



PRESS RELEASE

For Immediate Release: July 15, 2004

Contact: Harald Stavenas (202) 225-2539

Opening Statement of Chairman Hunter
Hearing on Army Transformation

The committee meets this morning to begin an in-depth look at the Army's transformation plans. Today, we will hear from a distinguished panel of outside experts who bring varying perspectives but considerable expertise to this question. Next week, the committee will receive testimony from the Army's senior leadership who will provide an update on where they stand on this plan as well as explain in greater detail the multiple aspects of this effort.

Let me first welcome our witnesses this morning:

- General (retired) Jack Keane, who retired last year after 37 years of distinguished service. General Keane last served as Vice Chief of Staff of the Army and is well versed in the difficult choices facing the Army today.
- Major General (retired) Robert Scales, who served over 30 years in the Army before retiring from his position as the Commandant of the Army War College.
- Colonel (retired) Douglas Macgregor. Colonel Macgregor is the author of *Transformation Under Fire, Revolutionizing How America Fights*, a provocative study of Army transformation.
- Mr. Pat Towell, visiting fellow, Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, and no stranger to this committee from his long stint as defense correspondent for *Congressional Quarterly*.

Both President Bush and Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld have embraced transformation as a guiding concept for reshaping our military forces for the new security challenge facing our nation. Arguably, the Army has emerged as the most visible and aggressive effort to implement this vision.

The questions before the committee are varied and complex, but they include:

- Precisely how is the Army transforming?
- Is it moving in the right direction? and,
- Is it wise to attempt such radical change while the Army's troops are continuously engaged in combat?

We may find that the Army has no choice but to significantly change to meet the demands of modern warfare, but we also have an obligation to determine what will be gained and what will be lost as the Army undergoes this lengthy and difficult process.

Change is always difficult. We understand that some have criticized the Army for being too bold in changing when it is fully engaged in combat in Iraq. Others, including some at the witness table, have said that the Army's plan is too timid to meet the challenges of today's security environment. While part of the Army's plan involves procurement programs, the more critical proposed changes rest in the Army's culture, doctrine and organization. In any case, we have a duty to carefully review this important initiative as the most fundamental change facing the Army since the end of the draft, close to thirty years ago.

Our witnesses today have either operated within or studied the Army intimately. Since none of them are presently officially connected with the Army, they are well placed to provide their frank and unvarnished views of the changes the Army is undergoing.

I encourage my colleagues to engage the experts before us with tough questions about the Army's plans, which involve the reserve components as well. With the active and reserve components as stressed as they are, is the Army on the right track? Will the Army plan adequately shape the force for the challenges of tomorrow while providing sufficient resources and protection for the soldiers who are sacrificing so much today? Are the hard lessons of Operations Enduring and Iraqi Freedom incorporated into the proposed plan? We have the responsibility to find the answers and ensure that the Army is on a prudent course.

###

<http://armedservices.house.gov/>