

Stenographic Transcript
Before the

COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

HEARING TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATION OF: GENERAL PAUL J.
SELVA, USAF, FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL AND
REAPPOINTMENT TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF
STAFF

Tuesday, July 18, 2017

Washington, D.C.

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

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

HEARING TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATION OF:
GENERAL PAUL J. SELVA, USAF,
FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL AND
REAPPOINTMENT TO BE VICE CHAIRMAN OF
THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

Tuesday, July 18, 2017

U.S. Senate
Committee on Armed Services
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m. in Room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. James M. Inhofe, presiding.

Committee Members Present: Senators Inhofe [presiding], Wicker, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Cruz, Graham, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Heinrich, Warren, and Peters.

1 OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES M. INHOFE, U.S.
2 SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA

3 Senator Inhofe: The meeting will come to order.

4 I think, first of all, we all have on our minds and in
5 our prayers Senator McCain. He is going through some
6 recovery right now and will not be able to come back this
7 week. So that will change the way we are doing business a
8 little bit. But, nonetheless, he will be back with us very
9 soon.

10 Our committee meets this morning to consider the
11 nomination -- I should say the renomination -- of General
12 Selva for the appointment to be the Vice Chairman of the
13 Joint Chiefs of Staff.

14 I think since we have already been through this drill
15 on the eight required questions, we are going to forego
16 that. I am assuming you have not changed your mind since
17 the last time we asked the eight questions. Is that
18 correct?

19 General Selva: I have not changed my mind.

20 Senator Inhofe: Do you have any family here you would
21 like to introduce?

22 General Selva: I do, sir. I will do that in my
23 opening statement.

24 Senator Inhofe: All right. That is good.

25 General Selva, your record of service to our Nation is

1 well known to this committee. Your first 2 years at the
2 Joint Chiefs of Staff have been marked by great challenges
3 to our national security: the advance of ISIS in the Middle
4 East; the Russian aggression in Ukraine and actions against
5 others in that region; North Korea's pursuit of both nuclear
6 and long-range missiles capability. Meanwhile, our young
7 men and women continue to serve on the battlefield in
8 Afghanistan, ensuring that that country never again serves
9 as a safe haven for terrorists.

10 Moving forward, new leadership at the Department of
11 Defense and military services presents renewed opportunities
12 for our armed forces. As we work to meet the threats of
13 today and prepare for the threats of the future, crises
14 around the world only continue to multiply. Our service
15 members face the most complex and diverse array of global
16 threats since the end of World War II.

17 Leading our military during such challenging times
18 requires strong leadership, and this committee looks forward
19 to your testimony about how you plan to guide our men and
20 women.

21 Senator Reed?

22

23

24

25

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

3 Senator Reed: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.
4 I too want to join you in wishing Senator McCain a speedy
5 recovery and a rapid return to his responsibilities. In
6 fact, this might be one of the few times I can say sincerely
7 "go Navy" because I certainly do. I want to see him back,
8 as we all do.

9 Senator Inhofe: I might observe, though, it cannot go
10 unnoticed that the first three that were here on time were
11 all three Army.

12 [Laughter.]

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

14 I want to join you in welcoming General Selva. Thank
15 you, sir, for your service. As we consider your
16 reappointment to Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff,
17 we recognize and thank you for your many years of service to
18 the Nation and your willingness to continue to serve. Also,
19 I want to recognize your wife Ricki for her many years of
20 support.

21 The United States faces a wide range of multifaceted
22 and varied challenges around the world. If you are
23 reconfirmed as the Vice Chairman, you will be an integral
24 player in addressing these complex international issues
25 facing our national interest.

1 Russia's malign influence and active measures
2 activities have been aimed at undermining the American
3 people's faith in our election process, as well as other
4 Western elections. Furthermore, Russia continues to
5 threaten its neighbors and our NATO allies and has failed to
6 end its interference in Ukraine by complying with its
7 commitments under the Minsk cease-fire agreement. Finally,
8 Russia has refused to withdraw its support for the Assad
9 regime.

10 North Korea's nuclear missile program is an immediate
11 and grave national security threat, and the United States
12 continues to grapple with the fact that there is no set of
13 quick and certain options. China has not demonstrated its
14 willingness to enforce effective sanctions against North
15 Korea and, in addition, continues to threaten the rules-
16 based order in the Asia-Pacific region by economic coercion
17 of its smaller, more vulnerable neighbors, and by
18 undermining the freedom of navigation.

19 Iran continues their aggressive weapons development
20 activities, including ballistic missile development efforts,
21 as well as other destabilizing activities in the region.

22 Finally, while we continue to make steady military
23 progress against ISIS, the administration has yet to
24 publicly articulate a broader whole-of-government strategy
25 for addressing the issues that gave rise to ISIS in the

1 first place.

2 General Selva, the aforementioned challenges are urgent
3 and pressing, and the committee looks forward to hearing
4 from you on how the Department of Defense plans to address
5 these issues.

6 In addition, the Vice Chairman is assigned a number of
7 specific responsibilities. For example, the fiscal year
8 2017 National Defense Authorization Act strengthened the
9 Vice Chairman's role on the Joint Requirements Oversight
10 Council, JROC, by making the Vice Chairman the principal
11 adviser to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs on joint
12 planning capabilities and joint performance requirements.
13 Given the important function of the JROC in reviewing
14 requirements for acquisition programs to ensure they are
15 reasonable and necessary, I look forward to your thoughts on
16 the effectiveness of these new authorities and whether you
17 believe additional changes are warranted.

18 The Vice Chairman is a key player in the interagency
19 process, a role that often requires working closely with
20 senior policymakers within the Department and at the
21 National Security Council on critical national security
22 issues. In light of the strategic challenges I referenced
23 earlier, the committee looks forward to hearing from you on
24 the effectiveness of the current interagency process.

25 Finally, General Selva, you have been a partner with

1 Deputy Secretary Work in developing and fostering the
2 Department's innovation strategy, including the so-called
3 Third Offset, the Strategic Capabilities Office, the Defense
4 Innovation Unit Experimental, or DIUx, and other special
5 projects. If confirmed to a second term as the Vice
6 Chairman, you will provide vital continuity between the last
7 administration and the present administration. It is
8 imperative that the Department of Defense under Secretary
9 Mattis continue this effort to learn how to leverage the
10 most dynamic sectors of our economy to harness new
11 technology and ways of thinking to solve our difficult and
12 diverse global challenges.

13 Thank you again, General Selva, for your willingness to
14 serve our Nation, and I look forward to the hearing.

15 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Reed.

17 You are recognized, General Selva.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF GENERAL PAUL J. SELVA, USAF, FOR
2 REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF GENERAL AND REAPPOINTMENT TO
3 BE VICE CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

4 General Selva: Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

5 Before I begin, I would like to also recognize Chairman
6 McCain's service to our Nation both in and out of uniform.
7 On behalf of the Joint Staff, I wish him a complete and
8 speedy recovery, and I look forward to him being back here
9 at work soon.

10 Senator Inhofe, Ranking Member Reed, distinguished
11 members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to
12 appear before you to be considered for a second term as the
13 Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I am grateful
14 to the President and the Secretary of Defense for their
15 continued trust and faith in my ability to serve.

16 I would like to make three brief points before I
17 continue and look forward to your questions.

18 First, I want to commend those who wear the cloth of
19 our Nation. During my 2 years as the Vice Chairman, I have
20 had the opportunity to visit service members and their
21 families around the globe, and I am continually impressed by
22 their dedication, their selfless service, and their
23 exceptional talents. It has been my distinct honor to serve
24 the men and women of the United States armed forces as the
25 Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And if

1 reconfirmed, I will strive to keep faith with them.

2 Second, as you have already mentioned, Senator Inhofe,
3 it is important to acknowledge the highly complex challenges
4 that face our joint force today. The combination of
5 external challenges presented by adversaries and competitors
6 and internal challenges such as readiness and modernization,
7 amplified by continual budget instability, are all issues
8 with which this committee is very familiar. Please know
9 that I value the dialogue that I and other senior military
10 leaders have with this committee, and I thank the committee
11 for your work on behalf of this Nation's soldiers, sailors,
12 airmen, marines, and coast guardsmen, particularly the swift
13 passage of this year's National Defense Authorization Act.
14 I hope through my work and our discussions that I have
15 conveyed to you the seriousness with which I take my
16 responsibilities as the Vice Chairman.

17 Finally, I would like to recognize my wife Ricki, the
18 love of my life, who is with me today and who has shared my
19 37-year career and our 37-year marriage. As many of you
20 know, she was a classmate when we attended the United States
21 Air Force Academy. She is not only a lifelong friend and
22 partner, but she provides me with the counsel that only
23 someone in her position can. And for that I will forever be
24 grateful.

25 Senator Inhofe, Ranking Member Reed, members of the

1 committee, thank you again for the opportunity to appear
2 before this committee to be considered for a second term as
3 the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I look
4 forward to your questions.

5 [The prepared statement of General Selva follows:]

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, General Selva.

2 I would like to start off with one that has been
3 foremost on my mind and I think on the minds of most of the
4 members here, as well as the uniforms. And I applaud the
5 uniforms for being straightforward and honest about the
6 threats that we are facing right now, and that would be
7 North Korea.

8 You know, they successfully tested a ballistic missile
9 on the Fourth of July. The country also completed a
10 successful nuclear test earlier on May 14th. The experts
11 consider North Korea's missile test on July Fourth to be the
12 most significant advancement toward a nuclear-capable
13 intercontinental ballistic missile.

14 We have had a lot of witnesses talk about this prior to
15 July Fourth. They were talking about when this happens,
16 what that will mean in terms of a threat to the United
17 States. If you take the projected range of that, that would
18 actually be somewhere around 5,000 miles, which would put
19 parts of the United States into range. So it is a scary
20 thing.

21 We had an Armed Services Committee hearing on the Asia-
22 Pacific strategy on April 25th. We had a panel of experts,
23 and they were good. They agreed with me that North Korea
24 currently represents the most imminent threat to our
25 national security.

1 So I would like to have you go ahead and start with
2 three questions concerning that.

3 One, do you agree with the experts who have come to
4 that conclusion concerning our national security?

5 And secondly, North Korea is known to export ballistic
6 missile technology to other adversaries like Iran. Do you
7 believe that they are in the process of doing that? They
8 have done that. And then what other countries might pose a
9 threat as a result of what they are receiving from North
10 Korea?

11 And thirdly, what is your level of confidence in terms
12 of our intelligence community's ability to monitor what is
13 really going on there? Those three things to start off
14 with.

15 General Selva: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 I do agree in principle with the assessment that the
17 North Koreans are moving quickly to develop an
18 intercontinental ballistic missile capability. I, however,
19 am not saying the test on the Fourth of July demonstrates
20 that they have the capacity to strike the United States with
21 any degree of accuracy or reasonable confidence of success.
22 What the experts tell me is that the North Koreans have yet
23 to demonstrate the capacity to do the guidance and control
24 that would be required --

25 Senator Inhofe: I was only referring to range.

1 General Selva: Yes, sir. On range, they clearly have
2 the capability.

3 Senator Inhofe: You know, if they have the capability
4 in range, the other improvements are perhaps not too far
5 behind.

6 General Selva: Yes, sir. We will have to watch very
7 carefully with the IC the developments on those particular
8 capabilities.

9 I do agree with the intelligence community and others
10 that the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea is an arms
11 proliferators. There is no evidence that they have engaged
12 in proliferation of their long-range ballistic missile
13 technology, but they have proliferated every other weapons
14 system that they have ever invented. So it is a pretty
15 clear pathway to the potential proliferation of these kinds
16 of weapons systems.

17 Senator Inhofe: And the third question was on the
18 capability of our intelligence.

19 General Selva: I am reasonably confident in the
20 ability of our intelligence community to monitor the testing
21 but not the deployment of these missile systems. Kim Jong-
22 un and his forces are very good at camouflage, concealment,
23 and deception. We have a series of programs that I would be
24 happy to talk about in a classified setting that talk to the
25 ability of our intelligence community both military and

1 civilian to monitor those activities.

2 Senator Inhofe: Yes. I think it has been said outside
3 of a classified hearing that the things that he has been
4 doing make him -- the nicest thing I can say about Kim Jong-
5 un is he is totally unpredictable and the most unpredictable
6 of anyone I have ever had any kind of experience with or
7 even reading about. And that is what has been scary to most
8 of the people, and I assume you agree with that.

9 General Selva: Yes, sir. I do agree with that
10 assessment.

11 Senator Inhofe: Okay.

12 Now, getting down to our threats, this committee has
13 received the testimony from the uniforms and from the
14 experienced people outside of the uniforms that only a third
15 of our Army brigade combat teams, only a fourth of our
16 combat aviation brigades are ready. We hear about 62
17 percent of our F-18's that the marines use do not work. So
18 we recognize when we are going through what we have been
19 going through in the last few years that the first thing to
20 go is maintenance and then, of course, modernization.

21 So I would like to have your assessment whether or not
22 you do agree with General Wilson, for example, when he
23 testified before this committee, that fewer than 50 percent
24 of the Air Force combat force are sufficiently ready for a
25 highly contested fight against peer adversaries. So he is

1 going beyond just equipment. We are getting down to our
2 individuals.

3 And then another Wilson, Secretary Wilson, and General
4 Goldfein have told us that they will be short 1,500 pilots,
5 most of them fighters, by the end of this year.

6 Do you agree with this assessment? Would you want to
7 elaborate on anything that they have said?

8 General Selva: Senator, I agree with both assessments.
9 Both speak to the availability of funds and resources to do
10 the high-end training that is required to make our forces
11 ready for what we call high intensity combat against a peer
12 competitor. The budget in 2017 is helpful. The proposed
13 budget for 2018 will move us down the pathway to being able
14 to restore much of that training. But it will be a 2-year
15 process beyond the initial insertion of those resources
16 before you see the readiness improve.

17 Senator Inhofe: I agree with that.

18 Senator Reed?

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

20 And thank you, General Selva, again for your service.

21 One of the issues in terms of the Third Offset is
22 creating some different agency. One is the Defense
23 Innovation Unit Experimental, DIUx. And they are working in
24 the public knowledge on sort of very cheap satellites --
25 inexpensive I should say -- and also exploiting them with

1 artificial intelligence. It is something that we really
2 need for many places, particularly Korea, for constant
3 dwell.

4 We are told that they are about to run out of money,
5 and we have not received the reprogramming yet. I would
6 think this would be an urgent need. Can you explain why
7 they are in this distress and what we can do?

8 General Selva: Yes, sir, I can. We actually put
9 tremendous demands on the defense experimental unit. In the
10 programs that they are working for us, we were notified
11 early last week by Director Raj Shah that they had been cash
12 flowing into two programs. We have a reprogramming proposal
13 that is in staff as we speak that will address the balance
14 of their requirements for this fiscal year, and we will
15 actually begin some of the funding for programs that will
16 extend into next fiscal year. They will be able to do that
17 with year-end money.

18 Senator Reed: Thank you very much.

19 One of the areas of concern -- and there are many -- is
20 the situation in Iraq. I was there about 4 weeks ago. They
21 are making progress on the ground. General Townsend is
22 doing a superb job as the commander on the ground, along
23 with, when I was up at Q-West, the 82nd Airborne Division,
24 2nd Brigade was leading the advisory effort.

25 But the issue now becomes, as we reduce their

1 effectiveness -- ISIS -- our long-term presence there. Do
2 you have views on that?

3 And also, I heard there were claims at least by
4 Revolutionary Guards of Iran that if they are designated a
5 terror group, they will retaliate against our forces. Can
6 you give us any insights there?

7 General Selva: Sir, on Iraq, the fighting is far from
8 over. ISIS has lost their sanctuary in Mosul but they still
9 have a handful of small towns that they control in and
10 around the province. President Abadi has a plan with the
11 Iraqi Security Forces to begin a campaign, with Steve
12 Townsend's help and consent, to clear those towns and move
13 into Anbar Province to secure their border with Syria, all
14 important work as that will deny ISIS sanctuary on both
15 sides of the Syrian-Iraqi border.

16 I share you concern. I read in this morning's papers
17 about the Iranian Republican Guard's Quds Force making a
18 statement that if they are declared an international
19 terrorist organization, that they will retaliate against our
20 forces in Iraq. We will have to posture ourselves to be
21 ready for that, but I do not think we should take that
22 threat and keep it from taking action against the Quds
23 Force.

24 Senator Reed: Thank you.

25 In another area in your advance policy questions, you

1 indicated, which is something that has been seconded by so
2 many, that our adversaries in anti-access and area denial
3 technologies have eroded what used to be a tremendous
4 overmatch by the United States. And the question is, what
5 are we doing to get back way ahead not just a few inches
6 ahead, metaphorically?

7 General Selva: Thank you, Senator. You alluded to the
8 work that we have been doing over the past couple years in
9 the advanced concepts development arena, as well as working
10 what Deputy Secretary Work called the Third Offset strategy.
11 Those are concepts that would allow us to contest what we
12 call the anti-access/area denial strategies that many of our
13 adversaries have attempted to impose upon us by making our
14 basing and our forces more resilient and able to survive
15 under the kinds of attacks that are associated with the area
16 denial strategies, particularly that China and North Korea
17 are attempting to impose upon us. It allows us to project
18 force into areas that otherwise would be presumed denied.

19 Senator Reed: Thank you.

20 Just finally and quickly, we have been working for
21 several different Congresses on acquisition reform. We have
22 passed legislation. We still have a long way to go. I
23 think we both recognize that, honestly. And as Chairman of
24 JROC, you have been given additional responsibility both
25 actual and also kind of referential or symbolic. But can

1 you tell us what you are doing to kind of help the service
2 chiefs jump start acquisition and get it so we can deliver
3 systems. The Army is commendable for many things, their
4 timeliness, et cetera. But they have had a tough record in
5 getting systems from the drawing board into the field. So
6 can you comment?

7 General Selva: Yes, sir. We are implementing the
8 guidance that we received in last year's NDAA. Two specific
9 things that give the Vice Chairman's office a little bit
10 more flexibility. One is the direct requirement to be the
11 advisor to the Chairman for readiness and the deployment of
12 systems that support readiness.

13 The second is a building relationship with the service
14 chiefs and the service secretaries in their acquisition
15 authority roles. So the JROC is now providing requirements
16 directly to the service acquisition authorities not only for
17 the basic design and integration capabilities that would go
18 into systems but actual performance along the line of buying
19 systems. One really striking example of that capability was
20 a piece of work that we did to move counter-unmanned systems
21 technologies into Iraq from idea to fruition, measured in
22 months, from delivery to deployment, measured in weeks, and
23 those are numbers that are actually quite useful.

24 Senator Reed: Thank you.

25 Senator Inhofe: Senator Ernst?

1 Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

2 Thank you very much, General Selva. Mrs. Selva, thank
3 you for your support and service to our Nation as well.

4 General Selva, in your answers to advance policy
5 questions regarding Southeast Asia, you suggest that short-
6 term stressors can be managed within the alliance construct.
7 And a few weeks ago referring to the Philippines
8 specifically, Secretary Mattis testified that in 2014 we
9 canceled our named counterterror operation with a premature
10 view of success, causing us to lose funding lines that we
11 would have otherwise been able to offer.

12 Do you agree with me and Secretary Mattis that
13 reestablishing a named operation is something we should
14 consider as part of our alliance obligations in order to
15 make sure that those short-term stressors do not turn into a
16 prolonged or long-term catastrophe?

17 General Selva: Yes, ma'am. In every case where we see
18 the resurgence of terror networks, particularly in the
19 fragile areas of the southern Philippines, I think it is
20 worth considering whether or not we reinstate a named
21 operation not only to provide for the resources that are
22 required but to give the Pacific Command commander and the
23 field commanders in the Philippines the kinds of authorities
24 they need to work with indigenous Philippine forces to
25 actually help them be successful in that battle space.

1 Senator Ernst: Excellent. I hope that we can work
2 with Secretary Mattis on this issue.

3 Moving on to another topic, you have been openly
4 critical of Congress about the budget process. And I agree
5 that it is long past time for us to break the cycle of these
6 continuing resolutions. We are not doing ourselves any
7 favor. However, budgets are also a two-way street. And the
8 DOD has not been able to conduct or pass a clean audit for a
9 very, very long time. And so that is not helping our cause
10 either.

11 What specifically will you do in your next 2 years to
12 achieve a clean audit that you have not maybe been able to
13 accomplish in the last 2 years?

14 General Selva: I have found over the last several
15 years that achieving the clean audit goal is a really vexing
16 journey. In particular, the discussions over the valuation
17 of real property are an obstacle in the way of getting that
18 work done, the debates over what we own and what it is
19 actually worth. I will share with you that in advance of
20 his confirmation, I spent several hours with the new Deputy
21 Secretary of Defense, Patrick Shanahan, discussing how we
22 might get at this issue of valuing capital property so that
23 we can, in fact, clear a clean audit. We will commit to
24 working that together through the Defense Management Action
25 Group to try and come to resolution.

1 Senator Ernst: I appreciate that. And I hope that we
2 can move forward on that, especially when it comes to the
3 real property. We have to own this, and we absolutely must
4 get his done to know how the dollars are being spent so that
5 we can reassure our taxpayers that we as Congress and you as
6 the DOD are doing the right thing. So thank you for that.
7 I hope we are successful.

8 You also support providing lethal defensive assistance
9 to Ukraine, something I have been pushing for a number of
10 years as well. Other than being actively engaged with the
11 interagency on this issue, what specific steps are underway
12 in DOD in order to make this happen?

13 General Selva: So we are working very closely between
14 the Joint Staff and U.S. European Command to actually put
15 requirements on the table for an inventory of what that
16 lethal defensive aid might look like. It will be more than
17 just a military recommendation. This will be a policy
18 choice on whether or not we are going to give the Ukrainian
19 Government the tools they need to defend themselves against
20 what we believe to be a Russian-supported insurgency
21 movement in the Donbas.

22 Senator Ernst: I think it is really important.

23 And in light of Russia's recently thwarted attempt to
24 deny Montenegro's accession to NATO, what steps should we be
25 taking to reaffirm our commitment to nations like Ukraine

1 and Kosovo and other candidates just in reassuring them that
2 we will assist them should they wish to become NATO members?

3 General Selva: Ma'am, I think one of the tools that we
4 can bring to bear as the Joint Staff and as the military
5 team is our mil-to-mil contacts with the chiefs of defense
6 and the leaders of their militaries to make sure that all
7 those countries, in spite of what is going on internally
8 with or without the interference of the Russian Government,
9 actually are able to make the military reforms that are
10 necessary so that they can move towards a path to membership
11 in NATO.

12 Senator Ernst: I appreciate that. We have got a lot
13 of State partnership programs out there and those countries
14 need our reassurance. So thank you, General Selva, again.

15 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

16 Senator Inhofe: Senator Gillibrand?

17 Senator Gillibrand: Hello, General. Thank you for
18 being here. Thank you for your service. I welcome your
19 family.

20 I want to talk to you a little bit about where we are
21 on trying to combat military sexual assault. In 2013, then
22 Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin
23 Dempsey, said a majority of the Senate of the United States
24 expressed a lack of confidence in our ability to solve this
25 ourselves. We are currently on the clock, if you will. The

1 President of the United States said to us in December, you
2 know what? You have got a year to review this thing and
3 show me you can make a difference. We understand that just
4 because Senator Gillibrand's vote was defeated yesterday
5 does not mean that a year from now it may not be
6 reintroduced, and if we have not been able to demonstrate we
7 are making a difference, you know, then we deserve to be
8 held to the scrutiny and standard.

9 This is now 4 years later. And we do not see a change
10 in the overall numbers. We do not see a change in the rate
11 of prosecution. We do not see a change in the rate of
12 conviction. And we do not see a change in the rate of
13 retaliation. So I am really worried that in these
14 measurables where commanders are entirely responsible for
15 outcomes, they have not met the level of scrutiny and
16 oversight that is really necessary to really tackle this
17 problem effectively.

18 So do you agree that more needs to be done to create
19 environments where victims and bystanders can report and not
20 be retaliated against?

21 General Selva: Senator, I believe that survivors of
22 sexual assault and bystanders should be given an environment
23 where they can report the events that have happened, and we
24 can provide an unbiased investigation and potential
25 prosecution of the wrongdoers who perpetrated the crime.

1 Senator Gillibrand: And do you agree that despite the
2 Department's efforts, we have not achieved enough progress?

3 General Selva: I do not agree that we have not
4 achieved enough progress, but perfection is the only
5 standard that can be allowed in this space. Sexual assault
6 is contrary to the notion that we treat all soldiers,
7 sailors, airmen, and marines with the dignity and respect
8 they deserve because they wear the uniform of this Nation.

9 Senator Gillibrand: I do not think we are going for
10 perfection. I think we are going for a climate where men
11 and women can serve without being sexually assaulted, a
12 climate where they can report their crimes and know that
13 they will be prosecuted, that they can report their crimes
14 and know that they will not be retaliated. And so we are
15 not even close. I mean, the estimate of last year was
16 15,000 sexual assaults, unwanted sexual contact, and rape.
17 That is nowhere where we need to be. We still have almost a
18 60 percent retaliation rate, and our rate of conviction has
19 not moved in 5 years.

20 So I do not think we are achieving enough progress. I
21 think we have done a lot of good things in terms of getting
22 better evidentiary records, getting better evidentiary
23 standards, making sure there is special counsel for the
24 individuals who do report. But our rate of unrestricted
25 reports, the ones where you are willing to put your name and

1 make it public, is going down. Our rate of restricted
2 reports percentage is going up. So the confidence in the
3 system just is not there.

4 So I really hope that you will commit to me to do a
5 full look at this issue, look for new solutions, look for
6 untried solutions because what we are doing today is not
7 working. And we have done every small ball recommended
8 reform we could possibly do by every committee that has
9 offered them.

10 General Selva: Ma'am, I will commit to working with
11 the services and the service secretaries to take a deep dive
12 into all of the programs that they have implemented and to
13 take a look at whether or not they will be effective in
14 supporting the survivors of sexual assault and in making
15 sure that we get to unbiased investigations and
16 prosecutions.

17 Senator Gillibrand: Thank you.

18 I would now like to talk a bit about our transgender
19 service members. I have been pleased by the advances the
20 Department of Defense policies had made to be more inclusive
21 to transgender service members who are twice as likely to
22 serve, according to one study, than the general population.
23 But I am concerned that the recent 6-month delay the
24 Department has approved before letting transgender people
25 enlist in the services will have some unintended

1 consequences.

2 What have you learned so far in your review of this
3 issue, and how is the implementation going so far?

4 General Selva: Thank you, Senator. I am an advocate
5 of every qualified person who can meet the physical
6 standards to serve in our uniformed services to be able to
7 do so.

8 Our decision to delay the accessions of transgender
9 individuals into the services was largely based on a
10 disagreement on the science of how mental health care and
11 hormone therapy for transgender individuals would help solve
12 the medical issues that are associated with gender
13 dysphoria. There are a host of other issues that involve
14 the potential physical standards that the service chiefs
15 asked for additional time to assess so that they can make
16 the necessary changes to infrastructure, as well as training
17 curricula, for our basic trainees who come in transgender
18 status, particularly those who have not undergone gender
19 reassignment surgery and, while they present as their target
20 gender, are physiologically still in their birth gender.
21 And those issues will have to be dealt with before we can
22 actually begin to assess those individuals into active
23 service.

24 Senator Gillibrand: Thank you.

25 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Gillibrand.

2 Senator Cotton?

3 Senator Cotton: General Selva, welcome back.

4 Congratulations on your reappointment.

5 I would like to discuss the Intermediate-Range Nuclear
6 Forces Treaty, a treaty between the United States and the
7 then Soviet Union, now Russia, that prohibits land-based
8 cruise missiles or ballistic missiles with a range of 500 to
9 5,500 kilometers. Russia, it has been widely known, is
10 cheating on this treaty. The State Department found that 3
11 years ago.

12 You testified at the House Armed Services Committee
13 that to your knowledge, Russia does not intend to return to
14 compliance with the INF Treaty. Do you remain of the same
15 opinion today?

16 General Selva: I do, sir, and there is no new
17 intelligence that says that the Russians are either inclined
18 to return or to abrogate the treaty. So they are still
19 trying to walk the middle line.

20 Senator Cotton: I have to say I agree that as long as
21 Vladimir Putin gets to eat his cake and have it too, why
22 would he change? I assume that he is somewhat ambivalent
23 about the treaty. On the one hand, he benefits much more
24 from the prohibition on intermediate-range missiles in
25 Europe since the one country that could rapidly produce

1 those missiles and deploy them, the United States, is
2 restrained from making those missiles and deploying them.

3 On the other hand, I assume that he does not like the
4 fact that countries on his periphery, in particular, China,
5 can produce and deploy them. So the way to square that
6 circle is simply to cheat, and as long as we let him get
7 away with it, then there is no reason not to keep cheating.

8 Is there anything in your mind that we could do to put
9 pressure on Russia to bring them back into compliance to
10 change their current mindset?

11 General Selva: The diplomatic tools that exist inside
12 of the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty allow us to put a
13 modicum of pressure on the Russians through the bilateral
14 consultative committee to try and get them to return to
15 compliance.

16 The other tools that exist in the treaty include
17 beginning research and development efforts to field but not
18 test intermediate-range ballistic and cruise missiles within
19 the boundaries of the treaty. It is our assessment that the
20 Russians have gone beyond that provision in the treaty and
21 have actually fielded an intermediate-range cruise missile
22 that could be either nuclear or conventional capable. So we
23 do have some options inside the treaty to put pressure on
24 the Russians not only diplomatically but also inside the
25 military realm.

1 Senator Cotton: I am glad that you raised that because
2 my legislation, the INF Treaty Preservation Act, would
3 authorize money for just that and, in fact, with the House
4 and the Senate passed versions of the NDAA, it would start a
5 program of record. The administration put out a statement
6 of administration policy last week that had some issue with
7 that provision and another, but I suspect we will work it
8 out in the end since we all want to see Russia come back
9 into compliance with this treaty.

10 Putting aside its impact on our relationship with
11 Russia, though, I want to bring your attention to Admiral
12 Harris' testimony. He stated a few months ago in this
13 committee that over 90 percent of China's land-based missile
14 forces fall between the range of 500 and 5,000 kilometers.
15 Of course, China is not in violation of the treaty because
16 China is not a signatory to the treaty. Only the United
17 States and Russia are.

18 We do not have any matching offensive capability due to
19 our treaty obligations. Do you interpret this as a possible
20 offensive imbalance in the Asia-Pacific?

21 General Selva: Senator, it would be easy to interpret
22 that as an offensive imbalance but for that fact that we are
23 not restricted from fielding ballistic missile or cruise
24 missile systems that could be launched from ships or
25 airplanes under the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty. It

1 is specific to land-based missiles. And so with respect to
2 whether or not we use the INF Treaty as a reason to say
3 targets inside of China might not be held at risk I think is
4 a bridge too far. I believe we can assert that the
5 deployment of missile systems on aircraft and ships would
6 allow us to hold those targets at risk.

7 Senator Cotton: They do, although the obvious
8 disadvantage of ships and aircraft is that they are
9 relatively small compared to land, which is why China has 90
10 percent of their missile forces in that range from land. We
11 are limited to what we can do based on our ships and our
12 aircraft.

13 Do you think that we should consider extending
14 offensive capabilities to allies in the Asia-Pacific who are
15 also not bound by this treaty to help counterbalance China's
16 offensive capabilities?

17 General Selva: I think those are options we should
18 look at as people who provide sound military advice to
19 political leaders, but that would be a policy choice on
20 whether or not to use that leverage against the Chinese.

21 Senator Cotton: Thank you.

22 One final question about this area. Both General
23 Milley and General McMaster in his previous job have
24 testified the Army is outranged and outgunned. When they
25 say that, that the Army is outranged and outgunned, they are

1 speaking about missile systems that have this prohibited
2 range. Correct? The 500 to 5,500 kilometer range?

3 General Selva: Senator, that is part of their argument
4 but it is not all of their argument. Many of our multiple
5 launch rocket systems are outranged by the Russians within
6 the ranges that are stipulated --

7 Senator Cotton: Below the 500 kilometers.

8 General Selva: Yes, sir.

9 Senator Cotton: So it is both below the 500 kilometer,
10 which is a bad thing and we should address, but also that we
11 cannot get beyond the 500 kilometer range.

12 General Selva: Yes, sir.

13 Senator Cotton: Thank you very much, and thank you
14 again for your service.

15 General Selva: Thank you, sir.

16 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Cotton.

17 Senator King?

18 Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to join
19 everyone today who has mentioned our hopes and prayers for
20 Senator McCain to get back so he can harass the witnesses,
21 as he is accustomed to do.

22 General Selva, I know that you are interested in
23 innovation, and that is an important part of acquisition and
24 how we get where we are. I am concerned. We have had
25 testimony before this committee that small companies in

1 Silicon Valley, for example, will not even bid, will not
2 even interact with the Pentagon because the process is so
3 cumbersome and lengthy and burdensome. And now we are at a
4 point where some significant majority of the Defense
5 Department funds go to four or five major contractors.

6 How do we deal with the system itself, the structure,
7 the infrastructure of acquisition so that we can open up to
8 greater innovation coming very frequently from smaller
9 companies?

10 General Selva: Senator, for large programs, our small
11 companies in Silicon Valley are likely not going to be the
12 competitors we are looking for.

13 However, that said, two very innovative programs are
14 actually underway as we speak. The first is a venture
15 capital incubator at National Defense University that helps
16 our acquisition professionals learn the ins and outs of the
17 venture capital business. And venture capital is what runs
18 Silicon Valley. It is the willingness to take risks on new
19 programs, on new technologies, on rapid prototyping that
20 might or might not deliver at relatively small amounts of
21 money. And that is the reason we established in part the
22 Defense Innovation Unit Experimental in Silicon Valley not
23 only to have a point of presence to interact with these new
24 technology companies but to actually have a funding vehicle
25 where we can essentially engage in rapid prototyping and

1 venture capital-like activities with those companies.

2 Senator King: Is that far enough along to determine
3 whether it is working?

4 General Selva: Sir, I think it is far enough along to
5 determine that it is working. In fact, we have expanded the
6 concept to technology centers in Boston and Austin, Texas as
7 well because we are finding the kinds of companies that can
8 bring us the innovative ideas that can then be scaled into
9 major programs.

10 Senator King: Let me talk about the Third Offset. The
11 first two were focused largely on the Warsaw Pact and the
12 Soviet Union. Talk about the Third Offset as it would
13 relate to the multiplicity and diversity of threats that we
14 face today.

15 General Selva: Thank you, Senator.

16 The threats we face today are largely based on
17 mimicking our command and control philosophies but adding to
18 them long-range precision strike munitions that can deny us
19 access to the areas that we previously had free access to.

20 The projection of power is fundamental to our ability
21 to fight wars. And so as we look at the Third Offset, the
22 principal things we were examining and continue to examine
23 are artificial intelligence and the ability to team humans
24 with machines to speed our understanding of the complex
25 battle space that is represented by these new adversaries

1 and competitors and then react inside of that battle space
2 faster than they can respond to our actions.

3 It also involves building around our bases and our
4 forces a degree of resiliency through camouflage,
5 concealment, deception, as well as distributed operations
6 that prevent our opponents from being able to hold the whole
7 force at risk using their ballistic and cruise missile
8 systems. That is a snapshot of what the Third Offset would
9 bring us.

10 Senator King: And I assume part of this is resiliency
11 as a defense against cyber. One would assume that if a
12 conflict was to begin, the first phase would be cyber to
13 take out communications systems and those kind of things.
14 Is that part of the thinking?

15 General Selva: Yes, sir. In fact, implicit in the
16 Third Offset thinking is the partnership between humans and
17 machines, and in that space, machine-to-machine defense of
18 cyber networks is actually an absolute requirement. It is
19 not an implied task. It is an explicit task. If we cannot
20 defend our networks at machine speed, we are giving our
21 opponents maneuvering space in that domain to defeat us in
22 detail.

23 Senator King: A final question. There really is not
24 time for an answer, and perhaps you could take it for the
25 record. I recently finished General McMaster's book about

1 Vietnam, "Dereliction of Duty." And it is very critical, as
2 you know, both the political decision-making structure and
3 the Joint Chiefs. I would like your thoughts not now but in
4 writing on what the role of the Joint Chiefs are in a
5 situation where the political leadership is either not
6 listening or taking a position that you feel is contrary to
7 the country's interests in terms of its military
8 capabilities. General McMaster does a masterful job of
9 outlining the problem, but I am interested in some thinking
10 about what is the solution to the problem that he
11 illuminates so brilliantly in that book.

12 General Selva: In short, Senator, I would say our
13 obligation is to provide blunt, honest, best military
14 advice. And in the absence of a rule that forces our
15 policymakers to actually follow that advice, we continue to
16 give it loud and long.

17 Senator King: Thank you. Appreciate it.

18 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator King.

20 Senator Warren?

21 Senator Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And like my
22 colleagues, I want to say for the record how much we miss
23 Senator McCain and wish him a speedy recovery.

24 I also note that Senator Reed and Senator King talked
25 about DIUx. So I will not go back through this. But I do

1 want to express my very strong support for the work you are
2 doing there and how much more we can do with DIUx.

3 What I wanted to focus on, General Selva, I have heard
4 you publicly describe the main global threats that we face
5 as challenges: Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and
6 violent extremism. I want to ask you about another global
7 threat, and that is climate change.

8 A Defense Department report from 2 years ago observed
9 -- and I am going to quote it here -- global climate change
10 will have wide-ranging implications for U.S. national
11 security interests over the foreseeable future because it
12 will aggravate existing problems such as poverty, social
13 tensions, environmental degradation, ineffectual leadership,
14 and weak political institutions. In short, this DOD report
15 described climate change as a threat multiplier.

16 So, General Selva, what impact do you believe that the
17 change in climate will have on the military services? And
18 what do you believe the Department of Defense should be
19 doing now to prepare for this impact?

20 General Selva: Thank you, ma'am.

21 The dynamics that are happening in our climate will
22 drive uncertainty and will drive conflict. And I will just
23 provide one example of how that can happen, and this is a
24 manmade problem. The dams along the Nile River control the
25 flow of water into what was the Fertile Crescent of Egypt.

1 And any change to that water flow causes the Egyptians to
2 become more hostile to their neighbors who are putting dams
3 upstream of the Egyptian stretch of the Nile River. I could
4 build that argument in a variety of countries around the
5 world, and those are manmade problems not directly related
6 to climate change but related to how we as humans change our
7 environment.

8 If you extend that argument to the kinds of things that
9 might happen if we see tidal rises, if we see increasing
10 weather patterns of drought and flood and forest fires and
11 other natural events that happen inside of our environment,
12 then we are going to have to be prepared for what that means
13 in terms of the potential for instability in regions of the
14 country where those impacts happen, particularly today
15 places where there is massive food instability.

16 The Sahel in Africa is a classic example where a small
17 drought over a limited period of time can decimate the crops
18 and cause instability and make that an area fertile for
19 recruitment of extremists because they see no other way.

20 Similarly, you could look at the decimation of the
21 fisheries off Somalia that contributed to piracy because the
22 fishermen could not make their livelihood by doing what they
23 do best, which is fishing on the fishing grounds off of
24 Somalia.

25 So I think we need to be prepared for those. It will

1 cause us to have to address questions like humanitarian
2 disaster relief. It will also cause us to have to focus on
3 places where climate instability might cause actual
4 political instability in regions of the world we had not
5 previously had to pay attention to.

6 Senator Warren: So as climate change is an ongoing
7 phenomenon, one that right now is worsening, the climate
8 change is going to have a profound impact directly on our
9 military and on our military infrastructure and on how the
10 military is able to carry out its mission. So I really
11 hope, in addition to all the other global challenges that
12 you have in front of you -- and I know they are many and I
13 know they are serious -- we need you to lead today on this
14 challenge, General. Tomorrow may be too late.

15 So I want to follow up in just the little bit of time I
16 have remaining on Senator King's question about the Third
17 Offset. And I know you have made this a priority all during
18 your first term, and I assume you will do the same if you
19 are there for a second term.

20 But what I am concerned about is that we do not appear
21 to be moving very fast. Many of the technologies that we
22 are talking about here are still in the development phase.
23 Meanwhile, our near-peer competitors are continuing to
24 improve their capabilities. It can take years, sometimes
25 decades from the time we first sign a contract for a new

1 technology to actually make it out into the field.

2 So let me just ask you if you can say something very
3 briefly because we are really over time. And you can take
4 this for the record. What can we do about this to speed up
5 our response time here?

6 General Selva: I would make two quick points.

7 Senator Warren: Okay, and let us make them quick.

8 General Selva: First is rapid prototyping. We have to
9 be willing to invest and fail in systems that might not
10 work.

11 The second is we cannot be bashful about bringing new
12 software into our architectures. And so we have worked very
13 closely with some of the companies in Silicon Valley to do
14 rapid prototyping, testing, and deployment of software that
15 helps with things like automatic target recognition and
16 change detection.

17 I think those are two things that we could do right now
18 and be quite successful.

19 Senator Warren: Good. I know you share my concern
20 about being outpaced by technology and how much you make
21 this a priority. You will have, I think, everyone's support
22 here as you make that a priority. Thank you.

23 Senator Inhofe: Thank you.

24 Senator Rounds?

25 Senator Rounds: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1 General Selva, first of all, let me begin by just
2 thanking you for your service to our country.

3 Your previous work before you took your current
4 position -- you were the Commander of the U.S.
5 Transportation Command. And I know that in your statement
6 for the record, you stated that our military strategy is
7 predicated on our ability to deploy and sustain forces.
8 Based upon your previous position, you understand the need
9 to be able to get to where the fight is at.

10 I understand that you appreciate the reliance that we
11 have on commercial air carriers in order to do that within
12 our current plans. As you already know, right now DOD has
13 no means to extend the cyber protection to these critical
14 commercial carriers. I have talked about this at a few
15 hearings, including just last week.

16 My question for you is that if you were an adversary
17 nation, how would you exploit this? And how would that
18 impede the ability of the United States to deploy forces? I
19 realize that you may be limited in what you can say about
20 this in an open session, but I think it would be really good
21 for this committee and the American people to hear a few
22 general comments on the issue because unless we continue to
23 focus and gain public support for what I think we need to do
24 with regard to cyber protection, it is going to be very
25 difficult to where we have to be. And we have to have the

1 commercial air carriers available in times of an airlift.
2 Could you comment about what that means and how our
3 adversaries might exploit the current situation?

4 General Selva: Senator, I am cautious other than
5 echoing what you said about the potential vulnerabilities of
6 commercial networks in an open session. But I will add the
7 following.

8 It is not just our air carriers that make us successful
9 at projecting force overseas. It is our air carriers, our
10 over ocean merchant marine, as well as the rail and trucking
11 industry in this country. And all three together, land,
12 sea, and air, are the capability that we bring to be able to
13 deploy force around the world. All of those capabilities I
14 just described are dependent on the quality and veracity of
15 the data that they use to move our forces. And so that
16 data, those networks are just as important as the trucks,
17 trains, ships, and planes that move our soldiers, sailors,
18 airmen, and marines.

19 Senator Rounds: Thank you, sir.

20 I think solving this public-private cybersecurity
21 vulnerability would give us insights and experience to
22 really build the framework to use on the countless other
23 cyber seams between organizations in and outside of
24 government.

25 Can you give me an update at least in general terms on

1 how the security gap is being addressed today? Clearly, it
2 is not a case of where we are just planning for the future.
3 We have things in place today. Can you give us some
4 reassurances?

5 General Selva: Again, this is based on my experience
6 in my prior job. The TRANSCOM J-6 Director of
7 Communications is given the authorities and responsibilities
8 of protecting not only the TRANSCOM network but extending
9 through contract vehicles to our civilian providers those
10 data standards and network standards that allow them to
11 subscribe to many of the protections that are afforded to
12 the TRANSCOM network. That may be a model upon which we
13 could build a continuing public-private partnership into
14 critical infrastructure in other sectors of the economy.

15 Senator Rounds: Thank you, sir.

16 Just in the minute or so I have remaining, in your
17 experience is 2 years enough time to maximize the Vice
18 Chief's potential to provide optimal strategic guidance, as
19 well as maintain continuity for your large portfolio?

20 General Selva: No, sir, it is not, and that is why I
21 am so encouraged to see the work that was done in the 2017
22 National Defense Authorization Act that actually makes the
23 Chairman and the Vice Chairman positions 4-year tours with
24 only one potential renomination for a 2-year extension.
25 That 4-year term will allow the Chairman and the Vice

1 Chairman to have the strategic impact that you expect of
2 uniformed members in those positions.

3 Senator Rounds: Thank you, sir.

4 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Rounds.

6 Senator Peters?

7 Senator Peters: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 General Selva, it is great to have you here before us
9 again. I certainly appreciate the opportunities to have
10 some discussions with you both here, as well as in my
11 office. And I want to thank you for your focus on advanced
12 technologies and the understanding of how we need to be at
13 the forefront of that to continue to keep our competitive
14 edge.

15 I just want to say, before I ask you a question, we
16 have heard a lot about Silicon Valley and other places like
17 Boston when it comes to advanced technology, but we have all
18 of that in Michigan as well. In fact, when the U.S. Patent
19 Office opened their first field office outside of
20 Washington, D.C., they did it in Detroit, Michigan because
21 more patents are filed there than anywhere in the country.
22 And given the fact that we have more engineers per capita
23 than any other area, it leads to that. So I certainly hope
24 as you are looking at innovative technology, you continue to
25 focus on a wide geographic space and understand that we have

1 incredible capabilities throughout our country.

2 I recently met with General Dyass, the acting Director
3 of the Army's Capabilities Integration Center, as well as
4 Dr. Thomas Russell from the Army's Acquisition, Logistics,
5 and Technology, to discuss the Army's robotics and
6 autonomous systems strategy. During that meeting, we
7 discussed the challenges of fielding these capabilities
8 within troop formations and the efficacy of employing
9 autonomous and semi-autonomous systems in future conflicts.

10 And I know the Army's strategy calls for the investment
11 in specific technology areas over the next 5 years in
12 autonomy, robotics, artificial intelligence, as well as
13 common control.

14 I would just like to hear your assessment and analysis
15 as to the status of each of the services and the Department
16 in researching and utilizing particularly autonomy and
17 robotics.

18 General Selva: Thank you, Senator.

19 All of the services are actually quite engaged in a
20 campaign to understand where advanced artificial
21 intelligence and autonomy can be inserted into current
22 concepts of operations and how they might be used in new and
23 imaginative concepts of operations to help defeat
24 adversaries across the spectrum of potential conflicts that
25 we might find ourselves in.

1 I am very careful in public settings about the
2 discussion of the very specifics of some of those autonomy
3 initiatives, particularly as they relate to advanced air
4 defense and the projection of force into denied areas
5 because they will actually expose some of the
6 vulnerabilities we believe our opponents have and they will
7 actually expose some of the tools that we think we can bring
8 to bear.

9 But if you allow me to use shorthand, it is very
10 compelling when one looks at the capabilities that
11 artificial intelligence can bring to the speed and accuracy
12 of command and control and the capabilities that advanced
13 robotics might bring to a complex battle space, particularly
14 machine-to-machine interaction in space and cyberspace where
15 speed is of the essence. And I will stop there at the risk
16 of exposing things that we are actually doing.

17 Senator Peters: No. I fully understand, General.

18 The DOD directive 3000.09 governs the Department's
19 approach to autonomous weapons systems and is due to be
20 renewed this year, as you know. And this directive
21 specifically assigns responsibilities for the development
22 and use of autonomous and semi-autonomous functions and
23 weapons systems, including both manned as well as unmanned
24 platforms. And in doing so, the Department has stated that
25 it will not allow any robot or machine to take lethal action

1 without a human operator in the decision-making loop. And I
2 know you are well aware of the moral and ethical issues
3 associated with that.

4 However, our adversaries often do not consider the same
5 moral and ethical issues that we consider each and every
6 day. In fact, a recent article in "Defense One" highlights
7 Russia's ambition to employ AI-directed weapons equipped
8 with a neural network capable of identifying and engaging
9 targets and even suggesting that Russian weapon makers see
10 robotics and AI as a key for their future sales for
11 adversaries of ours around the world.

12 So given that DOD directive is due to expire later this
13 year, can you provide us some update on the process to
14 update and renew the process and your thoughts regarding
15 what seems to be Russian developments in AI targeting?

16 General Selva: Yes, sir, I will.

17 First of all, there will be a raucous debate in the
18 Department about whether or not we take humans out of the
19 decision to take lethal action. I will tell you in this
20 forum that I am an advocate for keeping that restriction.
21 Because we take our values to war and because many of the
22 things that we must do in war are governed by the laws of
23 war, which say we must take proportional and discriminate
24 action against an enemy to achieve our objectives, I do not
25 think it is reasonable for us to put robots in charge of

1 whether or not we take a human life. That does not mean
2 that we do not have to address the development of those
3 kinds of technologies and potentially find their
4 vulnerabilities and exploit those vulnerabilities to our own
5 defense. But publicly I think we should all be advocates
6 for keeping the ethical rules of war in place, lest we
7 unleash on humanity a set of robots that we do not know how
8 to control. And that is way off in the future, but it is
9 something we need to deal with right now.

10 Senator Peters: Thank you, General.

11 Senator Inhofe: Senator Fischer?

12 Senator Fischer: Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

13 Good morning, General.

14 General, when do you expect the NPR and the BMDR to be
15 complete?

16 General Selva: My expectation is it will take several
17 more months to complete the Nuclear Posture Review, and the
18 Ballistic Missile Defense Review will follow it because the
19 second review is actually informed by many of the strategic
20 choices that will be made in the Nuclear Posture Review.

21 Senator Fischer: And you testified earlier this year
22 that the NPR would be examining response options to Russia's
23 violation of the INF Treaty. Is that correct?

24 General Selva: Yes, ma'am.

25 Senator Fischer: And by that, do you mean that the NPR

1 will describe potential response options, or will it contain
2 a decision that we pursue a particular course of action?

3 General Selva: The design of the NPR is to provide the
4 President with options. So we will provide him with a set
5 of options that might be reasonable responses to the Russian
6 activity with respect to the INF.

7 Senator Fischer: With no decision on those, just
8 options?

9 General Selva: Yes, ma'am.

10 Senator Fischer: And I know that we have conferred
11 with the Russians about their violation, and what has their
12 response been?

13 General Selva: They have been mute on how they intend
14 to respond.

15 Senator Fischer: Have you seen any indication that
16 they intend to come back into compliance with this treaty?

17 General Selva: No, ma'am.

18 Senator Fischer: As you provide options to the
19 President, will you be including the Russian response or
20 non-response in those options that you give him?

21 General Selva: Yes, ma'am. The Russian activities are
22 a part of the strategic environment within which we will
23 present options to the President.

24 Senator Fischer: If they would, all of a sudden, step
25 forward and begin a dialogue with us, would that change then

1 the options that you present to the President?

2 General Selva: It would likely change those options,
3 but if the Russians step forward and said they were willing
4 to return to compliance with the INF, we would have to have
5 a method of actually verifying that compliance, which would
6 require inspections of the weapons systems they have
7 deployed.

8 Senator Fischer: So you would anticipate the options
9 still would contain that they have not responded.

10 General Selva: Yes, ma'am.

11 Senator Fischer: And there has been some suggestion
12 that Russia does not really get any kind of military
13 advantage from the deployment of their ground launched
14 cruise missile. Do you agree with that view?

15 General Selva: Given the location of the specific
16 missile and the deployment, they do not gain any advantage
17 in Europe, and that is as close as I will get to agreeing
18 with that view, ma'am.

19 Senator Fischer: Beyond the direct military
20 implications, do you believe there are broader strategic
21 implications when it comes to confronting violations of an
22 arms control agreement and that failing to respond could
23 have a negative consequence on those broader implications
24 when it comes to nonproliferation?

25 General Selva: I think, ma'am, with respect to any

1 given treaty on nonproliferation, the inability to enforce
2 the standards to which parties have agreed, whether
3 bilaterally or multilaterally, renders all other agreements
4 less compelling.

5 Senator Fischer: Can you tell us your opinion on where
6 we go from here?

7 General Selva: I think we should use all of the tools
8 that exist within the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty to
9 negotiate with and try to compel the Russians to return to
10 compliance. I am not saying that they will. We should also
11 take a look inside of the treaty, as we present options to
12 the President, at those research and development programs
13 that are available to us to actually increase pressure on
14 the Russians.

15 Senator Fischer: Thank you.

16 As you know, Russia maintains far more tactical nuclear
17 weapons than the United States, and they are deploying more
18 nuclear-capable sea, air, and now ground launched cruise
19 missiles. Do you believe that the line between strategic
20 nuclear weapons and tactical nuclear weapons is eroding, and
21 what implications does this have for any future arms control
22 talks?

23 General Selva: I think as we discuss nuclear
24 deterrence with the Russians and now the Chinese and likely
25 in the future other countries, we need to make very clear

1 that there is no firebreak between strategic nuclear weapons
2 and, quote, non-strategic nuclear weapons, that the use of
3 nuclear weapons in war crosses a threshold that will require
4 a response.

5 Senator Fischer: Is this advice that the present
6 administration has received?

7 General Selva: It is the standing advice we have given
8 every President that I know of in recent history.

9 Senator Fischer: And do you believe that future
10 agreements must include limitations on those tactical
11 nuclear weapons?

12 General Selva: I think it would be a useful diplomatic
13 exercise and useful initiative to attempt to negotiate with
14 all holders of tactical nuclear weapons, their reduction and
15 potential elimination to avoid the potential for
16 miscalculation in the future.

17 Senator Fischer: Should it be more than just an
18 exercise? Should it be part of the goals that we are trying
19 to attain in any treaty?

20 General Selva: Yes, ma'am. Let me be clear with my
21 terms. I did not mean that as an exercise as an
22 intellectual exercise. I meant it as an act of force of
23 diplomacy to actually get that work done.

24 Senator Fischer: Thank you very much, General.

25 Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

1 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Fischer.

2 Senator Heinrich?

3 Senator Heinrich: Welcome back, General.

4 I want to follow up on the questions on the Third
5 Offset that Senator King and Senator warren raised, and
6 specifically I want to talk a little bit about directed
7 energy.

8 As the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, you have
9 unique insight into the Joint Requirements Oversight Council
10 which identifies capability gaps for the military and
11 generates the requirements to fill those gaps. For the
12 purposes of things like base protection, counter-rocket,
13 counter-artillery, counter-mortar, counter-UAS, directed
14 energy weapons systems have significant advantages but seem
15 to be unable to enter the requirements setting process
16 largely because alternative kinetic options already exist.

17 What do you think is preventing the transition of these
18 technologies to the warfighter? Is it simply the pursuit of
19 perfection over fielding something today or are directed
20 energy weapons being held to a different standard?

21 General Selva: Thank you for the question, Senator.

22 I do not believe they are being held to a different
23 standard. The introduction of directed energy weapons into
24 particularly defensive capabilities has proven a difficult
25 task in order to produce the power and the concentration of

1 energy on targets to destroy them, particularly artillery
2 and ballistic missiles. We have had significant progress in
3 the counter unmanned aircraft systems area in bringing
4 directed energy weapons into either defeating the sensors or
5 defeating the actual aircraft themselves.

6 I think the promise is there for directed energy. It
7 is going to be a matter of the concentration of that energy
8 to have lethal effect. And so back to your original point,
9 I do not believe we are holding the directed energy
10 technology to a different standard, but we need to continue
11 to investigate whether or not it does give us the advantages
12 that the technology advocates promise specifically with
13 respect to the necessity to kill an incoming kinetic
14 vehicle.

15 Senator Heinrich: You know, I have been following this
16 for a long time. As you know, I started out my career at
17 Air Force research labs, and I would just encourage you to
18 take a close look at where these are today both in terms of
19 high-energy lasers and high-powered microwaves. You know,
20 once you see artillery shells shot out of the sky, unmanned
21 aerial vehicles, I think we are at a point today where this
22 is ready for prime time as opposed to continuing to chase
23 perfection. And I think the solutions that it offers avoid
24 many of the collateral damage issues that inherently plague
25 kinetic munitions and missiles. So I would just urge you to

1 sort of stay at the cutting edge of what we can offer right
2 now within this technology.

3 I want to shift a little bit to the issue of Russia.
4 And you and I have talked before about that. But to me and
5 to many of my colleagues, I think the pattern of behavior
6 from Russia is painfully obvious, that they will do what it
7 takes to achieve their objectives with very little
8 limitations. Whether it is interfering in U.S. elections,
9 interfering with European elections, formulating an
10 assassination plot like in Montenegro, Russia is treating
11 the West right now like it is the wild, wild West with no
12 norms, no laws, no consequences.

13 Should there be consequences for the kind of hostile
14 actions that we have seen from Russia both directed at the
15 United States and at our allies in Europe?

16 General Selva: Senator, I believe there should be
17 consequences. The Russians have adopted a philosophy of
18 operating below what they believe what is the West's
19 threshold to respond.

20 Senator Heinrich: Exactly.

21 General Selva: We need to understand what that
22 strategy means and how to counter it and impose the kinds of
23 consequences that are necessary to prevent them from being
24 successful or to deter them from the activity in the first
25 place. Part and parcel of that is understanding how they

1 are doing what they are doing.

2 Senator Heinrich: Absolutely.

3 Do you have thoughts on what those consequences should
4 look like if we want Russia to change their current pattern
5 of behavior?

6 General Selva: I think this is going to require that
7 we bring all of the tools of government to bear. The
8 military tool is not going to be enough particularly given
9 the kinds of circumstances where the Russians attempt to
10 operate, as I mentioned earlier, below our threshold to
11 respond.

12 Senator Heinrich: So a whole-of-government approach
13 that includes things like sanctions, that includes things
14 like the removal of properties that we have seen here in the
15 United States. We should consider all of those things
16 working in concert.

17 General Selva: All of those, among others, yes, sir.

18 Senator Heinrich: Thank you.

19 General Selva: To your question on directed energy, I
20 will commit to having a meeting with the JROC and bring in
21 the technology experts who can bring us up to date to make
22 sure we are not missing something.

23 Senator Heinrich: I would deeply appreciate that. I
24 think there is a handful of projects that are sort of on the
25 shelf and ready to go right now, that there is a great deal

1 of interest in moving forward directly to the warfighter.

2 General Selva: Yes, sir.

3 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Heinrich.

4 Senator Sullivan?

5 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 And, General, congratulations on your renomination.

7 I want to talk about readiness here for a minute. From
8 2010 to 2016, the Department of Defense budget was cut by 24
9 percent, a quarter of the budget gone. Did you support that
10 drastic cut?

11 General Selva: Sir, I was not in the position I am in
12 during that period of time. I was the executor of the cuts
13 at the receiving end as both a fielded commander and a
14 combatant commander.

15 My caution is those cuts hurt. They hurt not only our
16 ability to respond with respect to purchasing new weapons
17 systems and being ready for what we are facing today, but
18 they also caused us to balance readiness and procurement.
19 And because readiness is something you can defer to the
20 future, we deferred a lot of training during that time
21 period in order to make those numbers work.

22 Senator Sullivan: I agree with that, and I think that
23 these drastic cuts are coming home to roost in terms of
24 readiness. Do you believe that a lack of readiness can be
25 deadly for our military members?

1 General Selva: A lack of readiness in high-end combat
2 can be deadly. It is important to understand that what we
3 did during that time period was focus on the fight that was
4 right ahead of us. So we made sure our forces were ready to
5 deploy to the places they were going, and we deferred most
6 of the high-end training, the complex maneuver exercises,
7 the joint exercises that make us ready to face peer
8 competitors.

9 Senator Sullivan: Let me just go into more specifics.
10 There was an article in the "Marine Corps Times" a year and
11 a half ago. It talked about Marine Corps aviation and how
12 the lack of readiness is not only harmful to our national
13 interests but it is actually threatening the safety of our
14 aviators. When they are not able to fly, the article said,
15 more Marine aviation-related deaths are going up.

16 We had a horrible, horrible accident just 2 weeks ago
17 with the C-130 refueler. 16 brave souls were killed in
18 that.

19 What are we doing about those kind of training
20 accidents that in my view are undermining the ability of the
21 force to operate and risking the lives of the men and women
22 who volunteer to defend their country? It is outrageous.

23 General Selva: First of all, Senator, I mourn the loss
24 of the 16 marines last week as well. But it is way too
25 premature to make any conclusions about the cause of that

1 accident. And in deference to the bravery of those 16
2 marines, I think we should reserve judgment on whether or
3 not training was an issue in that accident.

4 It is common among aviators, of which I am one, that
5 training does have value in increasing the safety and
6 efficacy of our force. So during those time periods where
7 we compromise on training, we do assume risk. That is a
8 consequence of having to balance within a budget that we are
9 given to operate. So I think we should be careful about
10 making conclusions about last week's accident or using a
11 single article to make conclusions about the viability of
12 training for aviators inside the Marine Corps.

13 Senator Sullivan: Well, in 2015, Marine aviation-
14 related deaths hit a 5-year high. And something needs to
15 change. And to me, it relates to training. Are our
16 aviators in the Marine Corps and Air Force flying less hours
17 right now?

18 General Selva: Sir, I am not disputing that we need to
19 focus on training and safety within all of our aviation
20 services. Please do not get me wrong. With reference to
21 the specific accident we are talking about --

22 Senator Sullivan: I am not talking about that. That
23 is an example of what is happening too often, and I think it
24 relates directly to a 25 percent decline in military
25 spending. Nobody talks about this Congress approved that

1 the previous administration cut a quarter of the defense
2 budget.

3 General Selva: It is reasonable to draw the conclusion
4 that reductions in training are potentially the cause of an
5 increase in the risk we take to do the work we do.

6 Senator Sullivan: Let me ask just a follow-up on
7 Chairman Inhofe's question about North Korea. The testimony
8 in front of this committee has been consistently in an open
9 setting it is no longer a matter of if but when Kim Jong-un
10 is going to have an intercontinental ballistic nuclear
11 missile that can threaten not just Alaska, my State, and
12 Hawaii, Senator Hirono's State, but the entire Lower 48
13 continental United States.

14 Can you describe succinctly what our North Korea
15 strategy is, what the goal is, and how we are trying to
16 achieve it, and how we in the Congress can help you? Is the
17 goal to prevent at all costs Kim Jong-un having that
18 capability? Because, as you know, General, he is rapidly,
19 rapidly getting it. What is the goal. What is the end
20 state? And how can we support it?

21 General Selva: Senator, I think we have to have two
22 parallel lines of effort. The first is to attempt
23 diplomatically and militarily to prevent him from achieving
24 his goal of having a nuclear weapon on an intercontinental
25 ballistic missile.

1 Senator Sullivan: And would we preemptively launch
2 military operations?

3 General Selva: I think we have to entertain that
4 potential option. That would be a policy choice by the
5 President of the United States to execute or not execute
6 that option.

7 Senator Sullivan: Which would need the authorization
8 of Congress. Do you believe that?

9 General Selva: We would. And we need to think
10 seriously about what the consequences of that action might
11 be.

12 A parallel line of effort is to make sure that as he
13 continues along a path to developing weapons that can strike
14 the continental United States, that we have a parallel
15 effort to provide for the defense of the United States with
16 a suitable ballistic missile defense system that can handle
17 the low volume at this point of missiles that he might be
18 able to deploy that could strike us here across all of U.S.
19 territory, Alaska, Hawaii, and the Lower 48.

20 Senator Sullivan: Thank you.

21 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Sullivan.

23 Senator Hirono?

24 Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 And, General, it is good to see you again. Thank you

1 very much for your continuing service.

2 As we sit here discussing the threats posed by both
3 Russia and North Korea, they are two very different
4 countries that we try to figure out what is it going to take
5 for us to alter the behavior of both of these countries.

6 In the case of Russia, it appears as though maintaining
7 sanctions and possibly imposing more sanctions has some kind
8 of salutary effect. Would you agree with that?

9 General Selva: Yes, ma'am. I think in concert with
10 our NATO allies and other partners, that targeted sanctions
11 on Russia do actually have effect and can affect their
12 behavior.

13 Senator Hirono: It is a lot harder to figure out what
14 will incentivize North Korea to alter their push to become a
15 nuclear power. So we seem to be placing a lot of emphasis
16 on our hope that China will play a pivotal role in reining
17 in North Korea's ambitions. Do you think that we are
18 placing too much emphasis on China? And if so, you
19 mentioned diplomatic solutions or diplomatic approaches. I
20 do not know that we even have a confirmed ambassador to
21 South Korea, for example.

22 What are your thoughts about what more we can do, i.e.,
23 to incentivize China to do more with regard to North Korea
24 or for us to pursue some other avenues, long shots as they
25 may be, because Kim Jong-un does not appear to respond to

1 the usual approaches?

2 General Selva: Thank you, ma'am.

3 I think the work that is being done to pressurize the
4 situation with respect to North Korea in terms of economic
5 sanctions and broad trade sanctions is helpful. It is also
6 quite useful to get the Chinese to do whatever they can
7 diplomatically and use whatever leverage they have.

8 A point that is not lost on me and I do not think on
9 any of you is the fact that Kim Jong-un, who has possession
10 of nuclear weapons that can threaten the United States,
11 clearly has possession of weapons that could threaten his
12 relationship with China and fundamentally change the power
13 structure in the region. And that makes a Kim Jong-un armed
14 with nuclear weapons a threat to China as well. I think we
15 should leverage as much of that as we can to try and get the
16 Chinese not only to work on what they believe is maintaining
17 the stability of North Korea, but to put pressure on him not
18 to deploy nuclear weapons should he continue their
19 development. And I think that accrues to our benefit
20 because it avoids open conflict with North Korea, although
21 we need to continue to be prepared in the event that they
22 are not successful.

23 Senator Hirono: So do you think that our best bet with
24 regard to North Korea is to come to a much better
25 understanding with China? Because you say that economic

1 sanctions has an impact on North Korea, although it is hard
2 to see that as having much of a deterrent effect at all.
3 And we all recognize that, yes, a nuclear-armed North Korea
4 is a threat to China, but it is very hard to tell when China
5 will deem that there has been a tipping point reach with
6 regard to North Korea where some kind of a much more
7 concerted effort will come into play.

8 Do we have the kind of relationship with China right
9 now that will enable us very quickly to identify what I
10 would deem a tipping point and do something in a concerted
11 way with the U.S. and China?

12 General Selva: I can only give you an assessment as an
13 observer of the activities of the State Department and our
14 Secretary of State. They are giving a tremendous amount of
15 effort to building that relationship with China. The early
16 indications were that China was willing to put pressure on
17 North Korea, although we have not seen that pressure be
18 successful.

19 Senator Hirono: Well, I am keeping my fingers crossed.

20 With regard to the Asia-Pacific region, there are some
21 who argue that or observe that we do not have a current
22 overarching strategy to address the challenges in this part
23 of the region, which has some of the largest militaries and
24 four of the five most significant threats to the U.S. are in
25 the Asia-Pacific area. So do you agree that we do not have

1 an overarching strategy to address the challenges in the
2 Asia-Pacific arena?

3 General Selva: I do not agree that we do not have a
4 strategy. The question is whether the critics of that
5 strategy believe it is fulsome enough to deal with the
6 threats of a resurgent North Korea, an emerging China, and a
7 resurgent Russia, three of the principal threats in the
8 region, in addition to violent extremism.

9 Senator Hirono: I am running out of time, General. So
10 if we do have a strategy, very succinctly what is that
11 strategy with regard to the Asia-Pacific threats?

12 General Selva: We manage some of our longest standing
13 alliances in the Pacific with Japan, Korea, the Philippines,
14 Thailand, and others. We have relationships with Australia,
15 New Zealand, and likeminded nations that are putting
16 pressure on China not to destabilize the region. Those are
17 not specifically aimed at North Korea, but they could be.
18 We are a nation that exists on trade and economic
19 relationships in the region and very strong diplomatic
20 relationships and alliances across the Pacific. Those are
21 the sum pieces of the strategy without actually trying to
22 outline all of it.

23 Senator Hirono: Thank you.

24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Hirono.

1 Senator Wicker?

2 Senator Wicker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 Thank you, General Selva. I appreciate you being here.

4 There is a lot of bipartisanship on this committee, and
5 I think you know that based on the legislation that we are
6 putting forward. And the senior Senator from Hawaii serves
7 as ranking member of the Seapower Subcommittee, a committee
8 that I have the honor of chairing.

9 We recommended to the full committee and this committee
10 has reported language which is contained in the SHIPS Act
11 which sets as a policy of the United States of America that
12 we move to a 355-ship fleet. The House of Representatives
13 has also taken this issue up and has put that in their bill,
14 and that bill is further along over there than here.

15 This 355-ship requirement, General -- and I hope you
16 will take this back to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This 355-
17 ship requirement is not something the shipbuilding industry
18 came up with, although I am sure they are delighted about
19 it. It is not something that we invented as people in
20 States that build ships, although we would like to see the
21 idea of defending our Nation and military manufacturing.
22 This is a requirement that came from the people out in the
23 field looking at the seas and saying what do we need to make
24 America safe at this particular time. And basically they
25 took the requirements, sent them in, and it was way more

1 than 355. It was about twice that much. And then they
2 said, resource-constrained, what should be the requirement?
3 And so the considered opinion of the best minds in the
4 military came up with the 355.

5 I just want to emphasize to you before I ask another
6 question that we take that requirement seriously. And we
7 have been in a position this year, both in the House and
8 Senate committees, to give you what you need, and we want to
9 communicate to you that we take this seriously and we want
10 to be your partner there and actually give substance to what
11 has been stated as the requirement. So please know that.

12 Now, also in the area of bipartisanship, I want to
13 applaud what Senator Heinrich said about Russia. And I
14 think I am quoting him correctly. Russia will do whatever
15 they feel is necessary and they look at the threshold of
16 what we in the West are sort of willing to tolerate and kind
17 of stay under that threshold. That has been a pretty good
18 strategy for President Putin. And I am getting tired of it.
19 And I hope the American people and the Pentagon and this
20 committee are getting tired of it because it threatens
21 international security.

22 Now, you answered a question to Senator Ernst about
23 providing lethal weapons to Ukraine. And as I understand
24 it, in eastern Ukraine, the Government of Ukraine has troops
25 there, and they are engaged in kinetic activity against

1 Russian-backed forces. Is that correct, General Selva?

2 General Selva: Yes, sir, that is correct, along the
3 line of contact between the Donbas and the rest of the
4 Ukraine.

5 Senator Wicker: And would it be helpful to those
6 Ukrainian troops if they had better lethal weapons in which
7 to defend their country and defend the Government of
8 Ukraine?

9 General Selva: Sir, that is a policy choice. The
10 kinds of lethal defensive weapons that have been advocated
11 for Ukraine would allow them to defend themselves along the
12 line of contact against those forces supported by the
13 Russians.

14 Senator Wicker: And so there is a discussion among the
15 Joint Staff about this I understand from your earlier
16 answer. And you are working with the European Command to
17 identify what types of weapons are necessary. So when can
18 we expect a decision about that, and how can we be helpful
19 in exhorting our government to provide the kind of weapons
20 that I think Senator Ernst and I and others are advocating?

21 General Selva: Sir, those discussions are ongoing. So
22 I think within the coming months you will have an answer to
23 that question. But we have advocated, for example, for
24 lethal means like anti-tank weapons, so not tanks and
25 offensive capability, but defensive capability --

1 Senator Wicker: We have advocated. Who is the "we"
2 there?

3 General Selva: We being the European Command and the
4 Joint Staff.

5 Senator Wicker: Now, months. It could be 11 months.
6 It could be 2 months. Can you give us a little more
7 specific idea of when we might actually be able to make a
8 decision and do something that would help these people
9 defend themselves and stand up to the sort of activity that
10 Senator Heinrich was talking about in his question?

11 General Selva: Sir, if I can take that back and get
12 you the actual timeline for the discussions. I do not have
13 it with me, but I am happy to do that.

14 [The information follows:]

15 [COMMITTEE INSERT]

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Wicker: Okay. Well, thank you very much. And
2 please be advised that this Senator for one thinks that it
3 is time for us to give these people what they need to defend
4 their own country. Thank you, sir.

5 Senator Inhofe: Senator Wicker, let me add that
6 currently the Oklahoma 45th Guard is over there training
7 them, and they are a little bit perplexed on what they are
8 training them with. Excellent question.

9 Senator Blumenthal?

10 Senator Blumenthal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 I want to follow those questions asked by my colleague
12 from Mississippi, and first to overwhelmingly endorse his
13 view -- and I have championed it on this committee -- that
14 this Nation should be providing the kind of lethal defensive
15 weapons, including anti-tank armaments, that are necessary
16 for the Ukrainians to defend their own nation. You would
17 agree with me that they are defending their nation against
18 Russian aggression. Correct?

19 General Selva: Yes, sir. They are defending their
20 sovereignty.

21 Senator Blumenthal: And you said I think a moment ago
22 that the question of whether to provide that type of
23 weaponry is a policy choice. But perhaps you can tell us in
24 as graphic terms as possible what the difference it would
25 make if we provide those kinds of weapons to the Ukrainians.

1 They would be far more effective on the battlefield in
2 defending their country. Correct?

3 General Selva: Yes, sir. And let me make sure that I
4 am clear on the discussion of the policy question. The
5 policy question is not whether or not to provide lethal
6 defensive assistance but the kinds and quantities of that
7 lethal defensive assistance to the Ukrainians so that they
8 can defend their sovereignty.

9 Senator Blumenthal: Maybe you can give us some
10 examples of that choice.

11 General Selva: How advanced would the anti-tank
12 weapons be and in what quantities would they be delivered as
13 an example of that conversation.

14 Senator Blumenthal: Why not give them the most
15 advanced kind of anti-tank weapons or the most advanced kind
16 that they need to counter -- why give them second rate anti-
17 tank weapons?

18 General Selva: So I do not want to be argumentative.
19 Some of the weapons that we have have technology controls on
20 them that we do not transfer them to other countries unless
21 we can have assurances that the technology will not be
22 exploited. Even in your question, you actually qualified by
23 saying the lethal capabilities they need versus the best
24 possible available. And that is the policy choice we have
25 to make with respect to the types and amounts of aid that we

1 provide.

2 Senator Blumenthal: And I would agree with you that we
3 should not transfer technology that could be compromised or
4 that could be captured by our Russian adversaries. And they
5 are our adversaries too. But I just want to join in the
6 expression of impatience, very strong impatience with the
7 delays that we seemed to have encountered.

8 And I met just last Sunday with a group of Ukrainian
9 Americans who, in effect, said to me, you know, you have
10 been coming to us saying these weapons are going to be
11 provided. Is there some kind of barrier or obstacle? And I
12 am at a loss to give them the kind of answer they deserve.
13 And I think we are at a loss to understand what the barriers
14 or obstacles are. And I am not directing this question or
15 my impatience at you personally because I recognize there
16 are other factors at issue here.

17 With respect to Russian interference in our elections,
18 you have no reason to question the overwhelming unanimous
19 views of the intelligence community that they interfered in
20 our elections. Do you?

21 General Selva: I have no reason to question their
22 views, but I have no firsthand knowledge of the information
23 that they are examining.

24 Senator Blumenthal: And would you agree with me that
25 having some kind of cybersecurity pact with the Russians

1 seems foolhardy at best?

2 General Selva: Not having the details of the potential
3 agreement, it is hard for me to say that they would be any
4 more reasonable about a cyber pact than they are about INF
5 or any of the other treaties without some ironclad method of
6 verification and validation of their intentions. So it is
7 worth a conversation. The question is without any detail,
8 we are having a hypothetical discussion about whether or not
9 they would comply.

10 Senator Blumenthal: Their record in the cyber domain
11 is one of attacking this Nation. Would you agree?

12 General Selva: Yes, sir.

13 Senator Blumenthal: So sharing any information with
14 them is just going to give them additional, in effect, keys
15 to our cyber kingdom.

16 General Selva: If that is the foundation of such an
17 agreement, that would be true.

18 Senator Blumenthal: Well, any kind of information
19 sharing would be involved in a pact or agreement, and it
20 seems highly foolhardy and dangerous to our national
21 security.

22 General Selva: Again, without the context of the
23 actual agreement, it is hard to know what information would
24 or would not be shared.

25 Senator Blumenthal: Thank you.

1 I want to end where I should have begun by thanking you
2 for your service and congratulations on your reappointment
3 and your new position. Thank you very much, sir.

4 Senator Inhofe: Senator Graham?

5 Senator Graham: Thank you.

6 General, I want to echo that too. You have served well
7 and I look forward to keeping you in the job.

8 I associate myself with Senator Wicker and Blumenthal
9 and Inhofe about helping the Ukraine.

10 Do you agree that given the threats we face -- and we
11 have just been talking about a few of them -- the Air Force
12 needs to be bigger and more capable in the out-years?

13 General Selva: Yes, sir. And I believe that is the
14 proposal that the Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the
15 Secretary brought forward in the last budget.

16 Senator Graham: Thank you.

17 Let us talk about three battlefields right quickly.
18 Iraq. Do you support a residual force once ISIL is defeated
19 in Iraq, if the Iraqis would agree, of U.S. forces?

20 General Selva: Yes, sir. If the Iraqis will agree, we
21 will likely need to do continued advising and assisting and
22 training of the Iraqi Security Forces.

23 Senator Graham: Is that true for the Air Force
24 particularly?

25 General Selva: Yes, sir.

1 Senator Graham: The Iranians are there in fairly large
2 numbers I hear. Is that correct? Or having influence in
3 fairly substantial ways.

4 General Selva: As a consequence of a long relationship
5 between Iraqi Shia and the Iranian Government, there are
6 Iranians present in Iraq. That does not mean that they
7 necessarily have to be a controlling influence in Iraq.
8 Continuing to build our relationship with the Iraqi
9 Government and the Iraqi Security Forces I believe is in our
10 interests.

11 Senator Graham: Well, offering Iraq something they
12 would want from us not from Iran like helping train the Air
13 Force would probably give us leverage in Iraq.

14 General Selva: It quite possibly would, yes, sir.

15 Senator Graham: Afghanistan. What is the state of the
16 Afghan Air Force in terms of the capability to support their
17 forces in the field?

18 General Selva: They are beginning to be able to
19 support their forces in the field with a modicum of lift and
20 with light attack aircraft, which are very useful in the
21 theater. Their helicopter force is subject to the
22 maintenance woes of old Russian aircraft. So we have a
23 proposal in place to actually replace their aging Russian
24 vintage helicopters with UH-60's. Those are the helicopters
25 that the Afghan Air Force trains on here in the United

1 States.

2 Senator Graham: Until that happens, do you agree that
3 it would be in our interest to provide some air power that
4 is missing to the Afghan Security Forces as they fight
5 international terrorists?

6 General Selva: Yes, sir, particularly as a bridge to
7 their capability to provide long-term support for their
8 ground force.

9 Senator Graham: Do you support additional troops going
10 into Afghanistan?

11 General Selva: I think that would be a determination
12 of what specific tasks those forces would be doing, but as
13 we look at Afghanistan today --

14 Senator Graham: Counterterrorism would be --

15 General Selva: Counterterrorism would be one of those
16 missions. Supporting the Afghan National Security Forces
17 with train, advise, and assist would be another one of those
18 missions.

19 Senator Graham: And have some air power at their
20 disposal they do not have today?

21 General Selva: Yes, sir.

22 Senator Graham: Syria. The day we take Raqqa back, we
23 better have a plan post-Raqqa. Right?

24 General Selva: Yes, sir.

25 Senator Graham: What role do you think the United

1 States should play in terms of stabilizing Syria when Raqqa
2 falls?

3 General Selva: It is actually I think a bigger task
4 than that, Senator. Raqqa is the current center of external
5 planning for ISIS in Syria, but they have already begun a
6 migration towards the middle Euphrates Valley. So until we
7 have worked either by, with, and through partners on the
8 ground or the Syrian Government shows a willingness to
9 actually deny sanctuary to ISIS, they will continue to be a
10 threat to stability in Iraq and in the region. So we will
11 not be done when we are done in Raqqa.

12 Senator Graham: A very good point.

13 Air power is being deployed in Syria against ISIL
14 today. Right? American air power?

15 General Selva: American and coalition air power from
16 69 nations are being used in Iraq and Syria today, as well
17 as a very small number of ground forces that are providing
18 advice and assistance to those elements that are willing to
19 fight ISIS in Syria.

20 Senator Graham: Would you be open to adding more air
21 power into Afghanistan? I was shocked to hear the number of
22 F-16's we have was pretty small.

23 General Selva: I would have to look at the numbers, to
24 be honest with you, Senator. The capacity of those
25 airplanes to range most of Afghanistan and to service the

1 targets in Afghanistan with the help of tankers and bombers
2 from the Gulf is actually a pretty compelling amount of air
3 power in the region, as we speak.

4 Senator Graham: Well, when I left, I was shocked at
5 the few that we had given the task that we face in
6 Afghanistan.

7 So from the American military point of view, a lot of
8 hard fighting yet to be done in Syria, Iraq, and
9 Afghanistan?

10 General Selva: Yes, sir.

11 Senator Graham: Can you see a scenario where American
12 air power is not absolutely essential to deciding the
13 outcome of these battles?

14 General Selva: No, sir.

15 Senator Graham: Thank you very much. And to all those
16 who serve in the Air Force, thank them.

17 General Selva: Thank you, sir.

18 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Graham.

19 Senator Cruz?

20 Senator Cruz: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will say at
21 the outset that our thoughts and prayers are with Chairman
22 McCain as he recovers from his surgery, and we look forward
23 to his being back at the committee very soon.

24 General, thank you for your service.

25 I want to talk to you about several different topics,

1 but I want to start with the Iran certification.

2 Yesterday, the administration certified to Congress
3 that Iran is in compliance with the nuclear deal. I have
4 very significant concerns with that certification. I want
5 to ask you in your judgment do you believe Iran is in
6 compliance with the deal?

7 General Selva: Based on the evidence that has been
8 presented by the intelligence community, it appears that
9 Iran is in compliance with the rules that were laid out in
10 the JCPOA.

11 Senator Cruz: Are they testing ballistic missiles?

12 General Selva: They are testing ballistic missiles,
13 but those were not covered under the agreement.

14 Senator Cruz: How serious do you assess the threat of
15 Iran developing nuclear weapons?

16 General Selva: I think without the controls of the
17 JCPOA, Iran has the technical expertise to be able to
18 continue down the path to development of nuclear weapons.

19 Senator Cruz: As you know, a similar deal was
20 negotiated with North Korea in the Clinton administration,
21 and it resulted in North Korea acquiring a substantial
22 number of nuclear weapons. What do you believe makes this
23 deal likely to result in any outcome different from what
24 happened in North Korea?

25 General Selva: I think there are two substantial

1 differences at the outset. That does not mean that will not
2 be setbacks in the agreement. The first is the inspection
3 regime that went into the agreement that allows for
4 international inspectors to inspect all of the areas that
5 the Iranians used in their development and storage of
6 enriched uranium and potentially the development of nuclear
7 weapons. The second is --

8 Senator Cruz: How much advance notice does Iran get
9 before those notifications?

10 General Selva: I do not have the details of how much
11 advance notice they get, but we are reasonably confident
12 that the inspectors are able to randomly inspect. And they
13 have installed technical measures that allow for constant
14 surveillance of those same sites.

15 The second is the provisions that allow for sanctions
16 outside of the agreement to continue to be in place on those
17 areas of the Iranian economy, as well as leadership that
18 engage in activities that are not governed by the treaty --
19 or by the agreement. It is not a treaty.

20 Senator Cruz: So last week we also discovered that
21 Iran had sentenced an American citizen and a Princeton
22 graduate student to 10 years in prison. Does it concern you
23 that we are certifying they are in compliance with the deal
24 in the wake of their imprisoning yet another American?

25 General Selva: It concerns me whenever an American

1 citizen is imprisoned overseas, particularly in a regime
2 that is not transparent with their judiciary system. But
3 again, the specifics of the agreement are directed
4 explicitly at the development of and storage of nuclear
5 weapons.

6 Senator Cruz: Well, we will continue this
7 conversation, but I will say that I think the Iran deal is
8 wholly inadequate. The inspection regime is designed to
9 facilitate cheating. It requires effectively 3 weeks
10 advance notice, and for the most sensitive sites, the
11 Iranians self-inspect. And the American people received
12 numerous assurances that North Korea would abide by an
13 agreement very, very similar to this, and North Korea, Kim
14 Jong-il, happily took the billions of dollars the Clinton
15 administration sent to them and used it to develop nuclear
16 weapons. I believe the Ayatollah Khamenei intends to do the
17 exact same thing.

18 And I think the certification yesterday was unfortunate
19 and is dangerous. There is another certification that is
20 due in October I believe, and there is also an upcoming
21 deadline for waiving sanctions. And let me say I would urge
22 the administration there is no greater threat on the face of
23 the earth to the United States than the threat of a nuclear
24 Iran. And I think the certification yesterday was very hard
25 to justify with the facts on the ground.

1 Let me shift to another topic. There is right now a
2 disagreement going on between the Department of Defense and
3 the House Armed Services Committee concerning whether a
4 separate military branch should be created for space. I
5 would be interested in your thoughts on that question.

6 General Selva: Thank you, Senator.

7 I do not believe now is the right time to have a
8 discussion about developing a space force with all of the
9 leadership and infrastructure that would go with it. It
10 would also complicate the command and control of the space
11 constellation which is critical to our military operations.
12 So I believe the time is not right for a conversation about
13 a separate space corps or space force.

14 Senator Cruz: So how do we do a better job defending
15 ourselves in space, given the vulnerabilities and our
16 dependence on satellite technology for virtually every
17 aspect of our military?

18 General Selva: Senator, I think there are three things
19 that we need to do. Actually two are in progress. One is
20 in work.

21 The first was the consolidation of our national
22 military defense of space in a single command and control
23 center in Colorado Springs that allowed us to operate the
24 entire constellation as opposed to satellites in the aegis.
25 The National Defense Space Center I believe it is called is

1 functioning at Schriever Air Force Base in Colorado as we
2 speak.

3 The second is to vest the Commander of Air Force Space
4 Command with the components and responsibilities to manage
5 the entire constellation vice trying to manage it through
6 subcomponents of his own headquarters. USSTRATCOM, under
7 General John Hyten's leadership, has implemented that change
8 in the command and control arrangements just in the last few
9 months. It is time to let that play out and see if we can
10 get some efficiencies out of it.

11 And the third is to continue to vest in the Secretary
12 of the Air Force the acquisition authority for satellite
13 constellations that are critical to military defense.

14 Senator Cruz: Thank you, General.

15 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Cruz.

16 Senator Nelson?

17 Senator Nelson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18 At the outset, I want to say on behalf of so many of us
19 that have not had a chance to register our wishes that
20 Chairman McCain have a speedy recovery and return as quickly
21 as possible.

22 You know, you have had, General, an extraordinary
23 career, very distinguished. I suspect that there is not a
24 problem in the world with you continuing that service, and I
25 thank you for your willingness to be able to do it.

1 Because of that experience, do you want to comment on
2 the fact that Russia has a history of meddling in other
3 people's elections going way back, as far back as what we
4 saw and what they did in Georgia, what obviously we have
5 seen that they have done in Ukraine and using cyber? I am
6 asking this for your perspective because I think Putin
7 understands he cannot beat us on land. He cannot beat us in
8 the air. He cannot beat us on the sea or under the sea, and
9 he cannot beat us in space. But he thinks he can beat us in
10 cyber. And he has had a number of successes going back to
11 Georgia, Ukraine, now in the European elections, several
12 European countries.

13 So do you want to comment about how serious this cyber
14 attack problem from Russia is, including our own country and
15 the attacks that we have seen here?

16 General Selva: Thank you, Senator.

17 I indicated earlier that I do not have any firsthand
18 knowledge of the Russian activity that is alleged in our
19 elections from the intelligence community. However, as a
20 person who has spent a lot of time thinking about the
21 security of the data that represents our electoral system, I
22 think we ought to think very carefully about how we protect
23 that data and how we use that data to facilitate the
24 democratic process in our United States.

25 An example that I have used publicly and, if you will

1 forgive me, I will use now is it is much easier to tamper
2 with registration data than it is to tamper with voting
3 data. So if I wanted to complicate an American election or
4 I wanted to complicate an election anywhere in the world, I
5 would simply make it more difficult for people to vote as
6 opposed to trying to get in after the fact and change the
7 record of their votes. And so as we look at our system,
8 which is distributed across 50 States and every precinct and
9 municipality in those 50 States, we need to be really
10 careful that we do not make the assertion that that
11 inherently distributed system is protected because of its
12 diversity and distribution.

13 So I think we as a Nation ought to think carefully
14 about the value of the data on all of us, our voting records
15 in terms of how we register and where we register, and how
16 protecting that matters for future elections. And that way
17 no one, not Russia, not China, not anybody else who wants to
18 intervene in an election will have the capacity to change
19 our willingness and ability vote and our willingness and
20 ability to vote our conscience for those democratically
21 elected leaders of our country.

22 Senator Nelson: So, for example, it could be something
23 as simple as going into the registration records and
24 deleting registrations. So a person shows up and they say,
25 Mr. Jones, I am sorry you are not registered. Show up on

1 election day or something as easy as going in and changing
2 addresses so that it fouls up the registration system of
3 what precinct that you are in. It could be something as
4 simple as this, and it would hugely complicate, especially
5 in a place like Florida that has had tremendous
6 complications with its voting, which has produced long lines
7 that are sometimes as long as 7 hours. And that is recent
8 history, by the way. You can imagine with people trying to
9 contest the fact that they show up on election day and they
10 say they are not registered and they know they are and they
11 are trying to prove that they are and how that would foul up
12 all of the other voters standing in line. It is an
13 extraordinary and scary thought.

14 And since I am the last one here seeking recognition, I
15 just want to ask you another question. What is your
16 experience? Would you share with the committee your
17 experience where your own privacy has been invaded on your
18 personal accounts? Is that something that you feel
19 comfortable in sharing? I think it would be very helpful
20 for the committee to either know that publicly or privately.

21 General Selva: Yes, sir. I would share this small
22 amount of information publicly.

23 Immediately following the OPM breach, where significant
24 amounts of personal identifying information were made
25 available through a loss of data, about 48 hours later I was

1 locked out of one of my bank and investment accounts as a
2 consequence of a third party attempting to enter that
3 account using information that was likely garnered from that
4 personally identifying information that was the consequence
5 of the OPM breach. I subsequently received a letter from
6 OPM that notified me that my personal data was, in fact,
7 part of the breach. And so that is an example.

8 I can guarantee you for that hour and a half to 2 hours
9 it took for me to work with my bank and brokerage company to
10 make sure my data and my investments were secure that my
11 attention was not entirely devoted to the task at hand,
12 which was being the Commander of the United States
13 Transportation Command.

14 Senator Nelson: And are you aware that that has
15 happened to other high-ranking United States military
16 officers?

17 General Selva: Yes, sir.

18 Senator Nelson: I think that states it, Mr. Chairman.
19 Thank you.

20 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Nelson.

21 Senator Reed, did you want to add anything?

22 Senator Reed: No.

23 Senator Inhofe: Well, let me say, General Selva, you
24 have been an excellent witness. We appreciate very much
25 your straightforward answers, and we thank you for your

1 service.

2 And we stand adjourned.

3 [Whereupon, at 11:22 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25