



Selective Service: Future Mobilization Needs of the Nation

Transcript | April 24, 2019

This transcript was prepared by official military court reporters based on an audio recording of the hearing.

Commission:

- The Honorable Joseph Heck, Chairman
- The Honorable Debra Wada, Vice Chairman for Military Service
- Dr. Mark Gearan, Commissioner
- Mr. Steve Barney, Commissioner
- Mr. Edward Allard, Commissioner
- Dr. Janine Davidson, Commissioner
- Ms. Avril Haines, Commissioner
- Ms. Jeanette James, Commissioner
- Mr. Alan Khazei, Commissioner
- Mr. Tom Kilgannon, Commissioner
- Ms. Shawn Skelly, Commissioner

Panelists:

- The Honorable James Stewart, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense
- Rear Admiral John Polowczyk, Vice Director for Logistics, Joint Chiefs of Staff
- Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman, Deputy Director of Studies and the Leon E. Panetta Senior Fellow, Center for a New American Security
- Major General Peter Byrne, Mobilization Assistant to the Commander, U.S. Northern Command
- Ms. Elsa Kania, Adjunct Senior Fellow with the Technology and National Security Program, Center for a New American Security



OPENING STATEMENTS

Dr. Joseph Heck

Good morning and welcome to the first public hearing on Selective Service by the National Commission on Military National and Public Service.

The purpose of this hearing is to address an important question: What are the potential needs for a voluntary or compulsory national mobilization?

In 2016 the commission was created amid a debate over whether the requirement for selective service registration should be extended to women after military combat roles were open to women in 2015.

Congress charged us to answer two every important question: first, does our country have a continuing need for a military selective service system and if so whether the current system requires modifications? Second, how can we as a nation create an ethos of service and increased participation in military, national, and public service?

The first question is the reason we are here this morning. The four hearings we are holding today and tomorrow provide an opportunity to discuss the policy options the commission is considering with respect to the Selective Service System and a potential for a future draft.

This morning we will focus on the strategic security environment and potential requirements for elected service and the nation to meet those needs. Our distinguished panelist will discuss the current Department of Defense requirement for the selective service, our current plan's model, mobilization, and total force, and induction of skilled and unskilled non-prior service personnel and forecastable needs that the selective service system should be able to address, their perspective of U.S. National preparedness for major military conflicts, and to what extent future conflicts may pose emerging challenges that the Commission should consider when developing recommendations for a modified Selective Service System.



I hope our panelist will address these items as directly as possible in their oral statements and in their responses to commissioner questions.

This afternoon we will focus on who will be needed to respond to national security emergencies and how find and integrate into military organizations and structures. Tomorrow we will have the opportunity to discuss who should share the common obligation to defend the nation in a potential future draft.

Let me welcome our panelist: The Honorable James Stewart, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Department of Defense; Rear Admiral John Polowczyk, Vice Director for Logistics, Joint Chiefs of Staff; Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman, Deputy Director of Studies and the Leon E. Panetta Senior Fellow, Center for a New American Security; Major General Peter Byrne, Mobilization Assistant to the commander, U.S. Northern Command; and Ms. Elsa Kania, Adjunct Senior Fellow with The Technology and National Security Program, Center for a New American Security. Thank you all for joining us today.

I would now like to turn to our vice chair for military service, The Honorable Debra Wada for an opening statement.

Ms. Debra Wada

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As the vice chair for military service I have the honor of leading the efforts regarding Selective Service System and the military service for the Commission, but when it comes to the selective service, the military service there's a commonality that the commission has found. It is understood by small portions of Americans. We have found that many Americans do not understand the requirement to register or the purpose of the Selective Service System. And although there is no draft the Selective Service is still much in existence and is active but there seems to be much confusion between the two.



Most young men today register for selective service as a secondary process, whether they apply for a driver's license or federal financial aid. In fact, 75 percent of young men registry is a by-product of another state or federal requirement. Registering is the law and therefore if a male fails to register there are penalties such as not being able to obtain a federal job, financial assistance, or other sorts of federal and state assistance.

As you may all know that there was a district court case decided in Texas earlier this year, stating that an all-male military draft is unconstitutional. And earlier this month the federal court in New Jersey, handling 2nd Court's case involving women and the Selective Service, issued an opinion denying the core parts of the government's motion to dismiss.

Previously the Supreme Court held that the draft registration process, in 1981, in *Rostker versus Goldberg* the court ruled that a male only draft was fully justified because women were ineligible for combat roles.

As we all know, that has now changed. And I look forward to hearing from Mr. Rostker in our afternoon's panel to address some of the issues that was raised during the 1981 court case.

This decision will not speed up the commission's timeline in releasing our final report. The court's decision, however, makes the work of the commission all the more important and relevant. The commission is considering whether there's a continuing need for the selective service in its current form, whether, if any, changes should be made, or if should be disestablished. And when it comes to changes we are considering policy options that could expand the registration to include women, identify individuals who possess critical skills that the nation might need in the future, call for volunteers in a time of emergencies supported by using the existing registration database or incorporating reasonable changes to identify, evaluate and protect those who do not serve in the military.

And I look forward to hearing from our panelists on these very important issues today. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.



Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Debra. So, before we begin please make sure to silence any electronic devices. And let me now explain how we will conduct today's hearing.

The commissioners have received your written testimony and it will be entered into the official record. We ask that you summarize the highlights of your testimony in the allotted five minutes. Before you, you will see our timing system. When the light turns yellow you will have approximately one-minute remaining. And when it turns red you time has expired.

After all testimony is completed, we will move into questions from the commissioners. Each commissioner will be given five minutes to ask a question and receive a response. And as the commissioners know, while I'm reluctant to gavel down on the panelist, I am much less reluctant to gavel down on a commissioner.

Depending on time we will proceed with one and possibly two rounds of questions. Upon completion of commissioner questions, we will provide an opportunity for members of the public who are in attendance to offer comments, either on the specific topic addressed today or more generally on the commission's overarching mandate. These comments will be limited to two minutes. The light will turn yellow when you have 30 seconds remaining and red when time has expired.

We are now ready to begin with our panelist's testimony. I'd like to begin with the Honorable Mr. James Stewart. Mr. Stewart, you're recognized for five minutes.

Honorable James Stewart

Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman and Vice Chairman -- or Chairwoman.



Distinguished members of the commission, I'm honored to appear here today to discuss mobilization needs of the Department of Defense and the nation in the event of National Emergency or war. I will address two kinds of mobilization.

First, the mobilization involving the Department of Defense's all-volunteer force using our military services' reserve component, and second, the mobilization requiring more troops than the current all-volunteer force can supply using the Selective Service System.

The reserve components of the United States military are an integral part of America's National Defense architecture providing reliable capabilities to our global combatant commands and state governments. With the ability to quickly mobilize in emergency events, provide operational support abroad or at home the Reserve components are vital to executing the department's defense strategy.

The Department's operational reserve model with one standard of readiness allows our reserve and National Guard forces to be interchangeable with the active duty personnel when mobilized. Furthermore, the reserve component mobilization can be tailored to operational needs and structured to meet the National Defense Strategy.

The National Defense Strategy states that in wartime the fully mobilized joint military force will be capable of defeating aggression by a major power, deterring opportunistic aggression elsewhere, and disrupting imminent terrorist and weapons of mass destruction threats. However, Department of Defense has no contingency operations or battle plans that envision mobilization at a level beyond the all-volunteer force. Even in the face of sustained conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan DoD maintains its ability to recruit and retain professional volunteer force without resorting to a draft.

Some assert that the revolution in military affair by high technology weapons and the cyber battlefield obviates the need to mobilize manpower at the rates seen in the 20th century. Nonetheless the potential for global conflict on the scale of another world war still exists. And every administration since 1980 has made the conscious decision to maintain national



registration for selective service as the tool through which Congress and the President would provide additional manpower to the armed forces; an insurance policy should future threats spark requirements for manpower in excess of those available to the all-volunteer force. Therefore, in the event of a national emergency the draft may be initiated after Congress passes and the President signs enabling legislation.

So, let's talk about the Selective Service System and its value to DoD and the nation. First, it maintains a complete registration and classification structure capable of immediate conscription operations in the event of a national emergency. Should conscription be required the Selective Service System would significantly expand and activate the connections between all Selective Service System locations and Department of Defense Components.

The Selective Service System is ultimately responsible for the full execution of the conscription call up; from conducting lottery operations, classifying and evaluating registrations and ultimately delivering inductees into the military within 193 days from a mass mobilization order for the first person to arrive and 100,000 within 210 days.

The Department supports a continuation of the Selective Service System as an independent federal agency.

Since 1973 the Selective Service has maintained complete registration and classification structure capable of immediate operation in the event of a national emergency and is staffed to immediately reconstitute the full operations of the system, including, military reservist who are trained to operate such a system.

If the requirement for peacetime Selective Service registration was repealed and a mass mobilization was deemed necessary with an amendment to Title 50 the Department of Defense could assume responsibility for functions currently managed by the Selective Service System. However, the department has not developed a plan on how it would fully integrate the registration and mass mobilization functions the Selective Service System currently performs.



Maintaining the clear distinction between the Department of Defense and the nation's Selective Service System ensures the preeminence of civilian control and has historically been viewed as important to reinforce the public's perception of the integrity of the draft process.

The current registration requirement and systems for mass mobilization are designed to provide a fair and equitable process by which individuals are generally conscripted as untrained manpower without regard to their individual skills or abilities.

Removing the clear Department of Defense and Selective Service distinction would require significant thought and effort to counter the specter of an unfair and inequitable draft raised by accusations of targeted mobilizations. In addition, the number of benefits derived both directly and indirectly from the Selective Service System.

In a direct way the Selective Service registration database provides valuable military recruiting leads, seventy-five to eighty thousand a year. In a more indirect vein registration reminds America's youth of the importance of military, national and public service, and the existence of a draft service serves as a critical link between the all-volunteer force and society at-large.

Finally, the Selective Services is both a symbol of our national will and a deterrent of potential enemies of the United States. Given that we do not know precisely what the demands of a future conflict will place on the Department of Defense or the nation as a whole it is imperative that we have all mobilization options available to overcome any national emergency or threat we face.

The department is committed to sustaining the all-volunteer force. It has created the most formidable fighting force in history, able to handle all current threats. However, the Selective Service System is invaluable to safeguarding and ensuring that a mass mobilization, if necessary, will remain both flexible and scalable to adapt to the volume and immediacy of any national



defense requirement presented. And for approximately \$23 million a year an inexpensive insurance policy.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. I look forward to continuing our conversation and answering any questions you may have.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Secretary Stewart. Admiral Polowczyk will be next.

Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

Hi, good morning, Chairman Heck, Vice Chair Wada, honorable commissioners of the National Commission on Military National and Public Service. Thank you for this opportunity to present the Joint Staff's perspective on how the U.S. military mobilizes in the event of a national emergency. I have provided the commission 11-page written testimony for the record. I'd like to take just a few moments to highlight what I've provided you in writing.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been designated as the global integrator. In this role he provides military advice to the Secretary of Defense on how, when and where to use the joint force in long term strategic competition with China, Russia, while also mitigating the threats of states such as North Korea and Iran.

The Chairman supported by the Joint Staff focusses on counter and trans-regional all-domain threats today and into the future. Based on these threats the Joint Staff conducts globally integrated planning through readiness reviews. These reviews layer the simultaneous global requirements to defend the homeland, respond to the national emergency, and deter opportunistic adversaries in other theaters. These plans include large scale mobilization that rely on existing legislative authorities to expand access to reserve and the Guard components' capacity as well as the Defense Production Act that expands access to commercial transportation, sealift, airlift, industrial capacity, communications infrastructure, and other resources in coordination



with other U.S. Government agencies.

The plans we have developed are resourced informed. We have not assumed force expansion be it the Selective Service System or conscription. However, these are models to expand the U.S. military in the event that the all-volunteer force is not sufficient to meet the national need.

Our joint force is ready to fight tonight but we must acknowledge that national mobilization might still be necessary depending on the level of response required. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Admiral. Ms. Schulman, you're recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

Chairman Heck and Honorable Commissioners, thank you so much for having me today. My testimony today lays out my views on what I see as the modern focus of the American Selective Service System with the question of whether it still works for that purpose; has a brief examination of the modern debates around the draft that tend towards using the draft as a band aid solution to present exhibit challenges in American society; considers present and future national security challenges and whether the United States has adequately prepared for them to prevent a national emergency, and includes some general recommendations and comments on proposals under consideration by the commission.

So as you all know, I will reiterate for the audience, the original purpose of the Selective Service System was to ensure an adequate armed strength for the armed forces and reserve components and to share the obligations and privileges of military service, generally, in accordance with a selection system that is fair and just.



In my view, it is important to consider what has changed in American politics, its foreign policy management, and its economy and its labor market and its public engagement on national security matters before assuming this is still a reasonable mission to undertake.

Changes like that include, America's commitment to and substantial investment in an all-volunteer force; it's a large defense budget, and frequent touting of the military as the most effective military ever fielded; its engagement in a wide range of armed conflict over the past four decades without turning into conscription; the fact that parts of the military have grown far more technical, specialized, and in need of highly regular training; and that the fact that vital components of American economy have also grown more technical and highly specialized as well as more globally inter-connected and inter-dependent.

In my view several of these factors have significantly raised the bar for application of the draft in anything but in a pretty significant potentially unforeseen national emergency. That being said, I think the general purpose of conscription in this modern American context remains, through transfer labor and productivity from the civilian sector of the economy to the state for national security purposes, because the national security demand for these contributions is judged to be higher than what it displaces and there's no faster more effective or economical means. That's a pretty high bar.

What is rarely exclusively mentioned in discussions of the draft is the resulting burden of competency on the states to faithfully prepare for any national emergency or any range of national security contingencies that such forceful transfers of labor remain highly unlikely or unnecessary.

The burden on the state might include to maintaining and to equip its armed forces, to keep them in a state of readiness appropriate for any security environment, to generate the intellectual and operational innovations as necessary to deter, and if necessary defeat an adversary, and to maintain within its national security apparatus the expertise necessary to understand and generate sophisticated hedges and responses for future security challenges.



This high bar for the use of conscription also assumes that the United States has, in the event of a national emergency, attempted to enlist more allies to its cause, to employ private security contractors to meet security demands, to transform its military to generate more manpower, and to simply enlist more troops. So, there's a lot of steps of homework that need to be undertaken before you could think about the potential of conscription.

But because conscription leverages the power of the state in the most extreme ways possible citizens are justified in expecting that the states competently and responsibly exhaust all of these options before turning to the Selective Service System. And then only in a true emergency.

But because of this high bar many scholars judge that the present selective service system is potentially unsuitable to such an unpredictable national emergency. The nature of the gap between the present all-volunteer force and the requirements for any future crisis as others have discussed and will discuss is completely unknown, and I think we should have humility in trying to design the system that is actually going to meet those requirements effectively and efficiently.

Those gaps might include the extreme lethality of a future conflict, the demanding rotational schedules of any future conflicts, requirements for high demands or low density skill sets, or the question of whether or not the selective service system can actually provide manpower for those requirements without displacing unique or urgent civilian labor inputs or generating significant and economic pushback. The Selective Service System is in concept task doing that, but has not been tested to do so particularly in the great power conflict and a lot of experts like folks you're going to hear from today and later don't believe it is really well setup to pursue that mission.

Because it's not well setup to pursue that mission, many folks have examined whether or not there are other missions the Selective Service System might undertake, whether it be meeting challenges in civil-military relations such as making the United States military more



representative of the American people. Or to lessen support for current wars and increase America's skin in the game in present conflicts. Or to bring into the U.S. military more highly technical set of skill sets that are not easily acquired within today's military.

I think those are all laudable missions and I understand the intent behind those desires. However, I think that there are many other policy remedies that are available to that and the conscription should be used purely for the purpose that it was designed, to bring in manpower in national emergencies when there is no other possible remedy to do so.

I last say that I think that there's a lot of homework to be done in the United States before you begin to turn to questions of conscription. We have not, as it stands, in the federal Government, in the U.S. Congress, or in the broader American society, had a good conversation about what national security threats look like, and what will be the nature of the great power competition and great power war for which conscription might be utilized. We have not reformed our personnel system to bring in the kind of civilian or military skillsets you might need in this competition before it leads to conflict, nor have we engaged with our economic sectors to talk with them about inter-dependencies and technology competitions and the ways in which the United States economy is in many ways behind for the purposes of the great power competition.

I think these are pieces of the homework that need to be pursued before we turn to the question of conscription. And again, it would reiterate that this matter of conscription should only be pursued with seriousness when all these matters of homework have been exhausted and when all of the elements of the national power have been considered towards a conflict. Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Ms. Schulman. General Byrne, you're recognized for five minutes.



Major General Peter Byrne

Good morning, Chairman Heck and distinguished members of the commission. I'm honored to appear today as the mobilization assistant to the commander of United States Northern Command and North American Aerospace Command, NORTHCOM and NORAD.

I have a few brief opening remarks to describe these commands. USNORTHCOM is a geographic combatant command with the primary responsibilities of defending our homeland. USNORTHCOM also provides defense support to the civilian authorities and acts as Department of Defense synchronizer for integrating military forces when federal military forces are requested in the response to a disaster. NORAD is a bi-national U.S.-Canadian command that deters, detects and if necessary, defeats air threats to the United States and Canada while also providing aerospace warning and maritime warning.

The number one priority of USNORTHCOM and NORAD is homeland defense and that mission will only grow more complex as our adversaries' field increasingly advanced technologies designed to hold our nation and citizens at risk. Deterring threats to the homeland and assisting citizens in the aftermath of disaster is dependent on whole-of-government cooperation and collaboration, and on dedicated and capable public servants at all levels. These whole-of-government partnerships and relationships enable national leaders to act and respond to the needs of their nations.

USNORTHCOM and NORAD remain focused on our current responsibilities, as well as future challenges of the nation. Meeting our no-fail mission requires a deep bench of dedicated military and civilian professionals with a wide variety of skills, experiences, and expertise. As such, it is essential that our nation continues to expand the pathway national service.

I look forward to our discussion today and appreciate the opportunity to support the commission's important work on promoting military, national and public service. Thank you.



Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, General. And Ms. Kania is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. Elsa Kania

Thank you. I'm honored to have the opportunity to testify before the commission. This morning, I'll first provide an assessment of the strategic challenges that the People's Republic of China presents, as a great power rival. I'll then discuss considerations for American approaches to national mobilization in light of this challenge.

The Chinese People's Liberation Army or PLA is undertaking historic reforms to increase its capability to fight and win while also concentrating on improving the quality of its officers and enlisted personnel, as well as the realism of its training. Xi Jinping has called for the PLA to become a world class force, perhaps equaling or even surpassing the U.S. in the process. Chinese military power is starting to go global, including a new base in Djibouti.

The PLA is also actively advancing its space, cyber and electronic warfare capabilities. For the PLA today military innovation is a core priority. Chinese leaders and military strategists recognize artificial intelligence as a strategic technology that could change the form of future warfare.

To advance this agenda, china is implementing a national strategy for military-civil fusion or civil-military integration, which encompasses not only a more integrated approach to technological development, but this is also apply to priority that include talent, logistics and mobilization.

Indeed, the Chinese government has a framework for national defense mobilization that is far reaching and comprehensive, from a national commission as with authorities on the



subject, down to local level commissions, and including economic, political, information, transportation and technological mobilization among other elements. China is preparing to leverage civilian infrastructure and commercial capabilities to support military missions.

The legacy of the concept of people's warfare lives on in China today. In any future conflict scenario, the central military commission would mobilize a range of reserve forces and militia units.

The PLA's apparent prioritization of mobilization at scale, including a renewed emphasis on national defense education for students may indicate serious concern with potential contingencies of retroactive warfare or large-scale conflicts. We must reckon with not only scenarios of local or limited warfare, but also the troubling possibility of high-end conflict against one, perhaps even two great power rivals.

The PLA has long studied and identified weaknesses in American warfighting, developing concepts and capabilities, designed to exploit our potential vulnerabilities. Any future conflicts could start with surprise attacks against our battle networks, satellites, or logistics system intended to undermine U.S. command and control and power projection.

Our homeland is unlikely to be spared attacks on critical infrastructure. The will and resolve of the American people should be considered a center of gravity and likely target, whether through peacetime influence operations by the Chinese Communist Party, the United Front or through wartime psychological operations.

Clearly the United States must contend with the unique challenge of a potential adversary who could bring to bear massive human and industrial resources. However, we should not infer intentions from planning and capabilities alone, nor should we see the U.S.-China rivalry and relationship today as inevitably adversarial.



I want to highlight three distinct concerns for U.S. policy going forward as we think about challenges of mobilization as well as the overall vitality of our all-volunteer force. As a first consideration, potential deficiencies and concerning asymmetries relative to the PRC and our plans and capacity for mobilization could place us at a distinct disadvantage. Our peace time preparations, including adaptation of the Selective Service System must take into account challenges of speed and flexibility that are sustaining global logistics and transportation while also undertaking, if necessary, industrial mobilization at home, which will be requiring deeper public-private partnerships.

Looking forward the U.S. military might consider organizing exercises in the model of the model of exercise that now aims to prepare for a scenario of conflict, perhaps in the Indo-Pacific in order to test and bolster our capabilities for rapid deployment while reinforcing deterrence.

The gravity of threats to our homeland also requires significant investments and defends resilience and continuity. In the face of cyber-attacks, they could target U.S. power grid communications and financial institutions, the Selective Service System would have to operate under a uniquely demanding environment in a time of national emergency.

As a second consideration, our force must adapt to the challenges of an era in which conflict is being reshaped by technological transformations that render talent and human capital all the more vital.

We must fully leverage the talents of all Americans. Among our greatest strengths as a nation and all-volunteer force is and must remain diversity and inclusion, are welcome to all those who love this nation and are inspired to service it. In this regard, we have and should sustain a critical comparative advantage relative to the people's public of china despite its sizeable population.



Today too many Americans who may aspire to serve still tend to be overlooked, disqualified or even excluded. The full and equal participation of women throughout the military, including the Selective Service System should be recognized as imperative going forward. The ongoing implementation of a ban excluding even discharging transgender service members not only is wrong, but also wrongly deprives the U.S. military of their talent, dedication to service and ways that may undermine morale and present readiness.

Troublingly, the future of the military extension, vital national have program is also in peril. MAVNI should be revived and strengthened as a critical challenge through which to recruit future Americans whose skills and expertise will be vital to our future force. Too often the U.S. military also fails to retain talent. So, changes to personnel policies, including new options for career trajectories that enable greater flexibility and specialization also seem long overdue.

As a third and final consideration we must recognize the strategic imperatives of revitalizing American innovation which is at the heart of strategic competition today. Indeed, economic and technological competition abhor to U.S.-China rivalry. American mobilization for peacetime competition is equally imperative and will require pursuing our own national rejuvenation through investing in such core priorities as science, education and infrastructure. Thank you and I look forward to your questions.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you all for your testimony here this morning. We'll now enter into the period of commissioner questionings. I'll put myself on the clock for five minutes.

Secretary Stewart, I appreciate you listing out the reasons why Department of Defense feels that the Selective Service System is a low-cost insurance policy. However, I can tell you that over the last 18 months of our existence in multiple conversations with various members department, there seems to be a lack of any support to any of the arguments provided, whether



there's documentation of it being a deterrent to a potential adversary, how it narrows the civil-

military divide when 75 percent of registrants do so passively and don't know that they've

registered, or how many actual sanctions come out of the JAMRS leads that are generated by the Selective Service System.

In addition, in 2012, the GAO recommended DoD update their requirements for selective service which as you mentioned currently that the Selective Service System provides 100,000 inductees to MEPS by day 205.

PNR agreed to update that requirement back in 2012 aiming to have it done by December of 2012 but failed to do so. The GAO reiterated its recommendation that DoD update the requirement to the review of the 2016 DoD report to this commission. DoD again concurred that it should update the requirement. Can you tell us, what is the status of that review for the requirement to selective service? And when do you expect it to be complete? Do you have any preliminary results or conclusions you might be able to share with us this morning?

Honorable James Stewart

Yes, sir. 2017 the report was sent to Congress. So that report actually has been done. In fact, I have it in front of me here and I was referring to it as you were speaking. Some of the key factors that we mentioned in it was that with this particular report there are direct benefits and some indirect benefits, and I think I mentioned it in my comments, associated with the selective service. It provides timely fulfillment of military manpower in national emergency and that database that we talked about in our statement has provided us with a lot of leads for our recruiting service; 75,000 to 80,000 a year. So, it has been a direct benefit. In the indirect benefit in the report we basically pointed out that it reminds our youth of the importance of military, national, and public service. And it's a link between the all-volunteer force and the public at-large.



And finally, it is a symbol, we believe, of the will and the deterrent of this nation to go ahead and use this system to go ahead and provide, at least to our individuals out there that are not necessarily going to go ahead and agree with us in time of war, gives us a platform in which to go and draw personnel.

Dr. Joseph Heck

I appreciate those pieces that came out of that 2017 report, but it didn't answer the question that GAO specifically asked, which was "What were the manpower requirements that DoD would have for selective services and update that?" And as you mentioned yes, you get 75 to 80,000 recruiting leads yet DoD can't say how many actually assess out of those leads.

And again, going back to the issue of being a connection between the military and the civilian population, especially amongst those required to register at 18 years of age, 75 percent of those that register do so passively when he go to get a driver's license or fill out their FAFSA form for financial aid. So when we ask how can you demonstrate that it's helped to narrow that divide, there hasn't been any response that proves that point so I was wondering if, one, is there a potential point where we will see the reviewed and updated manpower requirements that GAO recommended and whether or not there's any concrete support to those direct and indirect benefits that you missed?

Honorable James Stewart

So, on the first point as far as manpower needs, I believe we actually, in the report, addressed that issue. We talked about 500 reserve officers, 1500 military retirees would be recalled, 700 state resource volunteers, and 6500 newly hired federal employees would be needed to go ahead and do that.

As far as the others, you're absolutely right. That's work that we need to do to go ahead and quantify it that we're actually getting those leads. And I know that our MEPS personnel out there are basically going ahead, and interested in that as well, particularly all the services as



well as far as those leads and how they're basically impacting their services.

Dr. Joseph Heck

I appreciate that. I think we still have a difference in what the GAO was asking. I'll follow up, perhaps in the second round or offline.

Honorable James Stewart

Okay.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Vice Chair Wada.

Ms. Debra Wada

Ms. Schulman, one of the historical roles of the draft was to expand the military, particularly, the Army through conscription. In doctrinal terms they call it total mobilization. In your view, is the draft or draft mechanism, for the purposes of expanding military end strength, in the response to a major conflict still a necessary component of U.S. national security given the evolution of the all-volunteer force since the Cold War?

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

Short answer? Yes. And that goes back to what I was saying in my public statement and what I also say in my written statement, in the sense that there are and will be national emergencies in which the all-volunteer force will not be sufficient to meet -- well, there may be national emergencies in which the all-volunteer force is not sufficient to meet the demand of whatever a conflict we're engaging in.



All that being said, I think that any attempt to actually predict exactly what those national emergencies may be and try to describe them in great detail such that you might be able to say here's exactly how the Selective Service System should operate and here's exactly the sort of people that we would require at that time is folly because that's sort of the purpose of our all-volunteer force right now, is to prepare for possible known contingencies.

That does not mean I think that I believe that all-volunteer force is sufficiently resourced or is sufficiently, intellectually invested [sic] in some of the challenges it may face in the next 10, 20, 30 years. There's still work to be done in those areas.

However, I think that having the opportunity to bring in other means of personnel in terms of mass conscription is an option that the United States will need to have now and in the future. I don't believe that it stands as the deterrent as it is described as. I don't believe that it stands as the link to the American people with the all-volunteer force and the means of civ-mil relations. Its sole purpose is to bring in personnel in a time of national emergency that we cannot easily defined otherwise that we would be preparing for it in a way that the all-volunteer force is tasked with.

Ms. Debra Wada

Thank you. Admiral Polowczyk, from the Joint Staff perspective, is the 205 days, given Ms. Kania's statement that we need to be speedy and flexible in our response, sufficient enough to meet the potential needs Ms. Schulman had mentioned in case of future National Security requirement?

Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

Vice Chair, Wada, I do. I think the time frames, that's measured in months. So, in our planning process, that we've undertaken to pull apart the plan, to understand the global nature, we do have a decision point well before conflict on the need mobilize. And those conversations



that have been on the mobilization of the authorities that we have today. There has been some thought on total mobilization, as you eluded to because it's in doctrine. That's before we would enter into conflict. That process would lead itself to an identification that the all-volunteer force would not be sufficient. And so, what would come forward would be a request through the Joint Staff, to OSD, you know, to the President, to potentially solicit total mobilization. In that request would be the manpower estimate, the time frames, et cetera. That's all measured in months. So, I think from the time that we would need total mobilization there would be that work needed to understand what would we actually have to do to totally mobilize? So, 205 days, I'm familiar with 193 days in the MEPS stations, right? I think that gives us some ability to plan.

Ms. Debra Wada

Thank you. I yield back.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Vice Chair Gearan.

Dr. Mark Gearan

Thank you to the panelist for your submitted testimony as well as oral. And of course, thank to Gallaudet University for hosting us. Ms. Schuman, maybe I could follow up with you. You highlight in your submitted testimony the importance of this national conversation between United States Government and the American people on the future security threats that our nation may face. I would be very interested in what you would commend to us to be thinking about other than declassifying national defense strategy or additional congressional conversations. What would you commend to us for structuring future conversations?



Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

I could give you my fantasy curriculum for the entire K through 12 but I'll set that aside and perhaps submit that in written testimony.

Just to narrow down my recommendation, I think that Congress can play a vital role in this conversation in a way that the Executive Branch is perhaps not motivated to do, and the private sector and the public sphere are not necessarily setup well to do. Changing Congressional oversight on foreign policy matters from one-off hearings on Syria, North Korea, all of which are vital issues to having a series of answer they're investigating a long-term challenge to the United States like China over the course of multiple weeks of multiple rounds of witnesses around the country and involving not only key experts from the think tank realm where I come from but also technology sector, teachers, students, firemen; people around the country who are not thinking on a day-to-day basis that China is our greatest threat. They may be not be thinking of China at all. To the degree that they do, they may be thinking that I'd like to have cheap iPhones.

If we truly believe as the national security leaks that China is the greatest threat to the American people or to our national security interest right now I don't in any way shape or form believe that this belief is held widely outside that national security elite. It is certainly not held by Google, Facebook or a lot of other technology sectors. They're bringing innovation into our economy. It is not widely understood in our Congress and it is not widely understood in our academic sphere.

Those conversations need to happen on an ongoing and continued basis. You need to have these, subject to the push back of those who would disagree. I think absent bringing that kind of conversation into the American people right now, if we have a national emergency in five years, such that United States believes that they need to turn to mobilization, even just the all-volunteer force, there would be skepticism amongst the American people of what for, what purpose, to what end? This is going to disrupt our economy in a way that is going to be highly



harmful. What is our “skin in the game” for this that is not consistent with what the American national security believes of the China threat?

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Allard.

Mr. Edward Allard

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the time of the panelist and your service to our nation. Thank you very much.

Secretary Stewart, as you are very much aware the Military Selective Service Act requires a period of time of conscripts of 24 consecutive months. There are people who are presently serving or those who may volunteer to serve, how would you recommend that we modify that requirement for the conscripts?

Honorable James Stewart

So, sir, just like the reserve components we can go ahead and tailor that. And so, if necessary, whatever the operation is we can go ahead and scale that. The nice thing about the selective service is it’s scalable and flexible. And very similar to the reserve component it’s flexible and scalable so whatever the requirement is and the duration of whatever it is the operation is we can go ahead and setup a time frame for that particular individual for that duration of that operation.

Mr. Edward Allard

All right. Thank you. Thank you very much. And the next question I have is for any of the panelist that would like to respond. What do you think is the likelihood, given historical precedence, likelihood of us ever having to utilize the draft?



Ms. Elsa Kania

If I may respond to that. I think whether we used the draft could be in some case be a matter of choice. But I think when we think about its potential role as a deterrent and contingencies of conflict given the challenge that China poses today; I think there is a non-zero probability. We could in the near future be in a scenario of national emergency with which we might want to consider using the draft. But I do think that continue to focus on strengthening the all-volunteer force as are imperative in the meantime. But if we see that possibility likely enough to merit serious consideration, and I do think we have to think quite critically about we would ensure that the Selective Service System could function under demanding conditions and could take shape rapidly enough.

So one alternative could be to have an expedited processing for those who volunteer within the process of the registration for the system to be a first line or front line of defense if you have critical skills that could be valuable and the early stages would lead up to conflict such as cyber defense. So, I think we do need to continue to think about creative solutions that way we can make sure the draft is well suited to the likely contingencies of conflict and competition in 21st century.

Mr. Edward Allard

Thank you. Any other thoughts?

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

I agree largely to Elsa's comments. I also state that I think that it is low. It will get lower over time. That does not mean that we should consider getting rid of Selective Service System or another concept that may be able to bring in conscription into the present all-volunteer force. And as it gets lower over time I think that places a greater burden on the U.S. Government to involve the American public, the economy and other parts of the political elites in conversations



about what our national security threats are, how we are meeting them and whether or not we are meeting them adequately with our current U.S. Government bureaucracy.

Mr. Edward Allard

Thank you. Anybody else?

Honorable James Stewart

Just one additional comment. Never forget the value of incentivized volunteers. That is always important to go ahead and keep in mind, is having incentivized volunteers certainly would come into play as well.

Mr. Edward Allard

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Major General Peter Byrne

You know, without getting out of my lane a little bit on where I think NORAD/NORTHCOM or USNORTHCOM would be looking at this with similar responsibilities we have with the defense of the homeland. So, you could see there would be a time and need, and it's been discussed here, on critical cyber skills. That may be needed and called forward pretty quickly, both for the military and then for our nation for critical infrastructures and really, command and communication modes out there. So, you go federal, state, local. You can go all along the lines of that.

I think there's probably other times if we're in some sort of major conflict or even major disaster to the United States of America I think you would see NORTHCOM looking for



additional capacity and capability that is requested for by a lead federal agency. So, FEMA for example. If there's a new Madrid or Cascadia disaster in the U.S. which would overwhelm us, and we would need to stop the cascading effects I think you would see something like that where we would need that organized manpower very quickly in order to stop those cascading effects.

Mr. Edward Allard

Thank you very much, General. I yield back.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Barney.

Mr. Steven Barney

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Admiral Polowczyk, I'm interested in this question on the issue of our preparedness as a nation to meet a significant national security threat that might require a national level of mobilization. The 2018 update to Joint Publication 4-05, the Joint Mobilization planning states that, "Military mobilization requires assembly and organization of resources from various inter-dependent resource areas including legal funding, environmental manpower, material, equipment;" I could go on. It includes the industrial base as well. Who in the Joint Staff is responsible for conducting that assessment and review of those material requirements?

Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

Commissioner Barney, there are 12 areas. All of the directors have some role in that. For example, the J3 has identification of the actual manpower requirements. The J4 has a role in the industrial phase et cetera.



Now through our readiness reviews, taking our major contingencies we've looked at all those areas. I feel pretty confident of our level understanding, what will be required in most all of them. There are two areas that I think, we as the Joint Staff, warrant additional learning in them. One is health services and the other is the industrial mobilization.

Health services, really only from the fact of a major contingency and how we would bring our wounded back for care back CONUS and how we stick them into the national disaster framework. That's not truly been tested in large scale war-game scenarios. It's multi-agencies across the federal government. It's civilian hospital, et cetera. So that's one area that I think we have some additional learning.

Mr. Steven Barney

Could I actually redirect it a little bit to help focus this a little bit in. I'm kind of responding to the comment that was made by Ms. Kania about the importance of the American public and national wellbeing being such a critical component to success when we're talking about a significant event and Ms. Schulman's comment that there's an argument to be made that perhaps or nation, both in terms of the general population, as well as folks in industry may not be prepared. I think also of the recent experience with the Project Maven situation where Google employees who would have been working on the defense contracts where that indicated their lack of support to pursue and to have their company working in support of a national security project. When you think about the critical requirements that the nation has, the speed of action, and the authorities that exist under the Defense Production Act do you believe, in your professional view that our nation is adequately prepared to execute a national mobilization in response to a significant national security threat?



Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

Let me get to the industrial based piece. That's the area that really concerns myself in the J4. The Chairman has asked that we work with industry. The National Defense University is looking to put on, I believe this fall, a forum where we can get after those issues. It is not from a lack of planning. Clearly, we're not going to take factories that were producing washing machines. They're not going to make F-35s. So that dynamic is whole scale different.

The second point I would make is the thought that we would go to total mobilization, right, that's a congressional decision. So, you would have that national conversation. So, I think in that forum you would address the national will.

To return back to the industrial base, that issue of speed, our weapons systems are complex. It's not like we're going to turn around and produce a new armored brigade overnight. So, if there was a force expansion and you were going to have additional armored brigades or additional aviation units, you have to make that stuff. So how would we do that? And that answer, I'd be lying to you, sir, if I had that for you today.

Mr. Steven Barney

Thank you, Admiral. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. James.

Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And again, thank you to our panelist for their very interesting and enlightening, both written, and oral testimony this morning.



I'm going to start with Secretary Stewart. You mentioned in your written testimony that

the National Defense strategy demands greater lethality from our military. In your view, would including women in selective service, and therefore, potentially including them in conscription or a draft result in a more lethal military? And I'd appreciate you explaining your answer.

Honorable James Stewart

Okay, so as you know, all career paths are open to women within the military. So, we basically are looking for standards. As long as those individuals meet standards then we basically are open to them. And so, as it stands now every single career path is open to male/female, everyone available out there.

Ms. Jeanette James

So, am I hearing, then, that you're saying, yes, it would lead to increased lethality of the military?

Honorable James Stewart

It is already.

Ms. Jeanette James

Okay. Thank you. My next question is actually for anybody that wants to answer it. Ms. Kania, you mentioned in your testimony that our other major competitors are very capable of disrupting our technologies, and that particularly some of our day-to-day technologies that we all rely on so heavily. Currently, part of our military mobilization, particularly for our reserve forces uses cell phones to contact people when they're going to mobilize. So how can we make and what strategies do we need or what do we need to think about to make our mobilization efforts



less vulnerable to our adversaries?

Ms. Elsa Kania

Chinese military strategists have highlighted that in future conflict they anticipate there will be no clear distinction between the front lines and the home front. So, I think we do have to confront seriously that those risks that are critical infrastructure could in the crosshairs and that the level of disruption that could cause might impede with the process of mobilization in some respects. And Chinese military thinks about conflict as an occurring across a spectrum rather than as a clear binary between peace and wartime. In that regard peacetime preparations, including potentially developing axes that could disrupt our communications, whether military networks or of the American economy and society, and communications in support of mobilization. It'll be important to ensure resilience, have redundancy and have potential alternative if there were a scenario where communications were interrupted. And when we're talking about future threats and challenges as well as opportunities such as 5G today, I think that when we do have to think very seriously about our supply chains, the whole process of managing our critical infrastructure and trying to mitigate risks to the full extent possible and also be prepared and anticipate that if there were to be major cyber-attacks and they're taken against the American homeland we'd have to be prepared for a rapid response. And that could also be a question of fully leveraging the cyber national mission forces as well as potentially augmenting them through voluntary efforts, perhaps from local level units or even leveraging the talents and capabilities of those working in American technology companies. So, I think we'll never be able to eliminate that possibility, but we could think about mitigating and managing risk to the fullest extent possible.

Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you. General Byrne? Admiral Polowczyk?



Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

If I could help answer that for a little bit. We spent some time in the Joint Staff thinking through that issue. And I believe my panel member here characterize both China and Russia have strategic campaigns to disrupt those types of things. So, we are going to have to deal with them. So, the homeland will be contested. And so, we've taken a look at how we project power. And our commercial partners are key to that; Kraft, Visa. We've had classified sessions with them to describe what we mean by contested environments, so we had a shared understanding. And the work that we're doing is all about redundancy and resiliency. There're also some authorities that we do not have today for our cyber area. You know, working off of the DoD networks. Those authorities are not in place. So even if we wanted to do something to protect our commercial partners, other industries we'd have to go ask for those authorities. That came highlighted here, I won't say recently but in the planning efforts and our war games and exercises the Chairman specifically asked the Joint Staff to start working on how we would ask for those authorities. So, I would recommend that in this forum for the selective service that I really do think you need alternate means. I know in the logistics area, people don't like to talk about this but I routinely say that, hey, we need to figure out how to do this without any IT. And unfortunately, we are working through those levels of defense.

Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Dr. Davidson.



Dr. Janine Davidson

Thank you to all the panelists for joining us today and putting thoughtful energy into your testimony and to give us your time today. We really, really, really appreciate it.

I want to hit this question of will. We talked a little bit about whether or not Americans would have the will for some sort of mobilization but let me flip the lenses. Ms. Kania, you talked about the way the Chinese strategists think and especially the PLAs thinking for mobilization, could you elaborate a little bit or maybe clarify for me, in a society with at least two generations of only children, is there any thought to whether the Chinese will to send all their only children into an all-out war would actually be there at that time during the conflict?

Ms. Elsa Kania

Thank you. That's a great question and I think it is important to recognize that although China does have certain strengths as a competitor, they also do have weaknesses and long-term challenges in terms of demographics are among them. And I'd say that we don't have a clear sense of exactly how the level of tolerance for casualties, for instance, that the Chinese military leaders might have. There is great concern on the part regarding concerns of political and psychological mobilization, including -- would expect massive campaigns in terms of propaganda. There had been ongoing efforts and patriotic education, a new development of curriculums for National Defense education to be implemented across Chinese universities.

I think that there is certainly a likely concern on their part and even cases where there had been natural disasters or emergencies with China and accidents that have deprived families of their own children. There has been a huge backlash against the government in the aftermath of those tragedies. So, I agree that I think we have to recognize that questions of will matter on both sides and as we see in the vulnerabilities in our own open information ecosystem that has placed us uniquely abreast. It's clear that Chinese leaders recognize that they also face challenges, in terms of public opinion and are devoting great tension and efforts to censorship, propaganda,



including experimenting with new techniques or monitoring public opinion to enable rapid

response if there were to be any potential unrest or resistance. And I think these sorts of ongoing missions would only re-double in the time of national emergency in which Chinese leaders were trying to mobilize a whole nation response.

Dr. Janine Davidson

Thank you. So given that sort of scenario, I'm asking Ms. Schulman and Admiral Polowczyk, back to the issue of deterrence and whether or not having a Selective Service System whereby the message to our potential adversaries is that American would be all-in; can you comment a little bit about whether you think that theory is a powerful one or not?

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

So, I'll just comment briefly. I think it is only a powerful theory if the United States Government has done all it can to, first of all, prepare itself absent turning to the Selective Service System, but then also prepare itself to potentially be able to absorb the manpower or technical skill sets that it might need in a possible conflict.

On that first point there is enormous unmet requirement for highly technical, cyber talent, technology talent, a range of other talent on top of there being an unmet demand for service amongst young people. We have to figure out how to match those. People want to work in government, they have highly technical skills. Government has not figured out how to hire them and retain them at a level that is actually going to be useful.

That part itself, that's already a concern about our national security policy. In a national emergency that is not going to change. We may be able to conscript people with high levels of talent. We may not be able to utilize them in ways that are terribly effective, absorb them into



our national security system, or even just like on a basic, you're trying to extend the Army. We

don't presently have the capacity to be able to absorb large amount of manpower in the Army at the levels it might need in that sort of competition. I know that's something that others can speak to in greater detail.

Admiral John Polowczyk

From the Joint Staff perspective I'm visualizing this decision support tool that we've created and that spot on mobilization, there is much discussion on what the messaging is there, whether it's to do what you said to show that we really have "skin in the game" if the President and Congress were going to authorize massive recall. Because of our planning for today, and we've not had the conversation, significantly, on total mobilization and the use of selective service, so I don't really have a specific answer for you for there but we do look at that mobilization decision point prior to major conflict and understand what it would do for either escalating or providing a de-escalatory factor. So, it's certainly in our calculus.

Dr. Janine Davidson

Secretary Stewart, I see your body language. You have something to offer on this topic? Thanks.

Honorable James Stewart

Think about the process that it's going to take to go ahead and bring the selective service up. You basically have to go through Congress and then the President has to go ahead and sign that order to go ahead and bring it back up.



So, there is going to be a discussion, nationally. So ultimately, to me any way, it is a symbol of power and basically a deterrent, I would believe, that another country sees that we

have our full nation working on this particular issue and that it's mobilized and the Congress and the President has basically said that we need to bring this mobilization piece up the Selective Service System.

Dr. Janine Davidson

Thank you. I yield.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Kilgannon.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all for being here and to the University for hosting us.

Ms. Kania, I wanted to ask you to follow up on Ms. James' question about critical infrastructure. You said the next conflict could begin with attacks on our critical infrastructure. Is it fair to assume that the Selective Service System/the Selective Service Database would be a point of attack?

Ms. Elsa Kania

I imagine that it could be a target that in those sorts of contingencies. So I do think that how we secure that data and prevent it, for instance, from being corrupted should be a critical concern since it's not simply a matter of data security and potential for targeting those in that



data, by our adversary intelligence services, for instance, if the information were to be compromised that we could envision if we were a scenario where we had to leverage the Selective Service System and we would have found that the information within those databases had been in some way compromised, addresses changed, names and information scrambled in a way that would make it difficult to you, that in and of itself could be a source of vulnerability. So, I do think that recognizing the data as strategic resource and also a likely target is important to keep in mind when we are thinking about the range of cyber challenges that we could confront with any future contingencies.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

In that respect would it be helpful to have one database or split that out into multiple databases and create redundancies, increase the budget for IT and security?

Ms. Elsa Kania

I am not familiar of the specifics of the current management of that database but I imagine creating greater redundancies, perhaps even hard copies as backups if need be and further evaluating and investing in the security of that database could be a vital first step to mitigate risks that we could see a compromise or corruption of the information within it, which as we've heard would be vital to mobilization, potentially and some of these scenarios of national emergency. And I'd add that I do think that when we think about this system capability as a deterrent we have to recognize that it would have to fit within the broader framework of national mobilization, including industrial mobilization for the system as a whole to have the desired effect on the calculus of our potential adversaries.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Ma'am, I wanted to ask you as well, Ms. Schulman, you've spoken about, and many others have the "Changing nature of warfare" with a greater reliance on technology, but does that



negate the need for ground combat, ground security, massive numbers of individuals who can do lower skilled type tasks?

Ms. Elsa Kania

The answer would depend on the contingencies we're envisioning. And I think in certain scenarios of high-end conflict we could see much greater employment of unmanned and autonomous systems in future warfare. But at the same time, we've seen with recent and ongoing engagements there also will likely be a continued need for ground combat. And I'd add on all of that to, I think, as technology transforms the character of warfare the human element and the demands for talent will become all the more vital and all the more critical including the concepts of human-machine teaming you need improvements in training and the technical proficiency of personnel across the board. So, I think that we should recognize that there is a possibility, albeit a slight one that we could need the large numbers of individuals to mobilized through the Selective Service System. But I do think we could explore options for a voluntary addition to the program where those who have these critical technical skill sets that are most likely to be required in the lead up to a conflict could opt to be preferentially -- or expedited in their mobilization in the ways that they could enable them to provide more frontline support.

So I think we have to be able to prepare for a range of options and potential contingencies and recognize that with advances in technology the demand in human talent will only grow but we also have to envision scenarios in which our technologies degraded and our dependency upon it could become a source of vulnerability as well.

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

I would just add something that you probably heard many times in this commission, that our ability to predict what future would look like has been a total failure in every part of history, because it usually misses the facts that politicians and senior leaders with local backgrounds are



making the choices about when and where we go to war, not only on the American side but also amongst our adversaries.

Our adversaries study our weaknesses just as we study theirs. They know that if they pursue against us a long-term war of attrition then it's eventually going to rely on multiple rotation, particularly the ground forces. That's going to be a weakness for us in many ways, as it will be for a lot of other powers because of the nature of our present all-volunteer force. So, I'd love to be able to say that a future American political leader will not turn to major deployment of ground troops in order to fight a major combat operation with a great power competitor. I don't have a sense of what that future security environment will look like in such detail that I wouldn't be able to feel competent making that statement, nor do I have a sense that our future political leaders will have a responsibility to see that that is not a useful exercise of American power. So, we can make these predictions, but we can't actually say that this is how it's going to work in the future.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. Haines.

Ms. Avril Haines

Ms. Schulman, I want to sort of make sure I understand an aspect of your testimony and then ask you a question about it. As I understand it part of what you're saying is we can't rule out the possibility that mass mobilization is necessary in the future, right? And the selective service, therefore -- as I understand it, you're relatively skeptical that the current system is one that actually is capable of affecting the purpose for which it was originally setup, but you



wouldn't rule out the idea of having selective service. And so, part of what I understand you to be saying to us is, look, if you're going to have this, and we should have this, then let's make it capable of achieving what it was originally set out to do. And in that context, it also seems as if

part of what you're saying for the future warfare is that it's going to have to be flexible, it's going to have to be capable of keeping up. And you noted in your written testimony that exercising it and doing a variety of things along those lines might be helpful, I wonder if there are specific modifications to the current system you would recommend that would sort of promote, basically, these issues that you've raise.

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

I'll offer few suggestions and then I'll come back to some other points in my testimony. Saying it like that, I think there are procedures that happen more on the existing standing government side and less on the Selective Service System side. For one, I think that, to the degree that we believe that we are going to have to rely on conscription in the future, even in the smallest possible chance, we need to change that system from a passive registration system to something that's a little bit more active, if only to remind people that it is there. But then it's even part of a broader conversation. That can't be done in isolation. I would also state that we need to consider that the present economy is just vastly different than it was when we were setting up this system. To be able to judge whether or not somebody can move from a college student or 18-year-old can go into a Soldier role that's one position. To be able to judge whether or not you can take somebody from Google in a highly technical position and move them over to a cyber-warfare position that's a really different kind of decision and I think that we would expect a lot of push back from Google or Facebook whoever we're trying to take that labor from in future kind of conflict where we have made different kinds of skill sets are demanded.

Considering those sorts of changes and developing better models for how you'd be able to make those judgements is something that needs to happen. That being said, I wouldn't want to



recommend that we over-design the Selective Service System for all possible kinds of contingencies. We don't necessarily know what that's going to be.

What we need to get better at is on the side of the present national security. Government is thinking through what are the current requirements that we have for national security and are we actually hiring and retaining and developing those kinds of skill sets that we might need in any future contingency whether or not we need to turn the draft or not. Those will help us in a future scenario where we might need to turn to the draft, be able to inform the Selective Service System about here's what we judge to be important, here's what we think is useful in making these kinds of decision of who would be able to be drafted, and here's how we would actually utilize them in that kind of future contingency.

So, I am hesitant to say please reform it in exactly this way because I think those reforms will vary based on the scenario. But your point about exercises is vital, not only for the purpose of testing the system but also just exposing the American people to this is what it looks like. This is how it works. Your feedback, to include your criticism of that is more welcome. And this whole commission has been a useful exercise in doing so.

Ms. Avril Haines

Ms. Schulman just mentioned, obviously, something that also Ms. Kania mentioned, this importance of building skill sets into the context of the selective service and how we do that and that's not something that's currently looked at in the registration piece. And I wonder if, you know, frankly, Admiral Polowczyk or Major General Byrne or Assistant Secretary James Stewart might be willing to comment on that and what your thoughts are about to address that.

Admiral John Polowczyk

I could start concerning your answer. Today, services -- I'm searching for the right words. I've struggled -- we all work towards keeping folks with those types of skill sets,



aviation, cyber, intelligence, EOD, medical, nuclear, et cetera, there's a plethora of really high demand low density skill sets. And the services all use various tools today to try to retain them;

enlistment bonuses, retention bonuses, et cetera. So, we're already working in an environment where said skill sets are important. Tapping into the industrial base can keep viral base from mobilization. It is adherent in questioning what are we going to mobilize. I'm not necessarily worried about welder but I am worried about welders because welders are a precious skill and

our shipyards today are having problems hiring welders, right? But what is that skill set and what are we going to be asking for the industrial base? That's the period of learning and how to go do them, what do we really need? That's my comments on health services. There's an aspect to that and there's this industrial based piece that I'm not quite sure that we've put enough human capital to understand how to go do that, what we might need. It's not today. We're thinking 2030, 2035; you know, out here. It's not an easy task but it well a task that we are going to attain.

Major General Peter Byrne

Can I make one comment on it? I'm sitting here thinking, you know, as somebody who has registered for selective service growing up when I was 18, the system itself, I look at it and it's not a positive system. It's a negative system. So, if you don't do it this is what's going to happen. So, when we talk about buy-in for the American people a lot of times we need to talk about what's the goodness of this? Why should you sign up instead of if you don't, you know, you don't get this or you don't get a job, you don't get financial aid, to further yourself, really, for me as a valued U.S. citizen or a valued member of the United States to be able to give back to society.

When I look at skill sets that is what system that we need to have the flexibility that the system works and not designed around the cyber warrior. I mean, we know that electricians are in short supply. So some of those things that we know are knowns, unknowns, or unknown



unknowns that are out there we have to be able to leave that to the side if we're saying design a system that can adapt to those things that we know 20, 30 years ago we wouldn't even have

thought of. As we know we have iPhones that are only 10 years old and we can't believe, for us, of the amount of technology in that iPhone. Thank you.

Honorable James Stewart

I would say that we have a total force. We have the reserve components. We have our civilians as well. We have incentives to go ahead and build the team that we need. They're already in place. So, when we look at the Department of Defense as a whole what we're trying to do is get these skill sets but it may not necessarily fit for that individual for that particular time. So maybe reserve component might be a better option for them or a Title 5 civilian versus the active component as a Title 10. So, what we're trying to do is to find these skill sets, provide the incentives to go ahead and keep them and as long as the demand signal is there that's what we're reacting to in the personnel readiness area.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. Skelly.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Admiral Polowczyk, I'd like to refer to the National Defense Strategy. From the Joint Staff perspective, where do we presently accept risk with respect to force structure and resourcing?



Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

The Joint Staff's and the Chairman's role is always a global integrator. It's not just globally integrated operations around the globe. We are working towards bringing forward a better budget perspective. I think through this and we do this on the Joint Staff in kind of three-time horizons. Force employment, the stuff we have today; force development, the things we could do within a budget cycle; so, think three to seven years; and then force design which is out here. And so, for the demands of the National Defense Strategy, protect the homeland, remain a preeminent military, et cetera, et cetera, there's all those time horizons. There are constant tradeoffs to employ the force today in a manner that deters and reassures allies. There's pressure on doing things differently with what we have today. And then certainly on the force design. The department has chosen here -- I'll give you an example. Over the last couple of budgets cycles we've put additional resources into munitions, precision guided munitions, because we realized we were maybe not as ready in that area as we should have been. As we put significant resources into munitions for fight-today readiness issue I'm sure that money came from one of those other time horizons, force design and force development. I can't list out every budget pressure but certainly on our commitments today, across the globe, pressurize those areas of design and development. And design being, I think, the hardest area to get after.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you. With respect to the framework you laid out, does the Selective Service System and the potentiality to bring conscripted manpower personnel into either the force of today or that development window affect any of the planning and consideration with regards to that framework?

Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

So, in any of the planning that we've done in taking a look at each adversary and building a globally integrated base plan we've done that with an all-volunteer force, the total force that we



have today. We cycle through that review session every couple of years. We're not necessarily changing the plan for 2035, 2040. That's the force design element. So, the plans that we're look today are informed by the stuff we have today. The capabilities we have today. The political leadership outcomes that the leadership wants. I can tell you, though, in that today-look force expansion has not been part of the calculus.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Alan Khazei.

Mr. Alan Khazei

Thank you. Thank you all. This is a really enlightening discussion. I was to go off of the last question that my colleague asked in terms of the Selective Service System. So, we have, as part of our mandate to look at the Selective Service System and how we modernize it. It was 40 years ago, and as we all mentioned the world has dramatically changed. So I'd like all the panel members, but Major General Byrne, you mentioned that it's a very passive system, it's kind of negative, what would you do to make it more active, more positive and also your recommendations as we think about -- if we're going to modernize it, what else should we do?

You mentioned a need for certain skills, cyber, electricians, medical, et cetera. So, thoughts on, if you were us what changes would you recommend if we're going to keep selective service? I guess I'll start with Major General Byrne.



Major General Peter Byrne

So, as I was talking about before I think it's important to be a positive system. So how we design this it's got to look at, if I'm a young person wanting to serve, no matter what capacity, where is it that my value I'm bringing to the table as an individual, and that's garnered for the system that I'm going to go into.

So, I think that would be the main thing, and looking at the system we have now, which does not reward to come forward because there's a lot of options out there for people; there's always been. And so that would be the first thing.

The second thing I'd mention would be the system. You've got to go back and look at the system, of course you said it, it's back to the 1980s when we actually put this forward for a reason with President Carter at that point, to what has changed? And what has changed is that we, as it's been mentioned, we're a little bit more vulnerable now, the things that we never thought they were. And we've all talked about it in cyber as we go along here. So, we have to look at that system. So, I was thinking -- let me go through some natural disasters' scenarios. And what we can use once we lose that infrastructure in order to bring the force forward, force projection, force platforms those kinds of things. Then I always look at what do we have that still doesn't use the technology of today as we would like to see but deliver what they've always done. And I go back to a system that we had from the beginning of time, which is the U.S. Postal Service. They have technology, they use that but when it rains, and snows and they keep delivering is because they go back to their old system.

So, if we're going to look at that we've got to look at also where are we going? I don't want to go back in time, but what systems out there are working. So, if you're going to deliver some notification to somebody and you can't get it by cell phone, you can't get it by email, well the U.S. Postal Service is going to get to you. So, some of those things I think we have to look back and maybe look back -- you know, 1950s -- I was born in 1960s, you know, Civil Defense Force. There's a lot of good programs they had going on for the whole of the nation in order to



build resiliency. So, I think somewhere along you have to look at that system and be able to build that back into it.

Mr. Alan Khazei

Thank you. Other thoughts from any of the panelist with us today on what would you do to modernize or change the Selective Service System?

Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

Just a quick thought. I do think that there's a need to understand the workforce of today and the labor, and the skill sets. I'll just go back to my own service and take my "Joint" hat off for a moment. The Navy has been somewhat vocal on trying to get legislation to bring in folks at a much more senior level to use them, let them serve and then let them return to industry. I think you really have to think through. The selective service was started back here in the horizon. Where are we today? And what are we really looking for? And it may be more skill set focused. I do think there is a moniker of a changing pace of technology and a change in industry that we have and change in labor and workforce. It's not just conscription based.

Honorable James Stewart

Can I add to that on the skill sets? Because I wanted to piggyback on that from the Department of Defense perspective. So, in the report that we provided in 2017 we actually had been looking at skill sets, and this might be a model as to go ahead and use for, say, cyber and other areas. It was in the healthcare professional delivery system. It's another model of induction of persons with special skills and qualifications that we put forward already. And so, if you use that as a model for the other skill sets that are out there that would be a good starting point, I think, as far capturing cyber and some of the other areas.



Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

So, I would just add, to augment my earlier comments, the original purpose of the Selective Service System is hard enough to actually meet that mission. Do not expand the mission, either the stated mission of the Selective Service System or the benefit that it is meant to acquire unless that expansion is going to help you meet that original mission. There is a lot of really good ideas like how to expand public service and how to augment people interested with military national service. That sometimes tie into how we might change the Selective Service System such that it will either may become more interested or maybe become more invested due to mandatory national service.

Those are great ideas. It's hard enough for us to do the Selective Service System. Let's get that right first.

Ms. Elsa Kania

And if I might just add. I agree completely with many of the points raised. I think it's important to think, as was mentioned, about flexible options towards service, about leveraging voluntary initiatives and positive incentives. But I think when we think about national mobilization from a whole-of-nation perspective we also have to look beyond the Selective Service System and think in particular about demands of industrial mobilization and beyond the great efforts of the Joint Staff on this.

I don't we have a single national authority with the responsibility to take leadership in coordinating the functions that could be required for a national industrial and technological mobilization. So, I do think -- China has a model, a National Defense Mobilization Commission with a structure that extends down to the very local level, and regular exercises and attempts to continue to innovate in that system. So I think we might look back through our own history into some of the paradigms that China is creating today and try to find options to think much more



beyond purely military mobilization and the ways to improve selective service, how we think in a much more far reaching manner that with a whole-of-nation mobilization, particularly this industrial dimension of it would like in the future. Thanks.

Mr. Alan Khazei

Thank you. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you. Well, thank you. That concludes the first round of questions, and if everybody is hanging in there, we'll just dive right into the second round. So, I'll put myself on the clock again for five minutes.

Ms. Kania, so there's been a lot of discussion about the perceived deterrent value of the Selective Service System to a potential adversary. Since 1994 DoD has been saying that the draft serves as that deterrent. I wonder, in your studies, specifically with your interest in China, whether or not any references to U.S. National Mobilization has appeared in any references from our near-peer powers and how might potential competitors react if we were to suspend registration or put the Selective Services Systems in deep standby like it was before, even disestablish it, and is the concept of Total National Mobilization only fulfilled by having a Selective Service System, right? Can we still portray that we are committed to a total national mobilization in the events of a national security emergency without necessarily having a pre-events selective service registration system, compared to China our total force is roughly equivalent to 10 percent delta in total force? So, I think anybody would agree that a war of attrition with China probably is not going to go well based on total population for us. So, your thoughts on true deterrent value if it were to be met through a pre-event Selective Service Registration System.



Ms. Elsa Kania

Thank you. Great question. I would say to start that I think deterrence is in the mind of the adversary or potential adversary I would say when we think about long term competition with China and some of these risks of scenarios of outright conflict. I think we should recognize that the Selective Service System could have relevance in some of these worse case scenarios that I hope will never come to pass. But in order to maintain deterrence and reinforce strategic stability in the region, including when we think about Chinese leaders' intention, potentially, regarding Taiwan and otherwise I do think we should preserve the Selective Service System while looking to modernize it for many -- for all of the reasons mentioned the course of this conversation as a means of insurance. But I do think we also have to think in a more -- developing more of a comprehensive framework for national mobilization beyond simply that of the military manpower. So I think looking at these industrial, technological elements of it, ensuring the surety of our supply chain, for instance, Taiwan is a critical hub of manufacturing capability for semi-conductors and I think we do need to think about the level of risk in a global supply chains and ways to diversify and build our own indigenous capability and manufacturing, including in functions like ship building or to think about maintaining the overall national capacity for mobilization in a manner that can reinforce deterrence and also demonstrate the credibility of our alliance commitment in the region.

And as I mentioned in my spoken and written testimony I think exercises, perhaps harkening back to the president of REFORGER and otherwise and to demonstrate our capability to mobilize rapidly and project sustain power distance, given the concerns of logistics, sealift and otherwise I think that could be one way to further reinforce deterrence and demonstrate credibility in way that I hope could be stabilizing in a complex and competitive relationship with our great power rivals today.



Dr. Joseph Heck

General Byrne, I want to go back to a comment that you made regarding selective service registration being seen as kind of negative event as opposed to a positive event, that you get penalized if you don't do it. And again, the idea that DoD feels that it helps to close the civ-mil divide by being a link between the all-volunteer force and the potential for a future draft, again, as previously stated the vast majority of young men do it when they're applying for financial aid and they get to that box that says "Have you registered for selective service?" If you check "no" it automatically brings you to the registration page before you could proceed or now when they go to get their driver's license for the first time, recently an article came out that you see fewer millennials actually getting driver's licenses because they opt not to drive in today's given economy. And so, one of the primary pathways to registration it seems to be diminishing. What are your thoughts on how to make it a positive experience as opposed to a negative experience?

Major General Peter Byrne

I hope there's a lot more opinion than mine on how to make it a positive system as we go here. You know, I think for me it has to be simple. The simpler it gets -- I'm not going to give a really good answer on this as we go along here of what to change in the system -- but is there somewhere along the line if I sign up, you know, there's a positive reward for that. You know we talk about service and we've talked about it on the military side, the incentives that we have to sign up or to retain. So if we're looking for the skill sets and there's an opportunity to use the selective service to identify the skill sets and we see those come forward there's an opportunity to go, hey, we do have something in the U.S. Government or our local to be able to use your skills and serve your nation. Does that appeal to you? And if it does then here's what we're going to do for you, we're going to pay a quarter or a semester of school, whatever it is it puts up there, but it does bring value. Whatever you do you have to bring value to that individual.



We've all grown up with these individual liberties and this is what we struggle with between -- the liberties that we have as U.S. and then we have the U.S. Government that sometimes has to balance between those individual liberties and what's good for the nation moving forward. That would be my recommendation.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Appreciate it. Thank you. Ms. Wada.

Ms. Debra Wada

Thank you. Assistant Secretary Stewart, thank you. The deputy director of military accession policy briefed the commission on the plan to implement conscription that would assume if you put a fourteen to eighteen thousand registrants a day nationwide during the mobilization outside of that day-86. The current MEPS stations though are currently resourced and staffed for current throughput of the 120,000 that currently comes through from the military services; do you believe that the MEPS stations have the ability to meet that increased demand if, in fact, a total mobilization was called?

Honorable James Stewart

So obviously if we are bringing up selective service, we'll have time to go ahead and bring on the experts that we need to go ahead and fulfill that requirement. I'm assuming that we're going to have the manpower and the money to go ahead and have both the facilities and the manpower to process them. Currently, as I said, fourteen to eighteen thousand a day is what they can go ahead and process. If we have locations and manpower to go ahead and meet the demand signal which we'll have enough time to go ahead and do with the amount of time that we'll have with the selective service at that time. Yes, ma'am, I think we can.



Ms. Debra Wada

So, is it the expectation that the department would then use contractor support as opposed to internal, let's say, reserve components given the decisions that are currently or may be made in the department?

Honorable James Stewart

So ultimately, we would have a reserve piece and also a contracting piece, and so that would basically be used to go and bring that MEPS capability up to capacity. So, we're anticipating both military, which is a reserve piece, and then the actual contractors as well.

Ms. Debra Wada

So, when the department makes decisions in terms of force structure is total mobilization or even partial mobilization part of the consideration that is made in determining force structure changes?

Honorable James Stewart

So, force structure itself is based upon the current demands, ultimately is based on the operations is based upon the current demand signals. So ultimately, it's based on the operation plans which a joint staff basically provides. And so, it's all based on the demand signal. So currently it's not some flavorful authorization using the selective service. Current plans use all of our forces that we have, or the reserve components, only active component forces out there will be utilized in the demand now not needing any additional manpower from the selective service. That's what it set up for right now. And ultimately what you're getting at is that selective services if our OPLANs don't match what the demand signal is all dear, which is more force than what we anticipated that's the insurance policy, and that the benefit of having the selective service there, is to draw that manpower when you needed.



Ms. Debra Wada

The setting aside of the draft and the need for Congress to actually draft, the way that the selective services currently set up doesn't seem to actually meet some of the factors that have been raised by some of the other panelist here today. Is it time that we look at a different construct if in fact the department needs some other things while flexible and more efficient, something this is more skill-based the selective service system currently does not provide?

Honorable James Stewart

So again, that's another organization so I'm not going to tell them how to restructure themselves, but if I can good have input to that I've asked him to concentrate on certain skill sets because these are the skill sets that I will need in time of war. They are necessary for us to win, So if I were to provide their input it would be in their particular area, skill set if you go ahead and screen them and provide me remember that I need to fill my requirements out there that will be beneficial to us.

Ms. Debra Wada

Can you provide those skill sets today?

Honorable James Stewart

Yes. So ultimately, again, in areas where we need to help -- I would use cyber for instance, cyber warriors. In time of warriors who would basically need that expertise along with medical, I'm sure will be needed at that time as well. So those are two areas cyber and medical we'd certainly need help and I would ask them to go ahead and focus their attention on them.

Ms. Debra Wada

Thank you.



Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Gearan.

Dr. Mark Gearan

Thank you very much. Major General Byrne, given your own impressive career working with our allies and partners I would appreciate your reflection on any international concerns there might be about U.S. resolve if we eliminated the selective service.

Major General Byrne

Our allies and partners look at the United States and the United States come in their time of need. I believe right now that if you look around the globe that our allies, partners, and our friends believe that the U.S. is going to come to their need. In that resolve I think it is important to maintain, and if we would eliminate one of those aspects where it may influence what they are thinking of is United States change their resolve. Are they not going to come when we need them? I think that's where we need to make sure that if we do change some things that how we project powers in the U.S. around the world and selective service would be one aspect of it if needed. We would need to be able to communicate with our allies and friends of what do we change and then really with the commission of why we made a better. Why we are going to be able to do more for them which means more for us also as we deal with allies and partners around the world.

Dr. Mark Gearan

Assistant Secretary Stewart, perhaps I can ask you similar questions in terms of our international allies and partners. Would you have concerns about the projection of that for U.S. resolve if we indeed eliminated the selective service?



Assistant Secretary James Stewart

As you know I can't speak for them, but I would think that it would have an impact on them because again it is one way in which we -- when levered, that we can go ahead and use to show that we mean business with other countries. And so, I think you might be somewhat alarmed, but I can't speak for them.

Dr. Mark Gearan

Any other panelist want to reflect? Ms. Schulman?

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

I'll just another quick point, that getting rid of the Selective Service System would require a lot of messaging to our allies and partners not only because many of them use conscription on a regular basis to meet the needs of the military on an annual basis. This is how they meet a lot of their national security needs, not only for the security services but for other purposes nationally. Many of them do not understand how we manage our all-volunteer force and how the Selective Service System works against that. It would require a tremendous amount of messaging and reassurance, not because of the actual impact it has been because of the education that would have to take place in order to do so. And in some ways would be a bigger drag in order to help to explain to them that are actual impact itself.

Ms. Elsa Kania

I would just add also start resolve credibility in the mind of her potential adversaries and competitors because they will try to undermine our will and resolve including with regard to credibility of our commitment to a particular contingencies such as the defense of Taiwan and otherwise in our alliance commitments in Asia. So, I think we have to recognize temporal demonstration of our resolve and trying to mitigate any uncertainty that might be in the minds



Chinese leaders about whether we are dedicated to these alliance commitments across the board will be an important factor going forward. And selective service is one part of that, but certainly continuing to demonstrate our will and capabilities in a variety of manners I think will be important going forward too.

Dr. Mark Gearan

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Allard.

Mr. Edward Allard

Mr. Secretary, not to pick on you or anything, but I think it would be instructive for us to get the sense of how the all-volunteer force came into being and specifically for what purpose was it designed.

Assistant Secretary James Stewart

From my limited knowledge, '73, Vietnam, the draft, bad taste in the mouth from the country. As a result of that we basically went to the all-volunteer force. I was in high school and '73. I was a part of the volunteer force as a ROTC student Auburn University in 1977. I served 37 years in the all-volunteer force. I think it is very, very important that we do have this in place. And why we did this was we didn't want to go ahead and have the drafted place where individuals felt like they were unfairly taking the burden on of defending the country. And thus, it was easier to go ahead and incentivize individuals like myself to grade and serve the country. And so I think that the movement from the draft of the all-volunteer force since 1973 has been very, very successful, in that, we have been able to go ahead and provide force that we need to go ahead and take on our anniversary adversaries and it's proven itself and worthy of the



attention that was put forward to bringing this about in every single conflict of events in Vietnam.

Mr. Edward Allard

And it's also my understanding that I was not designed to deal with ongoing permanent warfare; is that correct?

Assistant Secretary James Stewart

I'm not necessarily sure that that's correct. Because I'm not sure of the whenever they formulated the all-volunteer force whether that was one of the reasons why. I do know though that they wanted to go ahead force that basically did not have a draft. And so, they wanted to try to do it with volunteers. And as I said it has been very successful in meeting our nation's requirements.

Mr. Edward Allard

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Barney.

Mr. Steve Barney

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ms. Schulman, I want to continue some of the discussion of this whole issue of the national will to support, when necessary, the mobilization of the nation in response to national security threat. Earlier several of the other panelist committed deliberative process that the nation must take the process that would exist as Admiral Polowczyk described within the Executive Branch and the department to determine what kind of resources



requirements will be required above our current capabilities and resources. And then also there's the political part that involves the actions of the Congress. It would have to be approved by the

President and signed into law. But you offered in your earlier comments kind of a tantalizing question gets to the third part of our nation and, that is, the preparedness of the American public.

You mentioned that you might have some thoughts unlike a K-12 curriculum and am interested in what you might think the nation could do this area. Not in the idea of militarizing our young people, but to better awaken the sense of national purpose, the opportunities to serve in a very broad sense, both of them military national public how we might better prepare young people when they become of age to make informed decisions about how and where they might serve the nation?

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

I will mention a few things in response to that. First, I think in terms of the national will we need to recall that the draft has become increasingly unpopular over the last four years also. Even during Vietnam, the draft was very unpopular, the war continued. During World War II the draft was middle-lingly popular the war continues. Politicians don't necessarily pay attention to the national will when they're making a decision about use of force, deployments, conscription. They don't necessarily make decisions on whether or not to curtail those conflicts. Corollary to that, if you can trust polling, is that the American people overall are increasingly in favor of a far more restraining foreign policy by the United States, and the rationale for that is questionable. Is it because we've been at war for 20 years? Is it because this is just our national tendency as a nation? There's not enough study you might need to actually make a final statement know what their reason behind that is.

The next thing I would say is that when you look at how the federal government recruits people into in-service its system is in large part delegated to, I would call human capital, human resource managers, very distinct from the people who are serving the mission on a day-to-day



basis. As a result, somebody was in college or grad school willing to serve the American people are not put into direct touch with somebody like me who worked in government for 10 years or somebody like many of the folks on the panel who might provide a better perspective is what is like to serve, here are your opportunities here is that access. We've increasingly cut off those who are performing the mission on the day-to-day basis from the American people made what did do a less transparent, less accessible and less understandable to help folks in college, folks in K through 12 and folks in the broader economy.

We need to reverse all of those tendencies starting with making what the federal government does more transparency American people, having them more involved in recruitment efforts to bring in talent to serve the U.S. Government and increasing our civic education such that people have a better understanding of American history, American involvement in the world, the plus or minus is to let them military interventions in foreign policy interventions and expose them to a broader sense of why it is we have an investment of \$700 billion in the Department of Defense for better for worse; why it is we have \$1 trillion investment in national security.

These are all things among people don't even learn until they get into government. If we want to have better understanding better access to American people in terms of having them be willing to serve in some form or fashion we give first type of exposure to what it is we do every day and we just need to stop pretending that it needs to be a secret, to start with having better briefings at Department of Defense. I have my colleagues to carry them back; directly to the American people and the press about what it is about we are engaging in right now.

Mr. Steve Barney

No, I thank you very much for that because we have certainly heard there is a tremendous need to improve the general awareness to things like civic education in our nation to make the



American public more informed, as you said, to transparent processes and ultimately for them to intelligently exercise their sacred right to vote. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. James.

Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Stewart, in one of your previous responses to a question you mentioned the healthcare professional delivery system, some people call it the doctor draft. And you talked about that is a reasonable way of being able to infuse specialty skills or critical skills into the military. My question is, when I think about that system one of the things that makes doable is that healthcare professionals, for the most part, are licensed. They're licensed by a state. It's easy -- maybe not easy, but it is possible to reach into those licensing systems within a state, maybe to compel a state, to provided information. My question is when I think about other critical skills, and we've had a lot of discussion about critical skills, when I think about cyber, when I think about some of the other critical skills even when we get into some of the skills, electricians and in the industrial base, how would you propose developing a similar system for those critical skills to not tied to a license? Maybe they are tied to a certification. The certification may be from a professional society versus a state. So, I would appreciate, actually, your thoughts and if anyone else has thought about that, how would you do for those non-licensed critical skills?

Assistant Secretary James Stewart

And you hit on the key. I think it's a professional organization that you would go after to go ahead and get those individuals, particularly the cyber and some of the other specialties that we are looking for.



So ultimately, I think his professional organizations as you mentioned in the area of healthcare, they're all licensed. As far as legal help, again they're licensed. And so how do we go ahead and reach out and grab those individuals? I think mostly, as you said from professional organizations is probably the only way with those lists and certifications that we have out there.

Ms. Jeanette James

Any other of the panelists thought about that issue?

[No response.]

Okay. Ms. Kania in your written testimony you talked about some additional expense of the Selective Service System. In particular you talked about a voluntary alternative of registrants to choose a status of frontline service within the system which could involve inclusion in a separate list of those who would then be among the first to mobilize for a contingency. That's an intriguing concept. Can you talk more about that so what you are thinking when you are discussing that?

Ms. Elsa Kania

Sure. I think it was very much in line with the conversation we were having about the criticality of skill sets and challenge of identifying those who do have those expertise and professional experience and I think as we discussed maybe having positive alternatives and really leveraging voluntary initiatives and the patriotism of the American people who may hope to contribute in a time of national emergency, given any channels in which to do so. And in terms of the identification of those who do have the skill sets to volunteering augmented process of signing up in which you self-identify; you have language skills or technical proficiencies that could be one way to perhaps augment the existing system.



I will defer to the expertise of those who are more familiar with selective service and I'd add that looking at the model that the Chinese military's starting to use today they also have a number of militias that they're building up at the local level recruiting those who might have experience in industry or even artificial intelligence engineers and trying to think about developing new types of militias. And that's also something we something tradition of our

history. We can look for whether continuing to augment the reserve or National Guard on new opportunities to leverage those who may dedicated to service but give them options that have greater flexibility than a full career in that national public service.

Ms. Jeanette James

Do you think that voluntary service of somebody coming or to go first, do you think that would need to be incentivized?

Ms. Elsa Kania

I think it could be certain incentives include the system. Perhaps optionality in terms of education; precedence would use with success in our all-volunteer force, and perhaps that could be augmented with annual optional program, training or education so that when we're thinking about what it would actually require to mobilize human capital for selective service that there are those in the system who have experience and have been through their processing at MEPS and otherwise who are prepared or registered in some sense to do so.

And I think in the theme of exercising and demonstrating preparedness in ways that reinforce the credibility of this system as one element of our overall deterrent and demonstration of resolve I think having new options or perhaps traction in that system while also recognizing its core purpose would be for some more extreme circumstances. You could imagine that sort of new track or new tier even having a lot of relevance if we're think about natural disasters or



other kinds of national emergencies beyond the contingency of much lesser likelihood of a large-scale conflict.

I'm not an expert on the Selective Service System but perhaps something to consider in line with the overall conversation of the importance of identifying these critical skill sets.

Ms. Jeanette James

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Dr. Davidson.

Dr. Janine Davidson

So, I would like to dig a little deeper on this issue. So, we talked a lot about skill sets and managing the talents of the American people in times of crisis. Earlier both your testimony, Mr. Secretary Stewart and also Ms. Kania, you talked about things like fairness. You said that our system should be flexible, scalable and fair and you talked about the idea of in the past people that were unskilled, people that everybody should be sort of on the hook for call up no matter who they are or where they come from because of the issue of fairness. And Ms. Kania you talked about diversity and inclusion sort of in a similar vein. How do you each balance that sort of societal requirement with what we were just talking about in terms of tapping specific skill sets in times of need?

Ms. Elsa Kania

So when we are thinking about the long-term challenge of strategic competition with a rival like China, who I believe is a potential adversary but not inevitably one, I think thinking about peacetime mobilization so to speak for this competition and really recognizing what are



our core strengths as a nation relative to the size, for instance, of the Chinese population and I do believe that in line with our values and also from a combative perspective, diversity, inclusion, and welcoming those who are inspired to serve really should be core to how we think about fully leveraging talent of the American people as well as perhaps the MAVI program otherwise immigrants who contribute critically to our national defense and building upon the long tradition of immigrants serving in the U.S. military with honor and with distinction.

So I think there is certainly a question of fairness when you think about how to have a system in the form of selective service that is universally applicable and ensures that all Americans have “skin in the game” so to speak or do have a stake in our national defense. I think that’s important. But I think first and foremost anything about leveraging those who desire to serve and, in some cases, may be today may be excluded from doing so for reasons that are not directly correlated with the capacity to make critical contributions to our national security. So first and foremost, recognizing who we are and how we best embrace that diversity as a source of strength relative to competitors who have who have other potential advantages.

Assistant Secretary James Stewart

So, let me piggybacking on that. The fairness, “skin in the game” obviously are key. Not everyone is going to meet those skill set requirements that we have but everyone has an obligation, in my view, to go ahead and served their country. And so, the fairness piece is that it gives everyone the opportunity to go ahead and serve in a random way. The fairness piece I was looking at is, its random nature, and you want to make sure that it is set up for a fair process. And again, the way the selective service is set up right now, a random drawing, it basically is based on the age group that you have that you’re looking for. But the fact of the fairness piece everyone should be a part of the process itself. Yes, we’re worried about skill sets that we have shortages in, but ultimately everyone we want to serve.



Dr. Janine Davidson

Thank you. My other question is for the other panelists and that is the uncomfortable emerging consensus that the homeland is no longer a sanctuary with merging potential scenarios. I don't know that Americans are, to your point, Ms. Schulman, are educated about that potentiality, and I am wondering how each of you thinks this affects the selective service and even just the logistics of the scenario, the homeland isn't a threat or actually potentially compromised and how would we think about going down activated, a draft or a conscription.

Major General Peter Byrne

I guess I'll start on this a little bit. But your comment of "The homeland is no longer sanctuary," and Gen. O'Shaughnessy, commander of NORTHCOM has comported to congresses -- and stated that the homeland is no longer sanctuary. I think what has changed is based on the national defense strategy that has come out and the reorder of where our near-peers are and what threats are out there what our national parties are that we see that there is going to be a risk to the homeland, different than what we grew up where there is always the risk of homeland by that near-peer competitor as far as nuclear weapons. Now we see that we have a competitor out there for kinetic/non-kinetic activity that threatens the homeland. How it affects selective service it will affect all aspects of our government as we go. And we talked a little bit about how we would make sure we had a resilient system in order to call up if we needed that.

When I look at the selective service our national leadership have made certain decisions that catastrophic events has happened to me because get to the selective service. Because we jump through a number of whoops at that point which is, you know, we've used all the actives at that point, we've mobilized the guard or reserve. And now after that full mobilization we have now looked at selective service. So, I think as we march along there, we talked a little bit about the American people committing to this or understanding what's going on. I think there's going to be an even just like 9/11, just like Pearl Harbor, I don't know what it will be, but when we see that I think the American people will really rally around and we won't have to worry as much as we



think we do about that national commitment that we're worried about. I think the event will happen. We'll mobilize. We've gone through a number of things and the nation is risk I think the American people see that and come forward.

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

So in your prepared questions for the panel somebody mentioned, and it was mentioned again in the discussion here, the potential need to declassify some of the scenarios so that major operational challenges for the U.S. military, this is the recommendation of the national defense community and there was a decision made when put in the national defense summary to not actually detail about what those operational scenarios, that they challenge the current all-volunteer force are. I bring it up because I think that were they to be declassified and discussed broadly the American people would be surprised that a number of those scenarios are ones in which there are not strong or well-planned out operational concepts and innovations that would allow American all-volunteer force to succeed in those scenarios, particularly if they took place simultaneously or with other stressing factors going up. Or that there be political factors that would prevent us from having useful success there.

To your point about the homeland being under threat as far as the American people, there is a tendency in discussing national defense to talk about the U.S. military as the strongest in the world. We never lose. We have had all successes and here are all the wonderful things that are great about us. And all of those things could be true while also acknowledging weaknesses, challenges that we have experienced within the last two decades of conflict, the potential to face really catastrophic losses and possible scenarios that are a part of that list of international defense strategy and if I did we need to have a better conversation about the fact that even \$700 billion of investment in the all-volunteer force is not a 100 percent insurance policy against threat to the American people. Those are conversations that I think it should be okay to have and to speak aloud. But when you look at whenever the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs testifies before Congress that's not the tenor of the conversation. And I understand why.



But as a result of that we're talking about defense in a very different way that I think we need to be going for.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Kilgannon.

Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Thank you. I propose this to anybody who'd like to take a shot at it. We've all spoken about the knowns and unknowns that the inability to accurately predict what's coming next, and we're going through this process of preregistration in the selective service based on that fact that we don't know what is coming. And in reality, if we do go to a mobilization/draft it will be the Congress that outlines in the draft legislation what is needed and what is not needed. Does the technology exist? Do the systems exist? Is there the capability if selective service and that preregistration did not exist for us to reach into the population based on what Congress puts in that draft legislation and call up those resources that are needed, who, what age, what skill sets, could we do that through the draft part of it rather than the preregistration or do away with the preregistration?

Ms. Elsa Kania

I am not familiar with the status of U.S planning but I can say that the Chinese military and Chinese leaders are thinking about options to collect the data to have greater understanding of the resources available in the requirements of the ongoing research on the needs of national defense mobilization, and there is interest, for instance, and using that data analytics, even artificial intelligence moot with model of smart mobilization and could leverage, for instance if a structure for future smart cities and the amount of data available to better assess the requirements and enable rapid deployment of resources in response.



So perhaps you can also explore some creative and technical solutions of our own and recognize that despite and beyond all the hype technologies like artificial intelligence could perhaps be transformative, not simply in frontline functions, but also as a means of supporting

the coordinating, scheduling, and mobilization of the range of resources that could be required for a whole-nation mobilization going forward. So perhaps something to consider on that front.

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

I think you have Bernie Rostker testifying either this afternoon or later this week. He has studied this extensively and has a context of that has a concept of face-to-face registration that he believes will not work well and the kind of scenarios that were under discussion but also would have a greater response in a national emergency. He is obviously the expert on all things related to selective service, this would be a good line of inquiry for him.

Honorable James Stewart

I guess my only input would be the cost of the new setup that you have already have something that is providing a set service. So, if Congress were to go ahead and do that ultimately there will be some sort of structure and some sort of processes that are put in place. How long would it take? How much does it cost? Those would be my two questions on that.



Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Anybody else? A related question, this goes to General Byrne's comments earlier, if selective service were completely voluntary, if that preregistration was voluntary, do you envision that could be an effective system, assuming that political leaders bought into it and did their part to inspire young people to register, sign up, offer their skills so that we have not only an all-volunteer force but an all-voluntary backup force that could be called upon. General?

Major General Peter Byrne

My first thoughts are I don't think so. I think as we talk about desire, commitment, "skin in the game" I think somewhere along the line, and I'm talking education in schools, there has to be an acknowledgment that living in this country there are some requirements of living in this country. One of those is to come to the defense of the nation when there is a need. There could be a time when we need that. We've so gotten used to not needing that, but the selective service is for that reason. So, I would be hesitant not something that is a requirement because there may be a need that somebody who lives in the country right now will need to come forward at that point. And that's just part of living here in the United States.

Ms. Elsa Kania

I would just that I do think that the quality of the system as a right and duty of all Americans, and I do love that woman will be included going forward, because when you think about the requirements of future conflict and the fact that all positions are open to woman there is no reason not to call upon the woman equally in this process. But if you were to tour alternatives, I'd say that continuing the equal applicability of this to all Americans but also providing some optionality beyond military service whether for civil defense or other forms of supporting the nation in a national emergency wouldn't purely involve military options. It could be worth evaluating going forward as well. Because I think there's something to be said for all Americans having responsibility and duty in these sorts of contingencies of extreme emergency.



Mr. Tom Kilgannon

Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. Haines.

Ms. Avril Haines

We've heard a fair amount, and I don't think anybody's testimony will have really contradicted this, but the likelihood of the need for mass mobilization/draft is pretty low in the context, and not being able to rule it out and still wanting to have Selective Service Registration System available sort of as an insurance policy in that scenario.

I guess, can you tell me what your view is about the likelihood of the need for a skill draft? In other words, a draft for a specific skill set that you may need to target.

Major General Peter Byrne

I wanted to go back to this a little bit. We got into the skill sets and what may or may not be required. I think it is important that -- I'll put it in an analogy of a football team, you know, and you need a number of players on the team. So you as a coach or manager and owner of that team you want to have the ability to field a team with players that one, fulfill your requirement to win the game; two, does not limit who you can put in what positions so you would like to have a broad base which you were talking about fair, equitable across in order to get the skill sets in order to put a tackle in or a center or a wide receiver. And then also, depending on who's on the other side of the field. You know, as you do your analysis it's going to change between this near-competitor, this near-competitor or one to the other three or whoever comes up in the future. So, I think that that will be important as we talk about what do we need? I think we need to be able



to have the plethora of players out there in order to field a team that makes sense for that coach or that manager that is putting that together and we're dependent on him to win that game.

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

I think we need to insert that scenario the potential that the United States has a set of requirements for, whether it be, doctors or cyber technicians or electricians or whatever it is. Unless it's a true emergency where they need everyone to show tomorrow, they have other mechanisms to be able to bring those sorts of skill sets on, whether it be contracting, recruiting or something else. In which case, if there is a need to be able to conscript those kinds of skill sets it's their scenario in which there is a resistance from those people were those skill sets to be able to come on board. Is the pay not going to be enough? The emergency does not judge -- radical enough. Their present job needs them more than what they think the American people really need. In which case do you need it Selective Service System that can help make the judgment about your labor is more valuable working for the state than it is for working for whatever entity they work for at the time. That is in theory what the Selective Service System set up to do, sort of, but not for these kinds of skill sets that we're talking about right now. We may have to practice it effectively and consistently in that kind of scenario.

Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

If I could just add one dimension to that. What's not been talked about here yet but I have it in my written statement is the mechanisms and the authorities that Congress has given us today to buy stuff, and so there may be a theme between what we contract for services, right, and that growth in how service contracting has essentially eaten up more than 50 percent of the dollars spent in acquisitioning, it might be a themed connection for you of how we've contracted for in the times of need to understand the dimensions that we are looking for. I'd be hard-pressed to tell you I think the skill set sitting here today that you would have to design the system to meet the



needs of 30, 40 years into the future. But you may have a benchmark of what we contract for. It might be a mechanism to keep pace.

Ms. Avril Haines

Thank you. I yield the rest of my time.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Ms. Skelly.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Admiral Polowczyk, it's been stated previously by my colleagues here and folks on the panel that we are pretty much incapable or haven't gotten the next war right. And when we're talking about mobilization, I think what really comes into play we didn't get it right and it's unexpected. The most recent example of that I can think of is Desert Storm where the reserve were brought into play without any real long-term notice or expectation that they would be brought to bear. That was not a particular success story with regards to combat formations of the reserves. Several combat brigades were found to be seriously deficient in terms of their training and materiel readiness, but also since we're focused here with regards to the selective service it's about personnel and that type of mobilization. We talked about there also serious concerns with the medical and dental readiness and significant chunks of those formations. What have we done in the last nearly 30 years to avoid that stuff? We do have an all-volunteer force which is the one that we plan to bring to bear that are ready to be put into play.



Rear Admiral John Polowczyk

So, the investment in readiness I think has been a byproduct of those things that you have mentioned. Currently on the Joint Staff in these reviews we are currently using tools to really understand the bench strength that we have and how ready they are and how ready they are for what. If I can give you dimension of the problem. If this was 1993 and the President asked us to go do North Korea, we would've given the Korean commander everything he asked for. We are not in that same place today. So back in '93 we didn't have China. We didn't have a resurgence in Russia. We didn't have Iran. So, the force has global commitments, so any contingency today the joint force will have to deal with that contingency and then balance the deterrent across the globe in that capacity. So, we realize that we needed a mechanism to really understand the bench depth and strength that we have. And so, the Joint Staff has developed some tools that can do that and the readiness mechanisms.

I can't comment on every individual readiness or any individual reserve unit, but I do agree with you that the strength of our reserves is a strength of the readiness. And I can tell you that the force employment horizon and that readiness gets a fair shake in the budget cycle.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you. Mr. Stewart, do you have anything to add?

Honorable James Stewart

Yes, ma'am. I want to basically make the point that the reserve components have been integrated ever since that time. There were lessons learned from Desert Storm/Desert Shield, Desert Storm. Units weren't trained together. They didn't have the proper equipment. But now, basically, we're using the same type of equipment. We're doing that in a coordinated fashion. When we have been mobilized, we've been going ahead and working with our active duty



counterparts out there. And I'm saying "I" because I used to be a reservist. So again, I am very, very familiar with coordination efforts from the lessons learned and associated with Desert Shield/Desert Storm because we did not have equipment, manpower training to the same standards. All those have changed.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

So, the policies and procedures would be ensuring the readiness of individual members?

Honorable James Stewart

Held to the same standards.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Was that not the case before?

Honorable James Stewart

Not necessarily. I think in policy it was but not an actual practice. We are actually seeing it now where individual units are working with our active duty counterparts in Iraq and Afghanistan and they're performing tremendously with the same equipment trained to the same standard.

Ms. Shawn Skelly

Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Mr. Khazei.



Mr. Alan Khazei

Thank you. Ms. Schulman, I am intrigued by, you said a couple times that we should because of the scenarios that could lead to the need for a mass mobilization which I think is a very strong you're making. Two-part question. First with you and then for Secretary Stewart and anybody else.

The first part just for you. What's the argument against declassifying numbers? And if we did need to move to a mass mobilization what would be the most important thing we would have to do? What should be doing in peacetime to prepare?

Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

So quick clarification. If I am remembering the actual language correctly, less those scenarios and the National Defense strategy are not necessarily ones that will lead to mass mobilization but they're just the ones that are operational challenges for the current force. I will also add that there's potential for not having the Department of Defense declassify them but having the broader defense community sort of acknowledge that they are there. They wouldn't be difficult to guess if I was up here, but I will not do so in this forum. But to be able to have those conversations, putting a name on those actual challenges rather than just saying, you know, succeed under AT or AD threat which doesn't really mean much to other people. The argument against doing so is the same reason that we classified the defense strategy which is something I recommended a few years ago, that our adversaries are reading how we prioritize, and our adversaries are reading where it is, we are taking risk. And I think there's got to be a balance conversation in terms of what are those most sensitive issues that can only be held at a highly classified level and debated there in terms of where we are taking risks and where we are concerned about the readiness of the present force as against the need of the Congress in particular to be able to hold duty to account and what it is doing to actually successfully



implement its strategy to anybody against those scenarios and to invest in a force that is ready for doing so. But the argument against it is obviously that China can read just as well as I can. They're probably reading the National Defense Strategy as we speak that's classified anyway. The other argument against it was it allowed us to have in the department better and more candid conversations about what our strategy was rather than to think through how is this going to read to China, NATO, the American public and Congress. And that's a useful mechanism but there's also a utility in having some of these conversations more transparently.

Mr. Alan Khazei

And if we did have to engage in mass mobilization what would be the most important thing you have to do and how do we prepare for that during peacetime?

Major General Peter Byrne

Everybody knows this; communicate; communicate; communicate. As we say you can't be late to need on this. Your communications got to be out front. We see that in every disaster. And really in a lot of scenarios where we get behind the power curve and we don't have our message out there of the reasons why. And we know that people are going to counter it no matter where they are in the world for the reasons, they would like to counter the message. So, I think there is an opportunity for that understanding and have some preselected mission assignments already for disasters that come up where we know that we're going to need that capability at this time. And we're going to move out as quickly as we can knowing that it is coming. I think there's probably we would be able to translate some of those messages into some sort of pre-scripted. You actually get ahead of the curve on things that we would like for our adversaries not to have an understanding of as we talk about plans. And there is some benefit to do both but I think some things that are being said here could be pre-scripted, could be already cleared, and they come out with the right person saying it to communicate that we're going to mobilize selective service, those kinds of things.



Ms. Elsa Kania

I would just add exercises as means of testing the likely vulnerabilities and our own plans and programs for mobilization, including any questions about economic or industrial mobilization and really trying to see our own plans through the eyes of a potential adversary and recognize where could points of failure be, what are the likely networks or systems or supporting infrastructure that they would be targeting and trying to anticipate and mitigate those vulnerabilities. Preparedness during peacetime will be absolutely integral in any brand-new scenario of great power conflict in the years to come.

Admiral John Polowczyk

I could tell you from a Joint Staff perspective since I own industrial base and mobilization there. I'd frame it a little differently. I'd frame it to understand how we mobilize or innovation base. And so large-scale conflict, long-term conflict with a thinking adversary I think we're going to have to first figure out how to get those folks in our capacity to innovate. That's where I see that the grey matter needs to be expanded and figuring out, not just how to mobilize the industrial base, what may that look like, how do we motivate the innovation base so that we can continue to be ahead of our thinking adversary.

Ms. Elsa Kania

In a said public-private partnership of all kinds I think will be critical going forward when we think about the technology companies that are critical to our innovation base going forward. And I think potentially exploring new mechanisms whether a board or commission to really engage these new stakeholders and solicit their inputs and their involvement in some of this preparedness. So, it could be worth considering as well.



Ms. Loren DeJonge Schulman

Two things that are something more federal, but one is the current distance between the American people and the all-volunteer force. That needs to be addressed in peacetime regardless of any possible conflict we see ourselves in. Right now, if you ask the American people 60 percent of them said they have some kind of direct connection to the military. Field people under the age of 30 that number goes down to 30 percent have some kind of direct connection with the military. We don't want to change that by saying let's grow the military and have more people serve. But there are ways to increase both the transparency of what the military does and civil-military relations, opportunities and engagement both through Congress, senior military leaders, senior defense leaders, and also engagements at the high school level.

The other thing that needs to be worked on is the trust and the national security state. From both parties, from the Whitehouse, on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House you hear people talking about a deep state and whether or not it can be trusted and whether or not we should believe the assessments and recommendations that come out of it. If we see ourselves in a national security emergency in the next 5, 10, 20 years I worry about a scenario in which the American people are fundamentally untrusting of the people who are working on its behalf in the intelligence community and the State Department and elsewhere. That's something that this commission and Congress as well can do a lot to help reverse as much as they can by talking about the patriotism of the folks who are sitting in these desks and what they do on behalf of the American people without a lot of things a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Alan Khazei

Thank you. I yield, Mr. Chairman.



Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you. Thank you, Secretary Stewart, Admiral Polowczyk, Ms. DeJonge Schulman, General Byrne, Ms. Kania. Thank you very much for being here today. We greatly appreciate your time and expertise that you've shared with us and thank you for providing valuable information to the commission.

Certainly, if there's one common theme it's that we can't predict the future. It reminds me of a quote of then-Secretary of Defense Gates to West Point cadets when said that "When it comes to predicting the nature and location of our next military engagement since Vietnam our record is imperfect. We have never gotten it right."

We will now dismiss the panelists. You are welcome to take seats in that front row if you'd like and we'll invite the public to provide comments.

The commission is committed to transparency and openness with the public. In keeping with these principles, the commission intends to provide the public with an opportunity to deliver public comments during our hearings.

As a reminder in order to provide the greatest opportunity for as many participants to offer comments as they like. Public comment is limited to a two-minute period a person as is noted on our website. Sign-up for public comment took place between the opening of registration and the start of this hearing.

When you signed up you received a numbered ticket. To ensure fairness tickets were randomly drawn. We will call out five ticket numbers at a time. And ask that when your number is called please come forward and make a line behind the microphone to my right, your left and provide your comment. On the easel to my left your right you will also see the ticket numbers in the order that you should line up. If time does not permit you to offer your oral comment we encourage you to submit your written comment at our website www.inspire2serve.gov.



Additionally, if you have any written statements that you would like to submit for the record please provide them to staff at the registration desk.

I now invite the following ticketed individuals up to the mic to provide comments: numbers 24, 26, 31, 29, and 028.

During your comments please be aware of the light in front of me. The light will turn yellow when you have 30 seconds remaining and red when time has expired. At this time, you will hear a buzzer. Please introduce yourself to the Commission with your name and affiliation before starting your comment. Sir, you have two minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Ticket #24

Good morning. I am Major General Dennis Leach, United States Army, retired. I'm the executive director of the All-Volunteer Force Forum. I appreciate the plug several times when I heard the term "skin in the game." I am the author of that book.

My comment is that although I agree with what I heard or interpret as a sense of others that the selective service should stay in place as a result of mass mobilization, I would suggest to the commission that absence mass mobilization we also have a problem with the all-volunteer force. As an example, the Army is the canary in the coal mine regarding enlisted historically. Last year the Army started out with a goal of 76,500 to be recruited. It was subsequently reduced to 70,000. Ten to 12 percent of those were successfully enlisted by waivers. And 1.9 percent were cat 4 Soldiers. That's a major problem with the canary in the coal mine in my judgement, and no matter how much we lower standards or how much money we throw at the Army in terms of incentives we still have a problem with potential for systemic or catastrophic failure of the all-volunteer force. I would also like to go on the record with response to Secretary Stewart's statement that "The all-volunteer force is successful" in saying that in my judgement the all-



volunteer force is unfair, inefficient, unsustainable contributes to the civil-military gap and also contributes to the militarization of U.S. foreign policy.

Thank you.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, sir. Thanks for your service. Sir, introduce yourself; name and affiliation. You have two minutes.

Ticket #26

My name is Bill Galvin, and I'm the counseling coordinator at the Center on Concision and War. The Center on Concision and War was founded in 1940 by churches who were concerned about how badly conscientious objectors were treated during World War I. It's horrible piece of our history that almost everyone should be aware of, especially, folks who are considering the future of selective service.

I'm going to talk to you a little bit today about the Hutterites. The Hutterites are a religious pacifist community who like many religious communities came to the United States seeking exercise of freedom of religion, including their pacifist beliefs. Those that came shortly before World War I had assurances from President Wilson that they would not have to worry about conscription for at least 50 years. When the registration requirement happened, these are law abiding people, they registered. Under the law of that time, they were drafted; you were in the military. If you were a conscientious objector you could apply to do non-combat service but if you were -- if your conviction said I can't do any of this, and the Hutterites couldn't even wear the military uniform, they were court-martialed. They were brutally treated. A number of them died in the military. [Holding up a book.] This book is all about their experiences in World War I and it includes first-hand accounts from many people who were brutalized. [Showing a picture in the book.] There's a picture that one of them drew. There is actually a brick at the World War I



Museum memorializing a couple of the Hutterites that were killed during World War I by the U.S. Army in a U.S. military prison.

Now, during World War II, a military base wanted to expand into some of their land they would not sell to the military. And when the government exercised eminent domain and took the land and sent them a check, they refused to accept the check. That's how deeply these folks believed in their beliefs. They came here in the summer of 2017. Four leaders from the Hutterite church, met with me, I took them to selective service. They said very clearly and unequivocally, if the draft is extended to women, they will violate that law.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, sir.

So, we originally called #24, #6, #26, #31, #29. #28? Some folks may have either had their questions answer or have departed. Numbers 30, 25, 27. If you're here and like to offer comment please come up to the mic.

Ticket #30

Commission members, staff, I am Dean Hess, Colonel, U.S. Air Force, retired. I am the senior advisor to SOS America, which is Service Over Self. As a retired Air Force officer, a business consultant concern with the need for continuing renewal of our country I commend the SOS America initiative as a part, hopefully a big part, of the solution of modernizing the Selective Service System. Pre-mobilization legislation would meet our need to track completion of new national service requirement. Using the Selective Service System is cost effective since it would be unnecessary to develop a new system to support the SOS military requirement.

General John Borling or chairman has testified before you here in Washington. But I take this opportunity to emphasize that the military is the most respected institution in the nation. However, since only a small percentage of our young men and women qualify physically and



mentally for the all-volunteer force, we support the need to expand the opportunities for military service. SOS America advocates an affordable one-year, small-unit military experience. Imagine, mixing geography, background and ages 18 to 25 in a small unit of young people whose physical and mental requirements would be based on the ability to take care of themselves versus the strenuous requirements of the all-volunteer force.

Absent exemptions, and given command, they will train and serve in platoons of 30 companies of a hundred. They will respond to the mission needs of the services, guard, reserve, federal and state agencies.

Shared values and experiences affirming the reality that they serve this is the earned benefit and the benefits to our nation. It's all about nation building. I commend [sic] you to look at www.sosamerica.org, Service Over Self. And I have a list of all the benefits that you can provide for an SOS America could also provide what you were talking about this morning.

Dr. Joseph Heck

Thank you, Colonel. If you could provide those documents to our staff, we would appreciate it.

Are there any other ticketed participants who wanted to ask a question that has not yet come up please do so now. Okay, seeing none now I want to again thank our panelists for providing their testimony today, and Gallaudet University for hosting us and all those in the audience who took the time to attend today's proceedings.

It's only with your help and input that the commission will achieve its vision, "Every American inspired and eager to serve." There being no further business before the commission the hearing is adjourned.

###