Economic and Security Review Commission 2010 Report to Congress, it concludes: "China has the ability to strike five out of six U.S. Air Force bases in East Asia."

The report also highlights China's increasingly sophisticated cyber warfare capabilities. Earlier this year, the Chinese Internet service provider redirected global Internet traffic for at least 18 minutes, briefly hijacking what the commission report refers to as a "large volume of Internet traffic, including data from the U.S. military."

A large-scale cyber attack against Google in China was also reported, an incident Google described as a "highly sophisticated and targeted attack" on its corporate infrastructure, originating from China, that resulted in the theft of intellectual property.

I predict that this committee and you will be spending a great deal of time on this whole issue of cyber warfare.

We don't know a lot about it. We haven't really understood some of the things that our both friends and adversaries are doing, and it opens up, obviously, a whole new type of warfare that we are going to have to be much better prepared for than we are today.

As Commander of U.S. STRATCOM, you will serve a critical role in countering these threats and advocating for our own nuclear missile defense, space, and cyber capabilities. One of these responsibilities which the Senate has spent considerable time reviewing is the New START Treaty, its references and legally binding limitations on ballistic missile defense, and the modernization of both the nuclear weapons complex and the triad of nuclear delivery vehicles.

I look forward to hearing your views on the treaty's handling of missile defense, the current health of the nuclear weapons complex, and the need for investing in the development and deployment of the next generation of delivery vehicles.

General Ham, I believe you are nominated for this command at a critical time, not only with respect to security on the continent, but with respect to possible growing threats to our homeland. In the past I've been critical of U.S. military involvement on the Horn of Africa. Other than providing more financial support for the UN mission there and humanitarian support, I'm unclear of what the administration's short or long-term plan is to achieve stability on the horn.

But the threat from the region to our friends, our interests, and even our homeland has changed significantly in the past few years.

AFRICOM was born in the shadow of COCOM fighting two wars. Concerns about basing rather than the mission dominated the debate for years. Given the command's integrated interagency command structure, AFRICOM remains unique among equals, and that's why AFRICOM must be prepared and resourced to protect Americans, American interests, and American security throughout its area of responsibility.

As we all might remember, in 1998 Al Qaeda launched attacks on the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania, killing 12 Americans. Al Qaeda and related groups have executed subsequent terrorist attacks in East Africa, including an American suicide bomber in Somalia in October 2008. This summer in Uganda, Al Shabab, a Somali Islamist insurgent group with ties to Al Qaeda, conducted its first successful attack outside Somali territory, killing 76 people, including 1 American.

While Al Shabab has focused primarily on its neighbors, then-Director of National Intelligence Dennis

Blair at a Senate Select Committee on Intelligence hearing testified: "We judge most Al Shabab and East Africa-based al Qaeda members will remain focused on regional objectives in the near term. Nevertheless, East Africa-based al Qaeda leaders or Al Shabab may elect to redirect to the homeland some of the westerners, including North Americans, now training and fighting in Somalia."

On August 5, more than a dozen Somali Americans, permanent residents, were arrested. Attorney General Eric Holder announced that 14 people are being charged with providing financial support to Al Shabab.

I trust that AFRICOM will continue to deliver its unique brand of interagency theater security cooperation and building partner capacity. However, it's imperative that AFRICOM also evolve and acquire the necessary capabilities to identify, deter, and counter all relevant threats to our Nation's security.

I look forward to our witnesses' testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.

Senator Manchin, welcome.

There's a series of standard questions that we ask all of our nominees, that I'll now ask, and you'll each just give us your responses together.

First, have you adhered to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

General KEHLER. I have.

General HAM. I have.

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

General KEHLER. I do.

General HAM. I do.

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

General KEHLER. I have not.

General HAM. I have not.

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

General KEHLER. I will.

General HAM. I will.

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

General KEHLER. I will.

General HAM. I will.

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

General KEHLER. They will.

General HAM. They will.

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

General KEHLER. I do.

General HAM. I do.

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

General KEHLER. I do.

General HAM. I do.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, General Kehler, General Ham. We're going to now turn to you for your opening remarks, and please feel free to introduce any members of your family or others who may be with you today. Thank you.

General Kehler, why don't you start.

STATEMENT OF GEN. CLAUDE R. KEHLER, USAF, NOMINATED FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL AND TO BE COMMANDER, U.S. STRATEGIC COMMAND

General KEHLER. Mr. Chairman, thank you, sir. Before I begin, I would like to introduce my wife, Marjorie, who is here. This is the first time she's attended a hearing in the Senate. This is an exciting time for the Kehler family. Unfortunately, our two sons are grown; they couldn't be here with us today. But I can tell you that, if I may just put a plug in for military spouses, the phenomenal things that they do for our airmen, soldiers, sailors, marines, coast guardsmen, Marge certainly represents that. I'm very proud of her and very grateful for the things that she does. Especially, she has set aside an accounting profession to be part of a team, to take care of our troops and their families. And I'm especially proud because she and others like her have been doing an awful lot to work in support of our wounded warriors.

Chairman LEVIN. Well, we thank her for that and for all the things that she does for us and for you. We could use maybe some of your accounting talents in the Pentagon.

Have you thought about joining forces with your husband?

You're very, very welcome indeed, Mrs. Kehler.

General.

General KEHLER. Mr. Chairman, Senator McCain, distinguished members of the committee: Thank you for this opportunity to come

before you today. It's my sincere honor to appear as the nominee to lead U.S. Strategic Command. I thank the President and the Secretary of Defense for nominating me for this important duty. I also thank the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for expressing his confidence in my ability to serve as a combatant commander.

If confirmed, I look forward to working with you to address the strategic challenges that face our Nation. They are complex, unremitting, and compelling, and U.S. Strategic Command plays a key role in each.

Previous nuclear threats continue, while new ones, state and non-state, are emerging. New and complex transitional linkages provide opportunities for terrorism and other security concerns. Space is no longer the sole purview of two superpowers and it is certainly not a sanctuary. Cyber threats present national security problems that we are only beginning to understand, and organizing for this challenge is still in its beginning stages. International security relationships need to be forged with rapidly growing new regional powers.

All these developments will require more intensive and extensive cooperation across many elements of our government and the governments of our friends and allies. Our ability to shape events to our interests will depend, as always, on the skill and dedication of the great men and women who serve our Nation.

Leading Strategic Command is an awesome responsibility. If confirmed, I pledge to you that the strategic challenges facing our Nation will command all the energy and commitment that I can muster. I'm very fortunate in that I have been the beneficiary of assignments and mentoring and operational experiences and command opportunities that align with Strategic Command's mission set and that I believe have prepared me for this challenge.

If confirmed, I will also be fortunate and deeply humbled in following the path blazed by some of our truly great national leaders. I want to particularly mention the most recent one, General Kevin Chilton. His leadership has been deeply important in these past critical years to shaping our National posture, and Marge and I are grateful to count Chilly and his wife Kathy as our dear friends, and we certainly wish them the best as they proceed into retired life.

Of course, as always, if confirmed, I will look forward to working with and caring for the world's best soldiers, sailors, marines, airmen, civilians, and their families.

Mr. Chairman, Senator McCain, distinguished committee members, it's a privilege to be here before you today and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Kehler follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, General Kehler.
General Ham.

STATEMENT OF GEN CARTER F. HAM, USA, NOMINATED FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL AND TO BE COMMANDER, U.S. AFRICA COMMAND

General HAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My family's not here, but I'm hoping they're watching by webcast. I wife Christie is a lifelong educator, having taught and served as a principal in numerous schools as we moved during our Army service. Our daugh-

ter Jennifer was born in Vicenza, Italy, and she and her husband, Army Captain Kyle Burns, a Silver Star and Purple Heart recipient for actions in Afghanistan, live near Fort Benning, GA. Jennifer and Kyle are parents to 3½-month old Jackson, our first grandchild.

Our son Jonathan graduated—was born in Weisbaden, Germany, graduated from the University of Georgia. He and his wife Sarah live and work in Northern Virginia and they're expecting a baby girl this spring.

I'm certainly proud of all of them and draw my strength from them, and thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to mention them.

Mr. Chairman, Senator McCain, and members of the committee: When I enlisted in the Army as a private in 1973, never in my wildest imagination did I envision appearing before the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. Senate to be considered as a combatant commander. The day that Secretary Gates told me that he intended to recommend to the President that I be nominated to be the next Commander of U.S. Africa Command, I was struck by two contradictory feelings. First, I was exhilarated to have the possibility to serve in a command which I believe is of great importance and for which there is such great opportunity. Second, I felt a tremendous sense of humility, the humility and sense of honor that comes from being asked to continue to serve alongside the men and women of our armed forces as they and their families unselfishly serve our Nation.

I also recognize that if confirmed I have big shoes to fill. I've been an admirer of General Kip Ward and Mrs. Joyce Ward for a long time, and I'm proud to be their friend. In my opinion, we owe General and Mrs. Ward our deepest thanks and appreciation.

Africa is important to U.S. interests. These interests include concerns over violent extremist activities, piracy, illicit trafficking, Africa's many humanitarian crises, armed conflicts, and more general challenges such as the effect of HIV-AIDS. U.S. Africa Command, as the military component of a U.S. "whole of government" approach, has a role in addressing each of these issues. The key remains that Africa's future is up to Africans.

If confirmed, I look forward to building upon the command's efforts, to continue expanding the unique inter-agency composition of the headquarters, and to enhancing partnerships with African nations. I acknowledge that, if confirmed, I have a lot to learn about Africa and about U.S. Africa Command, and I pledge to you, Mr. Chairman, to Senator McCain, and to the members of the committee the same pledge that I gave to Secretary Gates: I will do my best each and every day to uphold the trust and confidence you place in me, to accomplish the many and varied important missions of the command, and to the very best of my ability provide for the wellbeing of the soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, Coast Guardsmen, civilians, and families entrusted to my care.

If confirmed, I look forward to working closely with this committee to ensure U.S. Africa Command is correctly focused on accomplishing its role in support of U.S. policy objectives in Africa.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of General Ham follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you so much, General Ham.

Let's try a first round of 7 minutes. We have a good turnout here today.

General Kehler, the committee has a provision in our 2011 defense authorization bill that would require the Secretary of Defense to report to Congress by March 1st, 2011, on cyber warfare policy. The committee conducted an extensive examination of the Department's proposal to establish U.S. Cyber Command as a sub-unified command under U.S. Strategic Command. Our examination revealed that there are substantial and worrisome gaps in the policy and guidelines needed to govern U.S. military operations in cyber space. Senior Department of Defense officials testified to this fact and assured the committee that the Secretary of Defense understands the situation well and intends to have answers to many, if not all, of the major policy questions by the end of this calendar year.

Now, these are just a few of the unresolved issues: first, rules of engagement and authorities for various command echelons, including Cyber Command itself; second, how to limit escalation; third, what constitutes a use of force and an act of war in cyber space, including for compliance with the War Powers Act; and fourth, the lack of a deterrence doctrine, what deters cyber attacks.

Now, my question is kind of a status or process question. If you know the answer, what is the status of the Secretary's cyber policy review, and is the Department on track to fulfil the year-end commitment to complete the review that was given to the committee during the confirmation process for General Alexander?

General KEHLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First let me say I recognize that in the whole area of cyber space I have much to learn. If I'm confirmed, this is one of the areas that is going to command a great deal of my time and energy early on. My perspective today is as a Service component to Strategic Command, we have been working to align our cyber space activities under the new construction of Strategic Command, U.S. Cyber Command, and then the Service components that fit that.

So there is much for me to learn here if I am confirmed, and I would be delighted to dig into this further. My understanding, you have defined, I think, the issues very well. In my mind, this is about authorities, responsibilities, oversight, doctrine, all of the pieces that need to be put in place to drive forward and where we need to be postured in cyber space.

That work is under way. I think you and the committee are aware that the Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Defense have just signed a memorandum outlining roles and responsibilities and other steps that will be taken to partner together. Those are all positive steps, but there is much more to do.

My understanding is that there is—that the work on the report that you're referring to is continuing. In my preparation for the confirmation hearing, I was told that the expectation is that they will be delivering that on time.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Last year the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs, with support from the combatant commanders, unanimously rec-

commended the so-called “Phased Adaptive Approach” to missile defense in Europe, and the President approved their recommendation. This year the administration produced the Ballistic Missile Defense Review Report that set forth U.S. strategic, policy, and plans for missile defense.

My question is, do you support the administration’s missile defense policies and priorities, including the Phased Adaptive Approach, to missile defense in Europe?

General KEHLER. Yes, sir, I do support those policies and I do support the Phased Adaptive Approach.

Chairman LEVIN. General Kehler, Secretary of Defense Gates, Admiral Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Chilton, the current Commander of Strategic Command, and Lieutenant General O’Reilly, the Director of the Missile Defense Agency, have all testified that the New START Treaty does not limit or constrain our missile defense plans or programs. Do you agree?

General KEHLER. Mr. Chairman, that’s my understanding as well. Yes, I do.

Chairman LEVIN. Do you agree—let me ask you a couple of questions about the New START Treaty specifically. Does the New START Treaty limit our non-nuclear long-range weapons?

General KEHLER. Mr. Chairman, the New START Treaty as I understand it does not limit. It does, however, under certain circumstances cause them to be counted under the limits of the New START Treaty.

Chairman LEVIN. Does the New START Treaty constrain our development and deployment of missile defense capabilities?

General KEHLER. Sir, in my opinion it does not. There’s one relationship in the treaty, to put a finer point on it, about not being able to deploy missile defense interceptors in existing ballistic missile silos, except for the five that we have already done so at Vandenberg Air Force Base. However, it is not in our current plans, as I understand them, to do that.

Chairman LEVIN. Is the administration committed to replacing and modernizing our aging nuclear weapons laboratory and industrial infrastructure?

General KEHLER. Sir, my understanding is that they are. The 2011 budget is on the Hill and has sustainment and modernization funds in it. I have not seen the 2012 budget and can’t comment on the 2012 budget.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

General Ham, you and Jay Johnson, the DOD General Counsel, are serving as co-chairmen of the Department of Defense Working Group tasked by the Secretary of Defense to conduct a comprehensive review of the issues associated with implementing a repeal of the law that’s commonly referred to as “don’t ask, don’t tell.” Your report is due to the Secretary of Defense no later than the 1st of December, I believe.

When we met yesterday, you informed me that you are not authorized to discuss the content of the draft report before that time. This committee will hold a hearing on the report shortly after the Secretary provides it to Congress. We’re urging that that be done, by the way, prior to December 1st, if possible, and you will be available at that time to discuss the contents of the report.

My question is just on the timing issue, then, because I won't ask you about your views on the substance or what the substance is. Do you anticipate that the working group's report will be ready to be presented to the Secretary of Defense before December 1st?

General HAM. Mr. Chairman, I think it will take us until the 1st of December. The key factor remaining for us and the review group is to receive the review and comment by the service chiefs and service secretaries, which is ongoing. We anticipate their comments soon. Mr. Johnson and I will review those comments, make final adjustments to the report, which is currently in draft form, and then deliver it to Secretary Gates on 1 December.

Chairman LEVIN. Would you make every effort to deliver it prior to December 1st if possible?

General HAM. Yes, sir, in consultation with the Secretary's office. Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Senator McCain.

Senator MCCAIN. General Ham, since the issue has been brought up, the survey went out to 400,000 military personnel; is that correct?

General HAM. That's correct, Senator.

Senator MCCAIN. How many—what percent responded?

General HAM. Senator McCain, we received a little over 115,000 responses.

Senator MCCAIN. Like 25 percent.

General HAM. A little more, about 28, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. Excuse me, 28 percent.

And isn't it true that the survey said in a preamble, said that is considering changes to the "don't ask, don't tell" policy that "would allow gay and lesbian servicemembers to serve in the military without risk of separation because of their sexual orientation"? Is the true?

General HAM. Yes, sir, it is.

Senator MCCAIN. The question was also preceded by a presumptive declaration that if "don't ask, don't tell" is repealed, "the services will maintain their high standards of conduct," is that true? Is that also true?

General HAM. Sir, it is.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you.

General Ham, what do you understand to be the relationship between Al Qaeda's senior leadership and Al Shabab?

General HAM. Senator, I know that, from open source reporting, that Al Shabab has claimed that there is a relationship between—

Chairman LEVIN. What's your view of the relationship?

General HAM. Sir, their stating that they believe that they have a relationship certainly conveys to me that that's the type of operations that they want to engage in. I'm not privy to the detailed information and intelligence yet that would verify or refute that allegation. But they are certainly a dangerous and disruptive organization.

Chairman LEVIN. Well, I'm sorry you couldn't answer the question. I was asking your view as to what the relationship was. But what is the threat to the U.S. from Al Shabab, particularly given recent arrests of U.S. citizens apparently planning to travel to Somalia to join Al Shabab?

General HAM. Senator, my understanding is that Al Shabab is, while primarily focused on internal matters in Somalia, their recent activities outside of the country convey to me a very disturbing interest in conducting more widespread terrorist activities, which certainly are of concern to the United States. If confirmed, it would be a very high priority for me to understand better how we might counter that threat.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, again it's evidence that Americans are joining Al Shabab, right?

General HAM. Sir, my understanding is that in this particular case that's true.

Senator MCCAIN. General Kehler, notwithstanding Russia's threat to withdraw from the treaty, are you committed to advocating for the funding, development, and deployment of all elements of the Phased Adaptive Approach for missile defense in Europe, as well as implementing the strategy as portrayed in the ballistic missile defense review?

General KEHLER. Yes, sir, I am.

Senator MCCAIN. Do you believe that the Russian unilateral statement that the treaty is "effective and viable only in conditions where there is no qualitative or quantitative buildup in the missile defense system capabilities of the United States of America"? Have you heard—you know that statement was part of the signing statement at the time of ratification, right? I mean, agreement.

General KEHLER. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. Have the Russians made any public statement refuting that signing statement they made?

General KEHLER. Sir, I don't know if they have or not. I'm not—

Senator MCCAIN. To your knowledge?

General KEHLER. To my knowledge, they have not.

Senator MCCAIN. Given your involvement, you might know probably if they did.

General KEHLER. Yes, sir. Yes, sir, although I will tell you that at this point in my current seat I may not have seen everything. But I have not seen anything, I guess. I'm not trying to be evasive, but I've not seen anything.

Senator MCCAIN. Does it concern you that they would make a signing statement at the time that the agreement was signed that basically said that if there was any change, "qualitative or quantitative buildup in the missile defense system capabilities of the United States of America," that the treaty would not be viable, in their words?

General KEHLER. Sir, all I can answer with is that our position as I understand it has been that those two are not related.

Senator MCCAIN. But the Russians have made no statement that it is unrelated. It's just our position, right?

General KEHLER. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. Recent press reports state that North Korea's weaponry is showing design characteristics associated with the Shabab-3, Iran's most advanced missile.

Are you concerned that apparently the two countries, Iran and North Korea, are collaborating to produce improvements in both arsenals?

General KEHLER. Sir, I am most definitely concerned.

Senator MCCAIN. And we have seen, I mean in an unclassified manner, published reports have been that apparently they are working in coordination together to improve both arsenals. Is that your view as well?

General KEHLER. It is. The proliferation of missile technology, I think, especially in those areas like North Korea and Iran, is especially disturbing. My view, the number one threat that we are facing these days is the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction in the hands of the regional actors that pose the threat.

Senator MCCAIN. Do you agree with DOD's assessment that with sufficient foreign assistance, "Iran could probably develop and test an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching the United States by the year 2015"?

General KEHLER. I agree with the DOD assessment, yes, sir. I wasn't aware that it was 2015. I've read that, but I do agree with the DOD assessment on this, yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. So again, I return to my previous statement. It seems to me that it's deeply concerning that both countries have areas of expertise on both nuclear capability as well as missile technology, and transfers between the two countries is deeply concerning.

General KEHLER. Yes, sir, I would agree with that.

Senator MCCAIN. Are you concerned about Mr. Ahmedinejad's new relationship with Mr. Chavez down in Venezuela?

General KEHLER. Yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. How serious do you think that relationship is?

General KEHLER. Again from my current perspective, I'm not much more aware of that relationship than what we've just been discussing here in an open forum. This is one of those areas that, if confirmed, I'm going to have to push into to get a better feel for those specific points. STRATCOM does have some responsibility here, working with the regional combatant commanders, to address these kinds of threats that can go outside the regional boundaries.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, thank you. I just want to repeat again what I said in my opening comments. This whole cyber war issue is one that we've been working with Senator Lieberman and the Homeland Security Committee and the Intelligence Committee. It covers a number of jurisdictions here in the Congress. But I would argue that it is the greatest threat, of which we have the least knowledge and expertise, than just about any threat that we face. Would you view that as an overstatement?

General KEHLER. Sir, I wouldn't view that as an overstatement. I do think it's a significant area of concern. Certainly, again, in STRATCOM's portfolio, if I'm confirmed, this is one of those areas that demands I think the same sense of urgency that has been put on it here over the last year or so, and my pledge will be to dig right into this and be as helpful as I can.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.

As Senator McCain points out, the relationship of our committees that have jurisdiction over parts of that issue is extremely important, and our working together, which is under way, with Senator Lieberman and his ranking member, Senator Collins, and the Intel-

ligence Committee is, if not as important, very important, just the way inter-agency working together is very significant and very important, as Senator McCain points out.

Senator LIEBERMAN.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thanks, Mr. Chairman. Let me just pick up from your comments and Senator McCain's about how real the threat of cyber attack is and how much I think that members of Congress and the general public are not aware of it. Perhaps even some are skeptical of how serious it is.

Yesterday, in the Homeland Security Committee, we held a hearing on the so-called Stuxnet worm which was discovered. Really, this is another world, but the ability—just to show how complicated it is, as the experts said to us yesterday, we don't know where this originated, we don't know what its target was, but we know it's out there and it has the capacity—it's now infected 60,000 different computer systems in the world, including some in the U.S. It has the capacity essentially on command to disrupt the digital systems, the computer systems, that control, for instance, electric power plants.

When you think about the havoc that could be unleashed in a country like ours, it's profoundly unsettling. So I appreciate the very significant step forward in the memorandum of understanding between the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security, a pretty clear division of responsibility here. DOD has responsibility for, obviously, defense web sites and our offensive capacity and defensive capacity, Department of Homeland Security for the civilian infrastructure and the Federal Government non-defense web sites.

But DOD and of course NSA have such extraordinary capabilities that they can now inform what DHS does. I appreciate that. Our committees are going to continue to work together.

I was actually very proud yesterday that all the witnesses agreed that it was a group at the Department of Homeland Security more than anybody in the private sector or anywhere else that actually had the comprehensive capability to unravel the Stuxnet puzzle, if you will. But we need your help, and I appreciate your commitment to that, General, and I look forward to working with you on both committees.

Thank you both for your service to our country. You're both just extraordinarily prepared for this next assignment that the country has asked of you.

General Ham, I just want to ask a quick question about the working group on "don't ask, don't tell." It's not appropriate to ask—first, I appreciate that you've told us this morning that the report will definitely be out by December 1st and, if possible, working with the Secretary, earlier if you complete the work.

I wanted to ask you, just for informational purposes, not about the contents, but in a sense about the table of contents. There has been a lot of focus on the leaks about the survey down of military personnel, but am I right that that's just one part of what you're going to do? And I wonder if just in summary you could describe what else you and Mr. Johnson intend to cover in the report?

General HAM. Senator, I would. Essentially, the terms of reference which Secretary Gates issued to Mr. Johnson myself gave

us two tasks. The first was to assess the impacts upon effectiveness, readiness, unit cohesion, recruiting and retention—

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right.

General HAM.—should repeal occur. Then the second part of our charge was, understanding those impacts, develop a plan for implementation, so that if the law is repealed and the policy changes the Department is prepared for that. We would call that in military parlance contingency planning.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right.

General HAM. The directive to assess the impacts contained a specific issue or statement from Secretary Gates to conduct a systematic engagement of the force, to include families. We did this in a number of ways. The survey of the servicemembers, Active, Guard, and Reserve, was one. We also had a survey for family members.

In addition to those two statistically sound and analytically rigorous assessments, we conducted a number of engagements across the force, in groups both large and small, to get a sense of what were the topics of interest to the force and to their families. We conducted small demographically focused focus groups, for example a group of perhaps 9 to 12 junior enlisted marines from the combat arms and other similarly organized groups.

We established what we call an on-line in box, an opportunity for members of the military and their families to provide anonymously their comments to us with regard to their thoughts about “don’t ask, don’t tell.”

The most difficult challenge we had probably, at least in my opinion, was how do we get the sense from those who are gay men and lesbians that are serving in the force today without triggering the requirements of the law that would cause them to separate. So we established what we called a confidential communication mechanism through a third party, non-DOD entity to try to get a better assessment of that.

All in all, Senator, we believe this is probably as far as I could tell the most comprehensive assessment of a personnel policy matter that the Department of Defense has conducted.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thanks for that. Obviously, I agree it’s very comprehensive and should inform the decision that Congress makes in voting on the question, and also obviously, if it’s repealed, facilitate the transition that the Department of Defense itself will make. So I thank you for that.

I want to ask you one question about the Africa Command. It seems to me—and I agree with you, of course, in highlighting the threat posed by al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb and Al Shabab, that you’re highlighting the two highest counterterrorism priorities in Africa. It also reminds us that really the war against Islamic terrorism is a world war. We’re obviously involved intensively on the ground in Afghanistan, now scaling down in Iraq. But this enemy is appearing all over the world.

I view these two terrorist groups in Africa and the countries in which they’re located as tests of whether we can essentially stop them or contain them before they spread and they become something like Afghanistan, if you will. I note in your response to advance questions that you’ve said that AFRICOM, the Africa Com-

mand, faces significant resourcing challenges in almost every field. I hope upon your confirmation that you'll conduct a top to bottom assessment of your command's requirements for personnel, ISR, security assistance funding, and other resources and convey them directly, obviously, both up the chain of command, but when you appear before the committee, to this committee.

Can we count on you to do that?

General HAM. Yes, sir.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thank you.

That's all the questions I have this morning. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Lieberman.

Senator Inhofe.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, let me get the unpleasantries out of the way first. As I read this, there are many things about the START Treaty I don't like, but the major concern is one that's brought up by Senator McCain. When I read something like this, the unilateral statement—this is the wording they used—they talk about the extraordinary events would cause them to release themselves. Consequently, “the extraordinary events referred to in Article 14 of the treaty also include a buildup in the missile defense system capabilities of the United States of America such that it would give rise to a threat to the strategic nuclear”—and then that was further simplified, I think, by the Russians when they said “The treaty can operate and be viable only if the United States of America refrains from developing its missile defense capabilities quantitatively and qualitatively.”

I guess my question is, what's ambiguous about that?

General KEHLER. Sir, I'm not exactly sure what you just asked me.

Senator INHOFE. Well, I'm asking you—I mean, I read that and it says that they'd bail out if we enhance our systems.

General KEHLER. I see. Well, it doesn't sound like the Russian position is ambiguous. But again, as I understand it, our position is not that one. Our position is that these are not related. Again as I understand it, the regional threat drives our missile defense planning. The strategic balance between the United States and Russia is driven by the strategic forces that are covered by the treaty.

Senator INHOFE. Well, we are going to have to be enhancing our missile defense system. I think most people here, they may not say it that way, but we are going to. I know a lot of us were very much concerned when the ground-based capability was taken out of Poland, and it was just pointed out by Senator McCain that Iran would have this capability with a delivery system by 2015. That's not even classified. That's a position that everyone agrees with.

Now, I guess I'd just ask you one question: Do you think in the absence of that capability that we are not more endangered—and I'm talking about in Western Europe and eastern United States—by the removal of that system in Poland? A quick answer.

General KEHLER. As I understand it, I don't think we are endangered, provided that we go ahead with the Phased Adaptive Approach.

Senator INHOFE. All right. General Ham, I enjoyed our long, long, long visit that we had on the subject that's been discussed here. I can only tell you that the soldiers in the field, the ones you talk to, don't feel that their input was heard during this inquiry that was announced that was supposed to be taking place until December 1st. It was the impression, at least what I hear from them in the field, that they're saying: All right, we're going to adopt this position; now, how do we best implement this thing? So I only want you to know that we'll be talking about this in some length in the future.

But I am interested in what you're going to be doing, as I told you, in some of the problems in Africa that I'm very personally interested in. General Wald handled this thing during the transition. Then General Ward came along and has done an incredible job, I think with limited resources, with inadequate resources, at least it's my impression.

We've had a problem, a lot of little problems, in Africa that people don't know about. Of course, they're familiar with what's happening in Zimbabwe. They're familiar with Somalia, the problems between Eritrea and Ethiopia. One of the biggest things that I've been concerned with and personally involved in trying to do something about is the LRA, Lord's Resistance Army. Starting in northern Uganda, it's also spread through Rwanda, eastern Congo.

It wasn't until a few weeks ago that we passed and it was signed by the President a policy of this country to take out Joseph Kony and the LRA. I'd like to get your opinion as to—for those members of the committee who might be new, let me just say that Joseph Kony started about 30 years ago in this. Some people call it the child soldiers, little kids, 13, 14 years old. They trained them to be soldiers, and the first thing they have to do is go back to their villages and murder their parents and all this. If they don't do it, they cut their limbs off. This is really something that nobody likes to talk about, that a lot of people don't know about.

What's your level of concern and your interest in implementing the direction that we gave in the law that we passed a few months ago concerning the LRA?

General HAM. Senator, I agree with you. I need to learn more about the Lord's Resistance Army, but what I do know from my previous assignment as the Director for Operations on the Joint Staff and what I've read in open source, it is a horrific situation. As we discussed yesterday, Senator, I look to learn more about that personally and find ways that, if confirmed, that Africa Command can contribute to the solution to that problem.

I am aware that Africa Command has been engaged in developing the capability of the Ugandan forces and I think that's a step in the right direction. If confirmed, Senator, I'll look at this issue much more closely to see what the command might be able to do.

Senator INHOFE. I would say that President Museveni in Uganda and President Kigami in Rwanda and Joe Kabila, all three now agree that it's kind of a joint problem, because of the fact that this movement is moving around between these countries, and Central Africa, too, I guess, Central African Republic.

So anyway, that's going to be something that I would like to be the clearing point for any activity that you have and be updated

on on a regular basis, because I would like to have it during your command, and I think you're going to be doing a great job in that command, that we will have this problem be eradicated by that time.

Now, there are a lot of others. People know about Somalia, people know about some things that get Sudan a lot of publicity. But a lot of things are happening that they're not aware of. I am quite upset with the Morocco attack on the western Sahara that took place. I want to try to do something on the floor with a resolution on this thing, the horrible thing that took place there, and these people, who have been out in the wilderness for some 30 years now.

Are you interested in trying to come up with a solution, that James Baker was not able to do, I have not been able to do, but working with us to try to correct the problem that is out there in the western Sahara?

General HAM. Senator, my understanding is that the issues in western Sahara and Morocco are not primarily military. But if confirmed, I certainly want to explore what the role of U.S. Africa Command might be, again in support of a U.S. "whole of government" approach to that matter.

Senator INHOFE. Well, I appreciate that. I would think, though, that it becomes military when armed forces are invading there, although I understand what you're saying.

My time is up and it went too fast. So you and I talked at some length and I just want to make sure that you are on record on some of the things that you want to get done. One last question if I could, Mr. Chairman. That is, we made a decision, a good decision, on this committee several years ago—in fact, it was right after September 11—that we would assist the Africans in building five African commands, geographically located around ECOWAS is successful in West Africa, but the rest has kind of been lingering. People are not really—the Africans are not as aware of how we're trying to help them take care of their own needs.

So what I'd like to do is have you look at that—I'm sure that General Ward would agree that we haven't done enough with that—and before the terrorists start coming down in greater numbers through Djibouti and through the Horn of Africa, to try to have this in place, so that we won't be sending our troops over, they'll be able to take care of their own problems.

Would you consider that to be a priority?

General HAM. Senator, I would. I believe regional approaches are a good way ahead, in Africa.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

Senator Ben Nelson.

Senator BEN NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, General Kehler and General Ham, for your service and for your willingness to extend your service in these new positions, and a special thank-you to your families for supporting you in this effort.

General Kehler, the current Commander of STRATCOM, General Kevin Chilton, recently said—has been very vocal about the need for a new Strategic Command headquarters building at Offutt. I've

been extremely pleased with the progress that we've made so far in addressing this vital need. The existing facility's failings have put STRATCOM's mission and its personnel at some risk. I know you have previous duty as the Vice Commander of STRATCOM and that you would have views on the need and importance of the new STRATCOM headquarters facility.

To date, the design nears 60 percent completion and construction is planned to break ground in late 2011. The progress is a strong indication of the Department's commitment to STRATCOM's mission. What is your view on the need for a new headquarters at STRATCOM to replace the existing facility?

General KEHLER. Senator, I can base my view on this from the time that I was the Deputy Commander there and we went through a series of electrical fires and electrical outages and other problems, that reflect I think sort of the state of health of a building that was built in the 1960s.

Clearly something needs to be done about all of that. The demands of the mission there at STRATCOM have placed some stresses on that facility, that whole complex—as you know, there's an underground complex as well—that it was never designed to address. So if I'm confirmed, certainly I'll make sure that I am looking into that and looking after an appropriate way forward to make sure that the people there have what they need to get the job done.

Senator BEN NELSON. I appreciate that.

One of the things that I've always tried to look for back here, and as governor as well, stovepipes within government, whether it's in the military or whether it's in civilian government, which establishes duplicate services, duplication of efforts over mission effectiveness or the expenditure of taxpayers' money.

General Chilton has previously highlighted the importance of sharing information among the agencies, including Homeland Security, the intelligence community, Department of Defense, in addressing the security risks, particularly in cyber space. Just yesterday, Secretary Gates said that the future cyber threat was "huge," and that's no understatement.

My concern is that without strong coordination agencies will continue to build their own protective walls around their own unique situation. What is your view of the role of STRATCOM and its sub-unified command CYBERCOM? What is the role that it should play in coordinating this national defense against the growing cyber threat, both to our military and to our civilian agencies?

General KEHLER. Senator, I think that Strategic Command sits in a very unique position to have a very strong influence on the way the Department of Defense proceeds and also on these other relationships that you talked about. I think that as we look at STRATCOM's role to integrate, STRATCOM's role to advocate, STRATCOM's role to oversee some of the activities that go on in the sub-unified and the other activities, STRATCOM's role to engage with the other combatant commanders to make sure that cyber space is being addressed across the military forces, and then of course STRATCOM's ability to look up into the policy world, where I think there is a role for the Commander of Strategic Command to play there as well.

So I think there's a big role there for Strategic Command to plan in all of this. Most of that is handed to them by the President and the unified command plan.

Senator BEN NELSON. If we partner with all the private entities, whether it's Google or any other similar company that has significant interests and considerable experience in what we would call cyber, in developing that partnership could that also, let's say, enhance our National defense? In other words, can we learn something from the private sector as well as having the private sector learn something from us?

General KEHLER. Sir, my experience to date is that in many cases we're learning more from the private sector than they are learning from us. Some of the latest technologies, of course, techniques, and approaches are there. I think again you're defining the big challenge of cyber space. It is the ultimate partnership activity, and that is something that we need to be working on.

Again, I think Secretary Gates's comments yesterday about the DHS-DOD partnership is a real positive step here in terms of aligning responsibilities and authorities.

Senator BEN NELSON. Maybe we'll some day tear down all the stovepipes.

General Ham, AFRICOM has limited personnel to address a rather vast and diverse continent. One of the deficiencies we experienced in Afghanistan was that we lacked a cadre of soldiers that possessed the right language and cultural training. Given the diversity in Africa, are we developing the right skills, the right mix of skills, in our forces to be able to engage in successful operations, recognizing the diversity in Africa?

General HAM. Senator, if confirmed I'll look at that. My sense is yes, but not quickly enough. I think we start to see that the cultural understanding, the language skills, emerge first in our special operating forces, where they develop those attributes. As forces become available, as general purpose forces become available, I think it would be highly appropriate to seek ways to further understanding of African matters in the general purpose forces.

A way to do that is through the State partnership program.

Senator BEN NELSON. So this will be one of your high priorities as you step into the new position, to make certain that we direct enough of our resources so that we can get the kind of result that we need to get? We can't get it any other way. If we don't have the cultural and language understanding that is required, we're not going to be able to make our mission as successful as we might otherwise.

General HAM. Senator, I agree, and if confirmed I know I have to do that personally and also look at that across the command.

Senator BEN NELSON. My time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Nelson.

Senator Thune.

Senator THUNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Kehler and General Ham, thank you so much for your great service to our country and your willingness to take on these important positions of responsibility.

General Kehler, in your response to the advance questions you state that the Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command is “responsible for the plans and operations of U.S. forces conducting strategic deterrence,” which includes the mission of deterring attacks on U.S. vital interests. As the nominee to be the combatant commander responsible for strategic deterrence and responsible for missions such as ensuring U.S. freedom of action and the delivery of integrated kinetic and nonkinetic effects in support of joint operations, how important in your view is it to you that the Air Force develop a new long-range nuclear and conventional strike aircraft that’s capable of penetrating anti-access and area denial systems and technologies?

General KEHLER. Senator, I think it is critically important that we continue with both sustainment and modernization of all the legs of the triad, and I do agree that a long-range strike replacement is appropriate and would advocate for that.

Senator THUNE. The Air Force for some time has been working on requirements, to identify requirements and convince the Office of the Secretary of the need for a manned next generation long-range strike platform. What do you foresee as your role in developing and advocating for that type of system?

General KEHLER. Again, if confirmed I do think that one of the things that combatant commanders do is they establish requirements, and again if confirmed I would be responsible, I think, for setting requirements for such a platform. I know that the Air Force is looking, studying some preliminary ways forward and I would look forward to participating as a combatant commander if I’m confirmed.

Senator THUNE. There are on the order of about 25 studies that have been done with regard to next generation long-range strike aircraft and yet there hasn’t been any significant progress made to date. So as a follow-up to my previous question, what can you see yourself doing differently than your predecessors when it comes to successfully advocating for this capability to the Office of the Secretary?

General KEHLER. Sir, I don’t know if I—I don’t know if there’s anything different that needs to be done right now. I know, again from my Air Force hat, that this is getting a lot of attention. It’s a difficult set of issues to grapple with, to make sure that they have the requirements correctly stated and outlined and a way forward that matches those requirements.

So I don’t know that there is one thing if I was confirmed that I could do that would be different. However, I would just restate that, again, if confirmed, my belief is that modernization of the—sustainment and modernization of the entire deterrent force elements and the sustaining stockpile that goes behind it, the command and control that supports it, and the ISR that contributes to it are all important and I would advocate for all of those.

Senator THUNE. And as well as a follow-on or next generation long-range strike?

General KEHLER. Yes, sir, and that’s part of that. In the mean time, there’s also sustainment effort under way for the B-52s and the B-2s. So we shouldn’t ignore that.

Senator THUNE. Another question. This has to do with the START Treaty, which I know you've answered, responded to some questions about that already. But the New START Treaty includes a ceiling on operationally deployed nuclear warheads of 1550 warheads and 700 strategic nuclear delivery systems. What do you foresee as the possible implications of reducing our number of delivery vehicles under the treaty?

General KEHLER. If you mean to get down to the treaty limits, again I haven't—I haven't been part of the analysis, nor was I part of the negotiation activity. So what I would say at this point is what I understand from my current seat. From my current seat, I understand that at those levels, 1550 operationally deployed warheads, 700 operationally deployed delivery vehicles, up to 800 deployed and non-deployed, that we can still achieve our deterrence objectives.

Senator THUNE. The current plan to comply with the treaty would reduce the number of nuclear-capable bombers to a maximum of 60, and if my math is right we have the 20 B-2s that would remain nuclear-capable, and it would require us to reduce the number of nuclear-capable B-52s by about half, to somewhere around 40, to stay under what they expect to be the 60 number of bomber delivery vehicles.

What will the impact be in STRATCOM's mission of nuclear deterrence using the triad strategy and at what level of reduction in bombers do you start to become nervous about the viability of the bomber leg of the triad?

General KEHLER. Well, sir, first of all, the treaty—first of all, we've decided to retain a triad, which I think is the foundational step that we've taken. The exact mixture of that triad has yet to be determined, and I know there have been some numbers stated, but we have entry into force plus 7 years to get to the appropriate mixture of weapons.

I would like to take the opportunity, if I'm confirmed, to come back with a more fulsome discussion about what I think about the mixture of each individual leg.

Senator THUNE. If the U.S. develops a prompt global strike weapon, these systems would further reduce the number of bombers or ICBMs in our inventory. What's your position on the development of prompt global strike? Is this a must-have type capability, and is it important enough that we further reduce the other legs of the triad?

General KEHLER. Sir, first of all, again as I understand the treaty, a prompt global strike weapon could count. It depends on its characteristics, whether it is actually mated to an intercontinental-range ballistic missile. So it wouldn't have to count, but it could, depending on how we went forward.

My view is we should go forward on continuing to develop long-range strike, conventional strike, of some type. I think, again if confirmed, this is one I'd like to come back and have a further discussion with you.

Senator THUNE. I think it would be important in terms of reviewing the treaty, too, to determine whether or not whatever the prompt global strike would consist of would in fact fall under those

caps and therefore impact the other considerations with regard to the triad.

General KEHLER. Yes, sir.

Senator THUNE. I see my time has expired, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all very much for your service.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Thune.

Senator Webb.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, I'd like to congratulate both of you for having been selected to undertake these responsibilities. I have no doubt from the quality of the service you've already given our country that both these commands will be in excellent hands.

General Kehler, it was interesting to visit with you yesterday. As we discussed, my father spent a good deal of his Air Force career in SAC, did two tours at Vandenberg and one at Offutt. It brought back a lot of memories of the really amazing work that his generational cohort did in terms of pioneering these programs that have matured now into the discussions we're having today.

A lot of people don't realize the jeopardy this country was in in the late 1950s after the Soviet Union had gotten ahead of us with the Sputnik program. So the discussions that we're having and the issues that we're facing now are a direct product of, I think, the quality of work that that generation put into this.

Having grown up a good part of my life on those two bases, I wish you the best.

General Ham, we've had discussion here about the DOD study on the "don't ask, don't tell" issue. I would like to say, as the chairman of the subcommittee, how much I appreciate the cooperation that you and counsel Jay Johnson gave us in terms of designing this study. I think it's important, if I may, to quote from what Senator Lieberman just said when he said this study should inform the decision that the Congress makes in voting. We tend to forget that in our political haste here. This is a very important study for us, not simply to receive, but to examine and to discuss.

Your background as a former enlisted and as an infantry officer I think is very, very important to the credibility of whatever comes out of that study. I think—I can't—again, having spent 5 years in the Pentagon, I can't remember a study on this type of issue that has been done with this sort of care, not even having seen it or knowing the results. But I know the preparation that went into it. So it's going to be a very important study for us to look at and examine.

As I told both of you yesterday, I regretfully put a hold on civilian and military nominations based on an issue of what I believe was noncooperation from the Department of Defense. More than 3 months ago, I asked for a series of comparable historical data that goes into our analysis of all of these commands and the efficiencies which Secretary Gates is attempting to put into the Department of Defense and the efficiencies I fully support. But this should not have taken this amount of time. This was a basic providing us data so that we can participate in a discussion.

It was not a political ploy. Basically, if you don't have the information, if you don't have the tools, you can't do the analysis so that

you can have a discussion about where these reductions might be going in our commands.

I'm very happy to point out that last night at close of business we did receive the first cut on this data. So I'm happily going to release any of these holds that we were forced to put in place in order to do this. We're going to examine this data. We're going to have follow-on questions. But it's a very important part of how you're going to bring efficiencies into the Department of Defense. So you're free at last.

I have a question, General Ham, on Africa Command. Where do you think the headquarters is going to go?

General HAM. Senator, as you know, the headquarters today is in Stuttgart, Germany. When I had a discussion with Secretary Gates about the possibility of him recommending me to the President for this job, one of the things we talked about was the necessity to conduct an assessment of the headquarters location. So if confirmed I will certainly do that, and we'll consider a wide variety of locations, to include the current location, perhaps other sites in Europe. I think we ought consider locations in the continent of Africa, and certainly there are some locations in the continental United States that have asked to be considered as well. So if confirmed, Senator, I'll do just that.

Senator WEBB. Let me suggest you examine Norfolk.

General HAM. I understand, sir.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Webb, and thank you so much for your action on the nominations.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Senator LeMieux.

Senator LEMIEUX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank both of you for your service to our country and congratulate you on these appointments.

General Ham, if I may ask you some questions about AFRICOM and some of the concerns I have about that region.

Before I do, with all due respect to my friend from Virginia, please look at Florida also. We are so pleased to have three combatant commands in Florida. We would appreciate your evaluation of Florida as well.

Chairman LEVIN. If you'd yield, I think you'd better add Illinois and Michigan at this point. [Laughter.]

We don't have any commands and so we really feel we're entitled to one. I can't speak for Illinois.

Senator BURRIS. We don't have any commands. We'd like one.

Chairman LEVIN. It's about time we had a command.

Anyway, Senator LeMieux, thank you.

Senator LEMIEUX. Thank you, chairman.

I had the opportunity to visit Yemen as well as Djibouti this past August and talk about and see firsthand what our forces there are trying to do to combat AQAP as well as Al Shabab. I'm very concerned about what's happening in Somalia. I'm very concerned about the ties between Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula as well as the ties that they have with Al Shabab in that destabilized area.

You may have already spoken to this point, but I'd like for you to tell me what your view is of the area, what will be the plan of

this country in the coming years to combat terrorism and the links between Yemen and Somalia and other African countries and radical Islamic groups and what we're going to do to combat their threats to this country?

General HAM. Senator, I agree with you. I believe that the extremist threat that's emerging from East Africa is probably the greatest concern that Africa Command will face in the near future. If confirmed, that becomes a very high priority, I think consistent with what I believe to be the command's highest priority, which is to detect, deter, and if necessary defeat threats that would emerge from the continent toward the U.S. homeland or to U.S. interests.

One of the challenges I think for us will be that, as you correctly point out, Senator, that area sits astride two geographic combatant command areas of responsibility. One of the things I learned as the Director for Operations on the Joint Staff: It is in those boundary areas where we must pay great attention to ensure that extremist organizations and others find no safe haven and no opportunity to transition unimpeded between geographic combatant commands.

So, Senator, if confirmed I would look forward to working very closely with U.S. Central Command and General Mattis and his crew to ensure that we counter that threat appropriately.

Senator LEMIEUX. I appreciate that. I believe that outside of the Pakistan-AFPAC region, the most dangerous place in the world for us right now is Yemen and then the ties to Somalia. These ungoverned territories and the presence of people like Anwar Awlaki in Yemen, who are using sophisticated recruiting tools, who know—grew up in the United States, understands how to use social media to attract recruits, is as dangerous of a place in the world as it could be.

There's a lot of concern, and it's probably not something for an open hearing, but there's a lot of concern about the communication and connection now between AQAP and Al Shabab and the fact that they may be recruiting folks through Yemen and training them in Somalia. So being focused on that I think is of very high importance.

General HAM. Sir, if confirmed I'd certainly take that as a high priority.

Senator LEMIEUX. General Kehler, I want to talk to you a little bit about your new responsibilities at Strategic Command and the concerns about cyber concerns and cyber warfare. I know that we are looking at a Cyber Command, but tell me how that will play into your new responsibilities?

General KEHLER. Senator, when the Secretary of Defense decided, in consultation with the President, to stand up a sub-unified command, what he essentially did was he consolidated, if you will, a number of disparate activities that were going on inside the Department of Defense related to cyber space into one place, with a four-star, much like the relationship between Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea, where that's a subunified command of Pacific Command. It exists within Pacific Command and yet it operates with some degree of autonomy to take care of a mission that they've been assigned.

That's the same relationship that we have here. Strategic Command, as I have reread the mission here recently, still has respon-

sibilities to advocate, to integrate, to be part of the command relationships with the other combatant commands. So there is still quite a bit of work, both direct and indirect work, that goes on at Strategic Command level. But the day-in and day-out activities and command and control of network activities, those types of things are going on in U.S. CYBERCOM.

Senator LEMIEUX. So it won't be your specific day to day operations. It's kind of like a command within a command?

General KEHLER. It is a command within a command, yes, sir.

Senator LEMIEUX. Can I talk to you a little bit about space policy.

General KEHLER. Yes, sir.

Senator LEMIEUX. That is within your responsibility. With the degrading of our plans for NASA, although we were able to make some accomplishments before we went out for our recess in trying to continue the space program, tell me about your views of where we'll be on the military side of our space program and whether or not you feel that we're doing all that we can to make sure that we command space for military purposes?

There is always the view that we have to maintain the high ground. At one time, aviation was the high ground. But we know space is the ultimate high ground, and we do not want to be in a position where a future competitor to the United States has command over space.

Tell me what your view is of where we are strategically in terms of the command of space?

General KEHLER. Sir, the nature of space really has changed pretty dramatically in the last 5 to 10 years. It is now—and you'll hear these words used in the Department of Defense—space is now congested, competitive, and complex. You'll also hear the word "contested" used sometimes.

So I think what has happened is that from 1957, when there was one manmade object on orbit, to today when there are over 20,000 that are softball-sized and larger, the fact that there are now over 50 nations that are involved in some way in space, the fact that those nations that are spacefaring with their own capabilities to get there and stay there are growing, given that China and others are emerging in space in a significant way, with very ambitious programs, things are different.

So as a result of that, a new national space policy was just issued. It says essentially that we need to still maintain the competitive advantages here that it gives us in terms of our warfighting capabilities, and it says that to go about that we will need to be more collaborative and cooperative with allies, with friends, with partners, and with commercial.

So from a military side, leveraging those kinds of space capabilities has become the way that we think we need to go to the future. We have turned the corner, I believe, in many cases in acquisition difficulties. That is not to say we don't have any, but we have turned the corner in many of our acquisition difficulties.

Then finally, in terms of our relationship with NASA, of course those are two separate and distinct organizations, with two separate and distinct missions, but we do collaborate and we do partner since the beginning of the space age. We're looking for ways that

we can leverage NASA, the Department of Defense, and the National Reconnaissance Office to make sure that we are all working together to be more efficient while becoming more effective.

Senator LEMIEUX. I thank you for those comments. My time is up. I think if I were in your position the two things that would be keeping me up at night would both be cyber and space, as two priorities where we have to keep our advantage. And I appreciate your focus and attention on that.

General KEHLER. Sir, if I'm confirmed you can rest assured that those two will be at the top of my list, yes, sir.

Senator LEMIEUX. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator LeMieux.

Well, I have Senator Burris down as being next, and I think that that is correct. Senator Burris.

Senator BURRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Of course, this, as you know, is more than likely my last appearance before your great committee, and I just want to commend you, Mr. Chairman, for your wonderful work and the opportunity to be able to serve on this Armed Services Committee.

Chairman LEVIN. It's been a real pleasure for us and a real advantage for us to have you here.

Senator BURRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To both the Generals, I am pleased to meet both of you today. I have more of a statement than I do questions, but if I have enough time after my statement I would like to ask a couple of questions.

After reviewing both of your resumes, I'm confident that you will both serve commendably in STRATCOM and AFRICOM. I've had the privilege of visiting both STRATCOM and AFRICOM over this past year, so I've been able to see the capabilities in which you will serve—I mean, the challenges which you face, and I say that there are some challenges out there, gentlemen.

General Kehler, I traveled to Omaha to see the STRATCOM facilities in July and was impressed by the sophistication and dedication to mission shown by the entire staff. I hope that you look at those individuals and hold onto them. They're good people.

I see in your biography that you're the Deputy Commander at STRATCOM, so you need not reiterate the important role that your command has played in defending our Nation from ballistic threats. I'm confident that you are the right man for the job, and should I be here to vote rest assured you'd have my vote. But I will be following your success, sir.

To General Ham, your predecessor has laid the groundwork to take this unified command to the next level of proficiency and inter-agency cooperation. As you know, the United States African Command does so much more than train African troops in stability and security operations. They represent the United States and our military throughout the entire continent of Africa.

General Ham, what we find out in America, that most Americans speak of Africa as a country. They have no idea of the size of this continent, the complexity of this continent, with 53 I think different separate entities and countries on this continent. I stress

that point clearly as it has the potential to be both your greatest challenge and your greatest success.

The men and women that you command through the U.S. AID, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of State operations throughout the continent, but it is the presence of your men and women in uniform that Africans will remember the most.

General, this is a new and highly engaged command post. I'm excited to see its progress as I continue to follow your career upon leaving the Senate.

Again, I would like to thank both of you for sitting before this committee today and for your service to our country. You've put a lot of years of service in. I take my hat off to all of you Generals who made it through the ranks and made it up to the status that you've made it because of the contributions that you made and the confidence that people have placed in you. You've taken on added responsibility now with these two commands. So I am proud to support your nomination and should I be here I would be voting for it.

General Ham, I just have a couple points on AFRICOM. The AU, the African Union, I visited them in Addis Ababa and come to find out I think I was the first United States Senator. There have been a lot of Congresspersons have been to the AU, but as the deputy minister of the AU told me, I was the first Senator to come and visit them at their headquarters. They're building a new wonderful headquarters there in Addis Ababa.

So please encourage my colleagues through your contacts to check out the AU. They're looking forward to seeing us and to letting us hear their concerns.

I also visited the Eastern—let me get the correct title—the East Africa Standby Brigade, that really has all these different countries in it, where they're certainly trying to bring peace and security into those East African nations. They are concerned, too, about our participation. General Ward has stood up this command. He's done his best, but the resources are a problem. The other agencies that are there are really seeking to do what their responsibilities are, but I think a lot of it is depending on the military.

I found out that they were a little concerned about what standing up Africa Command was. They didn't communicate it properly. So you still have a PR job to continue to do, as General Ward has tried to do, in terms of those African countries, on just what is our purpose.

General Ham, you're also going to compete as well with China as they move into these various countries with their assistance. Africa has—it is the future for all of our existing countries, because the resources are there. We have to look to how we can build our relationships with those African countries in spite of the terrorism and in spite of the conflicts that exist. We need to have a better presence on the continent.

As far as the headquarters is concerned, I wouldn't mind Chicago. But I was in Stuttgart. By the way, my second language is German. I visited the headquarters in Stuttgart, had a great time there with the staff, and went on to Djibouti to visit Lamonier there and to Nairobi in Kenya. I turned in to my chairman a report of my experience that I received there, and just hoping, General

Ham, that we can really step up our presence and that the African countries understand that we are there to assist them. We're not there to, as they were concerned about, to take them over: Here comes big America. So you'll have that to deal with, as I was able to pick up, too, General Ham.

But you also must work with those different factions that exist in all those different countries. I have a great deal of sympathy for you as you undertake that.

So my question is—of course, you answered my headquarters questions, where do you think it's going to go. Do you have any idea?

General HAM. Sir, I don't. I think I should approach this, if confirmed, essentially with a blank piece of paper and start, what's the requirement, and then come up with the best recommendation for the headquarters location.

Senator BURRIS. I think every African country wants headquarters there. So you're going to have a problem unless you select an African country.

I see my time is up. Gentlemen, continue the service, continue to do good for the American people and to take our message abroad to the other countries and let them know that we are here, not as conquerors, but we're here to help move civilization forward for the betterment of all mankind. God bless you all and your families, and keep up the good work.

Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Burris. Again, thank you for your major contribution to our Nation and to this Senate and to this committee. It's really been appreciated.

Senator Udall.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me echo your words about Senator Burris. I'm going to miss him. I've really enjoyed serving with the former attorney general of Illinois and now Senator Burris. I look forward to your advice and counsel as we continue our work in the Senate.

Generals, thank you for being here today. Thank you for your service.

General Kehler, if I might start with you. I think you're familiar with a joint op-ed that Secretary Gates and Secretary Clinton wrote this week, where they said: "A more stable, predictable"—and this is on START. I should give you that overview—that a ratified treaty creates "a more stable, predictable, and cooperative relationship between the world's two leading nuclear powers."

Russia and the U.S. today, I think they comprise over 90 percent of the supply of nuclear weapons. As a strong regional power, Russia has a great deal of influence in dealing with Iran and its nuclear weapons program. I believe that New START will help to bolster our relationship with the Russians and in turn our ability to leverage Russian support to put pressure on Iran.

Would you agree? What are your thoughts on that particular situation?

General KEHLER. Senator, I would agree that an arms control agreement contributes as a piece of a broader relationship in many ways. And I would agree that my personal opinion is that a treaty will in fact be helpful in the ways that you suggest.

Senator UDALL. Well, thanks for that insight.

I am on the record strongly supporting New START as a new start, as a step forward. There will be more work to do. We discussed the other day the tactical weapon arsenal that the Russians have, but I think by passing New START we could continue to have those negotiations further about tactical nuclear weapons. But if we believe Iran is the center of our efforts in the Middle East, I think we have to ratify the New START Treaty.

Thank you for your comments.

Let me move to cyber security, if I might. I recently spent some time with Secretary Napolitano. I know that DHS and DOD have signed a cyber security memorandum of agreement. I'm really encouraged by the progress that both Departments are making in leveraging their capabilities to keep our Nation's networks safe.

Could you talk a little bit more about your involvement and the importance of this effort?

General KEHLER. Sir, again, if confirmed, as I mentioned before, Strategic Command I think has an important role to play. Strategic Command sits at the confluence of a lot of activity in the Department of Defense. Strategic Command I think has a strong advocacy role, certainly an integration role.

My intent, if confirmed, would be to try to continue to make Strategic Command a better and better and better partner, both inside the Department of Defense and then as necessary with DHS and others.

Senator UDALL. I know you're passionate about this. I know we've talked about the very interesting similarities between outer space and inner space, inner space including this area of cyber and cyber security. So I look forward to working with you when you're confirmed. I know that's certainly my intent.

General KEHLER. Thank you, sir.

Senator UDALL. General Ham, if I might move to you, and then I may have a moment to come—well, actually, let me, one final comment for General Kehler.

Could you tell me about the status of the final space posture review? Can you provide any insights in when we would see it and any additional thoughts you might have?

General KEHLER. Sir, I'm not sure I can. I'll have to get that for the record. But what I do know is, of course, the space posture review in large part contributed to two important documents. One is the new national space policy that the President signed some months ago.

The other is a strategy, a national security space strategy document that is being prepared as a follow-on to the policy. So I'm not sure if there will be a separate space posture review document released or whether that is now rolled into the National security space strategy. That national security space strategy is in coordination and should be available soon. I can't specify exactly when, and I will get that information for the record for you.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator UDALL. I would appreciate that. I think we both agree that we're increasingly reliant on space for our economy and for our National security. We also know it's that increasingly space is

a congested and contested environment, and we need to stay on the front end of this. I'm looking forward to your continued advice and counsel in your new position, given your past experience and expertise.

General Ham, I might like to turn to you. As I understand it, one of AFRICOM's missions is to enhance the kinetic capabilities of Africa's militaries through assistance programs. Another part of your mission would be to conduct or support actions and programs in conjunction with U.S. Government agencies and other partners to reduce the potential for intra—there's plenty of intra-state conflict, but there's also inter-state conflict in Africa, by enhancing the governance, stability, and economic development of the countries that are in the AFRICOM sphere of responsibility.

Of those two basic missions, do you see either as more mi than the other, particularly in the context of short-, mid-, and long-term concerns? That's a big question, but it's an important question. I know you've considered it.

General HAM. Senator, in my view they are indeed complementary efforts. I think the role of the command is through a wide variety of programs and authorities to help build the capacity that African nations need at their national level and then, importantly, also to build regional capacity. If confirmed, I think this becomes an important requirement, an important task, for the command, to see how we can best leverage the authorities and the resources that are available to achieve the best effect.

Senator UDALL. So those two basic missions, you don't elevate one above the other? You see them as both equally important, training the military and then also operating in that civilian-military space to build governing capacity?

General HAM. Senator, I think they do go hand in hand. If confirmed, I'd have to take a look at that, as I would all the other requirements of the command, and see if a prioritization was necessary, particularly in the application of resources. So certainly, if confirmed, I would take a look at that.

Senator UDALL. I see my time is about to expire. Let me make one final short remark and then ask you for a commitment I think you'll be able to meet.

But the Defense Science Board has been charged by the current AFRICOM Commander and the Under Secretary of Defense with assessing the security implications of climate change on Africa and the potential role for AFRICOM in addressing these impacts. I'd like to ask you to commit to providing the committee, once you get your feet on the ground, with your personal view on the findings and recommendations of that task force at an appropriate time next year. Could you do that?

General HAM. Sir, if I'm confirmed I will.

Senator UDALL. Thank you. Thank you, General.

Thanks again to both of you for being here.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Udall.

Senator Begich.

Senator BEGICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both for being here. I will also just state for the record that I am looking forward to supporting both of you in these new positions. I think you are very qualified, highly qualified, for

these new challenges that you're taking on. I also thank you and your families for the commitment they have to make in this new venture and stress that will be added to your households. So thank you both very much for that willingness.

I want to—General Ham, I'm not going to have really—most of my questions have been answered, except I would put in my pitch, of course, that Alaska would be happy to take the command when you look for a location. We would tell you that we're 90 percent by air to any place in the western world. We can access most places through our airport technology and we don't close our airports under any conditions. So I'll just leave it at that.

I know General Kehler knows that about Alaska and the uniqueness. But I had to get my pitch in. It seems like everyone else did.

General Kehler, let me walk through—mine are going to be a little parochial, but I want to give first a broad statement, because I did hear some comments, as usual on this committee, from some that are somewhat worked up over the START Treaty. I'm not. I think it's a good treaty and I'm looking forward, hopefully, to vote on this at some point.

But let me be a little bit parochial, but really clarify, and I think you will—I anticipate your answer on this, so it's more of a setup because I want to make it clear one more time. That the START Treaty—and I know there was some discussion of missile defense and how it interacts with it. My understanding is that the START Treaty does not restrict the missile defense system in any way.

Let me ask it in a formal way if I can: If confirmed, will the START Treaty hinder your ability to advocate for ballistic missile defense requirements for this country?

General KEHLER. Sir, I don't believe it will.

Senator BEGICH. You know, it's almost like we have to do this every hearing, with every person from the military, when we talk about the START, because there seems to be a discussion to kind of put it in the air, let people spin out there a little bit, and let the press carry it as maybe it will. But what I hear over and over, especially when we had Secretary Clinton here and Secretary Gates, that it was very clear that it does not hinder our capacity.

Now, I want to just say first, thank you for once again for the military putting it on the record so it's clear, and hopefully maybe we'll end that part of this debate around the START Treaty.

But now let me kind of hone in, if I can, on the missile defense system, especially in Fort Greeley, Alaska. As you know, that's the—the majority of the ground-based interceptors are deployed there, and I'm interested to know how you will in your—assuming you're confirmed in your position, help advocate and represent the requirements and the capability of what's up there? Can you give me kind of your sense and your feeling or your understanding of the need, how you will advocate for basically our last line of defense when it comes to missile defense for this country?

General KEHLER. Sir, as you well know, the current policy of our government is that we will deploy a limited defensive system against long-range threat from regional powers that could reach out and strike the United States of America. That is the basis on which the sensor network and of course the ground-based mid-

course interceptors in Alaska and the handful at Vandenberg were postured.

So my responsibility I believe is to help advocate for that capability, certainly as long as that's our country's view about what we need the do.

Senator BEGICH. Very good. Let me take you—I don't know if you've ever been to Fort Greeley. Have you been up there?

General KEHLER. Sir, I have not. I've not been—

Senator BEGICH. We'll invite you.

General KEHLER. Yes, sir.

Senator BEGICH. We would love to have you up there. I know the Director of the Space Missile Defense Command has been—always comes up. He always picks January. I think that's great. It gives him a lot of extra credit points when you come to Alaska in January.

But we would love to have you up there. It's a very unique situation, but also there are some, what I would call some deficits. The nearest town has one doctor and there's no clinic on base, to give you a sense of what they have to work in, the conditions they work in. So we would love to have you up there at some point, at your convenience, because I think once you're on the ground there, first, you'll find a very committed community within range of the base, that is very supportive and helping any way they can. But I think it's also important to kind of see.

So if you're confirmed, we would love to participate in any way we can to help make that happen.

General KEHLER. Yes, sir. Just to put a finer point, I've been to Alaska a number of times. I just haven't been to Greeley. Typically I go to Clair.

Senator BEGICH. Oh, very good. That's actually, as you know, another piece of the equation with Fort Greeley. I don't have questions on Clair, but I'm glad you brought it up, because at some point I'll want to have some conversation about the long-term plan—I know there is one—of rehabilitation and renovation to the facility, and just to make sure we're kind of on track on the dollar requirements.

I know in these tight budget times everyone's looking to push where they can, but obviously we think Clair is critical long-term and that investment that is being considered over the next several years will hopefully be continued. So I don't have to have a conversation on that right now.

Let me ask you just kind of a general question on support and development of the two-stage ground-based interceptor as a hedge in the event that the proposed development and deployment of the long-range Phased Adaptive Approach is not achieved by 2020. In other words, if we can't get to our schedule, do you see the two-stage ground-based interceptor as a hedge to make sure we're covered? I guess your thoughts on that.

General KEHLER. Sir, I don't know enough about this. I'd like to take that one for the record if I could.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator BEGICH. I would like that. That would be great, because it's not that I would say that the military is not always on sched-

ule, but there are times where planning and development of especially new technology gets delayed. And if we don't have something that backs against it to protect ourselves as we develop our technology, as things change, I want to make sure we have a kind of cohesive plan in that arena, and not just say, we're done here because we have this new plan down the road, and then we miss some timetables.

So if you could take that for the record, that would be very good.

General KEHLER. I will, sir. I apologize, but I'm just not familiar enough with the details of General O'Reilly's laydown to render a comment.

Senator BEGICH. No problem. I know when I talked to General O'Reilly he has it down to the detail. He lives and breathes it. But I know that you're just getting into this position, so I appreciate it if you'd could.

General KEHLER. Yes, sir.

Senator BEGICH. The other one is, in some advance questions we gave you and policy questions, you made a comment: "Robust access to space is a national imperative," which I 100 percent agree. In Alaska we have the Kodiak launch complex. I'm not sure if you're familiar with that. It is very flexible, efficient, and does commercial as well as military launch capacity.

The Space Development and Test Wing currently have I think two missions scheduled in Kodiak this year. It has very unique capability. I don't know if you're familiar with it, but I would love, again the same thing, if you're not I would encourage you to kind of look at that, and then help our office understand, help me understand, what you see is the potential, if at all potential, of a long-term relationship from your office and your operation with the Kodiak launch facility.

There is a lot of Federal dollars in there to build that facility. It has great capacity. Again, as I said, there already are two missions this year from one component of the military. So if you could just a brief comment. My time has expired, but any comment on that at this point?

General KEHLER. Sir, I think the mission is tomorrow, actually. I think one of them is tomorrow.

Senator BEGICH. I think you're right.

General KEHLER. Yes, sir, if confirmed I'd be more than happy to get involved with you and have discussions about Kodiak.

Senator BEGICH. Excellent. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, that's all the questions I have, and I just appreciate the time.

Again, congratulations for again your willingness to take on additional responsibility and commitments to this country. Thank you both.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Begich.

Senator Bill Nelson.

Senator BILL NELSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, congratulations on your appointments to these positions. Thank you both for your public service, your long service to our country.

General Kehler, as we have discussed many times the Nation's space program now, now you're taking it to a different level. In the

Strategic Command, you are going to have to be concerned with the nuclear program. I would encourage you to, as one of your first things that you do, which I encouraged General Chilton to do the same thing, and I think he would reaffirm that this is good advice: Go visit the three national labs. That's my suggestion.

I think—have you visited the three before?

General KEHLER. Sir, I have not visited all three. I've been through pieces of them in the past. You had mentioned this to me several days ago. I will do this if I'm confirmed, because there are some deficiencies that I have in getting eyes on to some of the aspects of what needs to happen, and I will go visit there. Plus the rest of the weapons complex I will go and put eyes on early on.

Senator BILL NELSON. Also, with regard to the triad, the nuclear posture review states that "Each leg of the triad has advantages that warrant retaining all three legs," and that "Strategic nuclear submarines represent the most survivable leg of the U.S. nuclear triad." Do you think that we should retain all three legs of the triad?

General KEHLER. Yes, sir, I do.

Senator BILL NELSON. You want to discuss the significance of the next generation of the ballistic missile submarine?

General KEHLER. Sir, I think it's important that, as we look to the future—I think it's important that two things happen. Number one, I think it's important that we sustain the legs that we have today, and I know that the Services have invested in sustaining those legs. I think it's important that we sustain the command and control that makes sure that the President is always linked to those forces. And I think it's important for us to sustain the ISR capabilities that support all of those activities.

Then I think it's important that we put in place the modernization efforts to make sure that we can get to the next versions of each of these. It looks like, my understanding of the programmatic of this, it looks like the first to come up for modernization investment will be the replacement to the Ohio-class ballistic missile submarine, and I'm looking forward if I'm confirmed to working with the Department of the Navy to make sure that we understand and have clarified requirements and that they are actively moving forward.

The other legs are under way, studies at various levels. I think it's important also to have a replacement long-range strike aircraft, and I also think it's important for us to begin the process to modernize the Nation's land-based strategic deterrent.

I would mention one other thing. Clearly, survivability is a key aspect that the triad brings to bear. No doubt about it, on a day-in and day-out basis the submarine ballistic missile force is the most survivable. But, if generated, the bombers are equally survivable.

Senator BILL NELSON. General Ham, we've got a problem of drugs going into West Africa and then it just goes right on up to Europe. Do you want to comment on that? Of course, a lot of those drugs are coming out of—unfortunately, even though they're coming out of Colombia, they go into Venezuela, and then from Venezuela they're either going straight to West Africa or they're going

to the island of Hispaniola, either the DR or Haiti, and they get dispersed out of there.

But they're coming into West Africa, and they're using that as a transshipment point then to get it on into other places, primarily Europe. Do you want to comment about that?

General HAM. Senator, it's a very real concern, certainly not exclusively a military or even primarily a military challenge. But I think Africa Command in its uniquely inter-agency composition is in a posture to contribute to countering that effort.

The illicit trafficking of narcotics and other illicit trafficking destabilizes nations and regions, all of which are unhelpful in trying to provide security. So I think this is a challenge for the whole of government and I will, if confirmed, look at AFRICOM's appropriate role in that regard.

Senator BILL NELSON. Have you had any thoughts about what should we do about that as Commander of AFRICOM?

General HAM. Senator, I think the way in which AFRICOM could probably bring military assets to bear are in maritime domain awareness. In this regard, if I'm confirmed I would very much like to partner with U.S. Southern Command, who participate in these types of efforts on a routine basis. I suspect, but don't know, that Africa Command has already done so, to learn from the experience of Southern Command and find how we might best leverage that experience in Africa.

Senator BILL NELSON. Mr. Chairman, this is a great example. General Ham just mentioned Southern Command. Southern Command and Africa Command is just a great example, where all the agencies of government are coming together to address a particular problem. It has certainly been true with regard to drugs in South America, but it's also being true with regards to drugs with regard to western Africa and through that command.

So it's the DEA, it's the FBI, it's the CIA, as well as the military components, that are all working together. So often we are giving deference and kudos to our young men and women in uniform, which is most appropriate and they are held in such high esteem. Often we don't realize the changing nature of projecting the interests of the United States and the free world is a combine of all of these agencies, sometimes led by the U.S. military, but other times working just directly in a partnership.

I think it's fascinating. West Africa is clearly a place where we have that going on right now, as well as the U.S. Southern Command.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Well, thank you for that comment. It's something that's important to make and it's not made often enough, and I'm glad, Senator Nelson, that you have pointed out, made that point.

I just want to ask one question about the START Treaty and then, unless there's other questions, we can adjourn the hearing. You have pointed out, when you were asked about the Russian unilateral statement, that it's not part of the treaty, it's not binding on us, it's their point of view, and that we've made our own unilateral statement at the same time, that we're going to proceed with missile defense; and our statement, our unilateral statement, made

at the same time theirs was made, on April 7th, says that: "U.S. missile defense systems would be deployed to defend the United States against limited missile launches and to defend its deployed forces, allies, and partners against regional threats." The United States further noted its intent to continue improving and deploying its missile defense systems in order to defend itself against limited attack as part of our collaborative approach to strengthening stability in key regions.

I think you've pointed that out, General Kehler, that our unilateral statement was made the same time as their unilateral statement; their unilateral statement is not binding on us, it is not part of the treaty.

But what is not pointed out enough, it seems to me, is that the exact same thing happened at the time of START I. There were unilateral statements made by the Russians. That had to do with the ABM: If we pull out of the ABM Treaty, then what they said was that—this is the unilateral statement at that time on the Soviet side, when there was a Soviet Union: "This treaty may be effective and viable only under conditions of compliance with the treaty between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. on the limitation of ABM systems as signed on May 26, 1972."

That's the statement they made, and we made a unilateral statement at the same time saying: Sorry, we're not bound by that statement and we can make changes in the treaty or pull out of the treaty if it's in our supreme national interest to do so. And as a matter of fact, we did pull out of the ABM Treaty, and as a matter of fact they did not as a result terminate the START Treaty, the START I Treaty, despite their unilateral statement.

Is that correct, General? Are you with me so far?

General KEHLER. Yes, sir, that's the way I understand it.

Chairman LEVIN. What I don't understand is why when our witnesses are asked about the unilateral statement and why, after they put out it's not binding on us, the Russian unilateral statement, and we've made our own unilateral statement saying it's not binding on us and we intend to proceed and that it's not going to threaten you in any way, why our witnesses don't point out: Hey, we've been there before; we just went through that exact same unilateral versus unilateral back in 1991.

I'm just curious. You're aware of the history, I gather. But why is that something which is used to address this constant refrain we hear about a unilateral Russian statement on this particular treaty? Why isn't that part of the response, the history?

General KEHLER. It's probably a deficiency on my part.

Chairman LEVIN. No, no. It's not a deficiency on your part. Most witnesses don't get there. I'm just curious as to, is it not as important as I think it is that they have been there, done that, listened to that before, and it had no effect?

I'm not critical of you. I'm just curious, frankly, because witnesses don't seem to focus on what seems to me is not only obvious, that their unilateral statement isn't binding on us, that we make our own unilateral statement saying it's not binding on us and, by the way, we intend to proceed with our missile defenses, that we've been through this exact same unilateral, unilateral before, and it didn't have any impact.

Rightly or wrongly, we pulled out of the ABM Treaty. I thought it was a mistake, but that's not my point. My point is we pulled out of the ABM Treaty and they did not pull out of the START I Treaty, even though they had made a unilateral statement saying the two were related. So I'm really curious. I'm not at all critical, because your not making reference to that history is fairly typical of our witnesses.

So is it not as important as I think it is? You can be totally blunt or diplomatic, as you wish, either one.

General KEHLER. No, sir. I just think certainly to describe the full context of the debate, you captured it better than I did, for sure. I don't know why I didn't capture it that way.

Chairman LEVIN. No. Again, it's not—it's kind of a pattern, frankly. Maybe people don't want to sound defensive. Maybe that's it. But it's not defensive not to—it's not defensive to make reference to this unilateral history, in my judgment. So that's my opinion.

I want to thank both of you. You've served our country well. Your family support, we know how critical that is. We thank your families again and appreciate your making reference to your families the way you do.

Unless there's further questions by me, which there are none, and there's nobody else here to add any, we will again stand adjourned. I want to thank, thank you both. But I also want to thank Senator Webb for the step that he's now taken to allow our nominations to proceed. He had a legitimate interest in getting information. He has obtained that information now and has indicated his release of the hold on nominations. Hopefully, that not only will facilitate a number of other nominations which have been pending, but also will help speed up your nominations and confirmation as well. We're going to try to get a quorum as quickly as we can of this committee so that we can address your nominations. I don't know if there's any other pending.

[Pause.]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you both. We'll stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the committee adjourned.]