

Stenographic Transcript
Before the

COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON UNITED STATES PACIFIC
COMMAND IN REVIEW OF THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Thursday, March 15, 2018

Washington, D.C.

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

1 HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON UNITED STATES PACIFIC
2 COMMAND IN REVIEW OF THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST FOR
3 FISCAL YEAR 2019 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM
4

5 Thursday, March 15, 2018
6

7 U.S. Senate
8 Committee on Armed Services
9 Washington, D.C.
10

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

14 Committee Members Present: Senators Inhofe
15 [presiding], Wicker, Fischer, Cotton, Ernst, Tillis,
16 Sullivan, Perdue, Sasse, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Donnelly,
17 Hirono, Kaine, King, Warren, and Peters.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

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

3 Senator Inhofe: Our meeting will come to order this
4 morning to hear testimony from one of my favorite people,
5 Admiral Harris. And I was so excited to be there at the
6 time that everyone was paying tribute to you in your
7 upcoming retirement. I stumbled into that big party of
8 people who were rejoicing that -- the great contributions
9 you have made. And we appreciate so much having you here.
10 I only regret that it'll probably be your last time here.
11 The committee would like to congratulate you along with me.

12 Chairman McCain has asked me to submit a statement for
13 the record. I'm going to go ahead and write the -- quote
14 him at this time, "The National Defense Strategy offers a
15 new framework for thinking about the global challenges we
16 face and that places China squarely at the top of our
17 priority list. As we turn our focus to great-power
18 competition and near-peer threats, we must face up to the
19 true nature of the reality of Chinese power and ambition."

20 [The prepared statement of Chairman McCain follows:]

21 [COMMITTEE INSERT]

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Inhofe: For evidence -- unquote -- for
2 evidence that Secretary Mattis identified priorities in the
3 NDS correctly, we need to look no further than what's
4 happening with China. Of course, everyone's familiar with
5 Russia and with the threats that are out there with the --
6 North Korea, but they haven't thought, really, about China
7 in the framework that we have now seen it from our trip out
8 there. I was recently out with members of the committee,
9 and we had a chance to see it firsthand. I'm hopeful that
10 our recent agreement to increase U.S. defense spending will
11 help us to recover from our current readiness and
12 modernization crisis and prepare for future threats in Asia
13 and beyond.

14 I recently returned from that trip, and, with several
15 members of this committee, we visited the Philippines,
16 Taiwan, South Korea, and Japan. We observed firsthand the
17 threat that -- Chinese expansionism in the region, and we
18 need for American leadership to assure -- if necessary, to
19 defend -- our allies.

20 Admiral Harris, the committee looks forward to your
21 very candid assessment of the threat that's out there. We
22 appreciate your being here with us.

23 Senator Reed.

24

25

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

3 Senator Reed: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 Admiral Harris, thank you for being here to testify on
5 behalf of yourself and for General Brooks. It's unfortunate
6 General Brooks wasn't able to join us, but we appreciate the
7 operational needs on the Korean Peninsula. And I also
8 believe it's the committee's expectation that General Brooks
9 will testify before us as soon as it is feasible for him to
10 return to Washington.

11 In Asia, we are faced with two very different problem
12 sets that will both require long-term, integrated, whole-of-
13 government strategies. I am concerned that the
14 administration has not developed the comprehensive
15 strategies for the threat posed by North Korea or our long-
16 term competition with China. Both problem sets are
17 interdependent. For example, I firmly believe that if we
18 preemptively attack North Korea, we will forfeit any ability
19 to prevail in our long-term competition with China. And if
20 we mishandle that competition, we will be poorly positioned
21 to put the type of pressure on North Korea that is necessary
22 to deter and contain the threat that the regime poses to the
23 United States and our allies in the region.

24 With regard to North Korea, the recent announcement
25 that President Trump will be meeting with Kim Jong Un has

1 led to cautious optimism about a path to a resolution in
2 this crisis. Success in the proposed talks will require
3 consistent strategic messaging, close coordination with our
4 partners in China, and increased diplomatic capacity and
5 empowerment for the experts at the State Department and
6 other agencies. I am concerned that some of the critical
7 players necessary for effective negotiation are not in
8 place, since we are still lacking an Ambassador for South
9 Korea, the Secretary of State is in transition, and the top
10 diplomat who had the most experience with the North Koreans
11 recently resigned. Additionally, there should be
12 significant pre-negotiations with the Republic of Korea,
13 Japan, and China to make sure that we are presenting a
14 comprehensive position that has buy-in from all of the
15 relevant stakeholders. And I am concerned that there's a
16 very short window of time for all of this work to take
17 place.

18 We should all be realistic about the prospects for
19 negotiations. Given North Korea's all-consuming drive for
20 strategic nuclear capabilities and its history of failing to
21 adhere to negotiated agreements, we can all agree that the
22 likelihood of either near-term or long-term success for the
23 talks is relatively low. And even in the event that North
24 Korea agrees to verifiable denuclearization on terms that we
25 can accept, there is a strong likelihood that a long-term

1 deterrence-and-containment strategy will likely need to be
2 in place for decades to come.

3 And finally, it is critical that, if negotiations are
4 not successful, the administration does not pivot to
5 preparing for a preemptive war with North Korea. I believe
6 there is growing agreement that war is not an acceptable
7 alternative to sustaining pressure on North Korea,
8 preventing proliferation and deterring aggression. The
9 talks should be seen as an opportunity to curtail the
10 regime's nuclear missile programs while still maintaining
11 the maximum pressure campaign.

12 Admiral Harris, I'm looking to hearing your views on
13 this latest development and the implications for U.S.
14 national security and the security of our allies in the
15 Pacific region.

16 China is the largest economic, military, and global
17 competitor that we face. It is critical that this
18 administration develop a comprehensive strategy that focuses
19 on all these areas of competition. First and foremost, the
20 U.S. needs a better global messaging campaign to counter
21 Chinese influence in the region. For years, China has been
22 circulating a narrative that the West is in decline and that
23 the economic future lies with China. Our consistent
24 response must be that we are committed to the Asia-Pacific
25 region, that we will stand with our allies and partners to

1 counter Chinese aggression, and that we will continue to
2 promote a shared vision of strong economies, vibrant civil
3 societies, and open democracies. In the end, it is that
4 vision and the human rights that we champion that will
5 ensure American success in the region.

6 China has not demonstrated a willingness to be a
7 responsible global leader. The U.S. should ensure that
8 international order is followed. Our contention with China
9 is not over who owns the South China Sea, but over who has
10 access to it. To that end, we must enable and assist our
11 partners and allies in the region, especially Indonesia,
12 Thailand, Vietnam, and Singapore, in defending their own
13 sovereignty, the maritime rights, and provide them with
14 economic alternatives to China.

15 China is using state wealth and productive capacity to
16 target key companies in entire industrial sectors in the
17 United States to gain economic dominance. Even wise tax,
18 regulatory, and trade policies would not be sufficient to
19 overcome this mercantilist strategy. We must invest more in
20 research and development, workforce development and
21 training, and correct lagging private investment in American
22 manufacturing. We must also improve our own defense against
23 the theft of our intellectual property and technology. Only
24 recently have we come to fully understand some of our own
25 vulnerabilities.

1 Admiral Harris, I'm looking forward to hearing your
2 testimony and how you view our long-term competition with
3 China as Commander of the Pacific Command. I'm interested
4 in hearing about all these issues and much more.

5 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

6 Senator Inhofe: Admiral Harris, you are recognized for
7 your opening statement, and then we'll have questions from
8 the Chair.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF ADMIRAL HARRY B. HARRIS, JR., USN,
2 COMMANDER, UNITED STATES PACIFIC COMMAND

3 Admiral Harris: Thank you, Senator Inhofe and Ranking
4 Member Reed and distinguished members. It's an honor for me
5 to appear again before this committee for what is likely my
6 last posture statement -- posture hearing to you all.

7 I do regret, as the Senator said, that I'm not here
8 with my usual testimony battle buddy, U.S. Forces Korea
9 Commander, General Vince Brooks, but I think you'll all
10 agree that he's where he's needed most right now, on the
11 Korean Peninsula.

12 General Brooks and I extend our thoughts and prayers to
13 Chairman McCain and his family as he continues his tough
14 health fight.

15 There are many things to talk about since my last
16 testimony before you 11 months ago, but I want to start by
17 thanking the Congress for your action last month. I'm
18 grateful for your bipartisan efforts to raise the budget
19 caps for FY18 and FY19, and I'm optimistic that Congress
20 will resource the FY18 NDAA in the coming weeks. I and many
21 others have regularly highlighted the negative impacts that
22 sequestration and the Budget Control Act have leveled
23 against the military, so I would ask Congress to make these
24 bipartisan measures permanent and end sequestration for
25 good.

1 One of the principal problems that we face in the
2 region is overcoming the perception that the United States
3 is a declining or disinterested power. A fully resourced
4 defense budget leading into long term stability -- budget
5 stability will send a strong signal to our allies and
6 partners, and all potential adversaries, that the U.S. is
7 fully committed to preserving a free and open order in the
8 Indo-Pacific.

9 As your PACOM Commander, I have the tremendous honor of
10 leading approximately 375,000 soldiers, sailors, marines,
11 airmen, coastguardsmen, and DOD civilians standing watch for
12 the largest and most diverse geographic command. These men
13 and women, as well as their families, fill me with pride in
14 their hard work and devotion to duty. I am humbled to serve
15 alongside them.

16 The U.S. has an enduring national interest in the Indo-
17 Pacific, and, as I stated last year, I believe America's
18 security and economic prosperity are indelibly linked to
19 this critical region, which remains at a precarious
20 crossroad, where tangible opportunity meets significant
21 challenge. Here we face a security environment more complex
22 and volatile than any we have experienced in recent memory.

23 Senator Reed, I join you in being encouraged by recent
24 developments on the Korean Peninsula and the possibility of
25 a summit between President Trump and Kim Jong Un. But,

1 North Korea remains our most urgent security threat in the
2 region. PACOM will continue to fully support the
3 President's maximum pressure campaign and be ready to
4 respond with our allies and partners to the full range of
5 contingency scenarios.

6 This past year has seen rapid and comprehensive
7 improvement in North Korea's ballistic and missile --
8 ballistic missile and nuclear capabilities, despite broad
9 international condemnation and the imposition of additional
10 United Nations Security Council resolutions. This includes
11 the detonation of its largest nuclear device, first-ever
12 launches of two different intercontinental ballistic
13 missiles, and six launches of an intermediate-range
14 ballistic missile, all of which Pyongyang emphatically
15 states will target the United States, including Guam.

16 While some might dispute both the reliability and
17 quantity of the North's strategic weapons, it is
18 indisputable that KJU is rapidly closing the gap between
19 rhetoric and capability. The Republic of Korea and Japan
20 have been living under the shadow of North Korea's threats
21 for years. Now that shadow looms over the American
22 homeland.

23 Meanwhile, China is leveraging military modernization,
24 influence operations, and predatory economics to coerce
25 neighboring countries to reorder the Indo-Pacific to their

1 advantage. While some view China's actions in the East and
2 South China Seas as opportunistic, I do not. I view them as
3 coordinated, methodical, and strategic, using their military
4 and economic power to erode their free and open
5 international order. China's aggression in the South China
6 Sea moves along unabated, despite the Permanent Court of
7 Arbitration's tribunal ruling that invalidated China's Nine-
8 Dash Line claim and unprecedented land reclamation in 2016.
9 And China is attempting to assert de facto sovereignty over
10 disputed maritime features by further militarizing its
11 manmade bases, to this very day.

12 China's impressive military buildup could soon
13 challenge the United States across almost every domain. Key
14 advancements include fielding significant improvements in
15 missile systems, developing fifth-generation fighter
16 capabilities, and growing the size and capability of the
17 Chinese navy, to include their first overseas base in the
18 Port of Djibouti. They're also heavily investing in the
19 next wave of military technologies, including hypersonic
20 missiles, advanced space and cyber capabilities, and
21 artificial intelligence. If the U.S. does not keep pace,
22 PACOM will struggle to compete with the People's Liberation
23 Army on future battlefields.

24 Thailand's ongoing military buildup, advancement, and
25 modernization are core elements of their strategy to

1 supplant the United States as the security partner of choice
2 for countries in the Indo-Pacific. China also holds global
3 ambitions. But, don't take my word for it, just listen to
4 what China says, itself. At the 19th Party Congress,
5 President Xi stated that he wanted China to develop a world-
6 class military and become the global leader, in terms of
7 composite national strength and international influence.
8 Ladies and gentlemen, China's intent is crystal clear, and
9 we ignore it at our peril.

10 These types of aspirational goals could be appropriate
11 for a nation of China's stature, but, judging by China's
12 regional behavior, I'm concerned China will now work to
13 undermine the rules-based international order, not just in
14 the Indo-Pacific, but on a global scale, as China expands
15 its presence in Central Asia, the Arctic, Africa, South
16 America, and Europe. This increasingly competitive
17 environment necessitates continued dialogue between the
18 United States and China and our militaries to improve
19 understanding and reduce risk.

20 For PACOM, my goal remains to convince China that its
21 best future comes from peaceful cooperation and meaningful
22 participation in the current free and open international
23 order and honoring its international commitments. After
24 all, the Chinese economic miracle could not have happened
25 without the rules-based order the region has long supported.

1 But, I've also been loud and clear that we won't allow the
2 shared domains to be closed down unilaterally. So, we'll
3 cooperate where we can, but remain ready to confront where
4 we must.

5 Now on to Russia. Russian operations and engagements
6 throughout the Indo-Pacific continue to rise, both to
7 advance their own strategic interests and to undermine ours.
8 Russia intends to impose additional costs on the U.S.
9 whenever and wherever possible by playing the role of
10 spoiler, especially with respect to North Korea. Russia
11 also sees economic opportunities to not only build markets
12 for energy exports, but also to build, or in some cases
13 rebuild, arms sales relationships in the region.

14 Of particular note are Russian efforts to build
15 presence and influence in the high north. Russia has more
16 bases north of the Arctic Circle than all other countries
17 combined, and is building more with distinctly military
18 capabilities.

19 In the PACOM region, one event dominated the
20 counterterrorism fight in 2017, the siege by ISIS of the
21 Philippine city of Marawi and the city's recapture by
22 Philippine security forces. This was symbolic of the
23 largest struggle against violent extremism that we saw in
24 Iraq and Syria and Africa, and now see in South and
25 Southeast Asia. Marawi underscores two important themes

1 with regard to defeating ISIS in the Indo-Pacific. First,
2 localized threats can quickly transform into international
3 causes. An early and effective response is vital to control
4 the fight and own the narrative.

5 Second, counterterrorism operations are extremely
6 challenging, and most regional forces are poorly equipped
7 for such fights. Our engagement strategy and capacity-
8 building efforts have remained, and will continue to remain,
9 focused on enabling regional counterterrorism forces to win
10 whatever fights they face. Through multinational
11 collaboration, we can eliminate ISIS before it spreads
12 further in the area.

13 Every day, our allies and partners join us in
14 addressing these global challenges to defend freedom, deter
15 war, and maintain the rules which underwrite a free and open
16 Indo-Pacific. These mutually beneficial alliances and
17 partnerships provide a durable asymmetric strategic
18 advantage that no competitor or rival can match.

19 In the Indo-Pacific, our alliance with Australia
20 continues to anchor peace and stability in the region with
21 increased collaboration in counterterrorism, space, cyber,
22 integrated air and missile defense, and regional capacity-
23 building. Our alliance with South Korea is ironclad, and
24 our alliance with Japan has never been stronger. The attack
25 on Marawi City served as a reminder of the value of our

1 alliance to Philippine security and stability, and we
2 reinvigorated our alliance with Thailand through continued
3 engagement with military leadership to promote regional
4 security and healthy civil/military relations. We've also
5 advanced our partnerships with India, Indonesia, Malaysia,
6 Singapore, Sri Lanka, Vietnam, and many others who are
7 dedicated to the principles of longstanding customary
8 international law.

9 While U.S. interests in the Indo-Pacific are real and
10 enduring, the growing challenges to our interests are
11 equally real and cannot be overstated. In order to deter
12 conflict initiated by revisionist powers, rogue states, and
13 transnational threats, we must continue to develop, acquire,
14 and field advanced capabilities. Our evolving force posture
15 must decrease our vulnerabilities, increase our resilience,
16 and reassure our allies and partners. America's resolve is
17 strong, and it's imperative that we continue to show our
18 commitment to the region in the years to come.

19 I ask this committee to continue its support for these
20 future capabilities that maintain our edge and prevent
21 would-be challengers from gaining the upper hand. Based on
22 your bipartisan efforts last month, I'm excited about the
23 path ahead. Thank you for your enduring support to the
24 PACOM team and our families who live and work in the Indo-
25 Pacific, a region critical to America's future. And I look

1 forward to your questions.

2 [The prepared statement of Admiral Harris follows:]

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Inhofe: Well, thank you very much. It was an
2 excellent opening statement.

3 I -- you know, since we started the NDS as being the 23
4 approach -- the 2, of course, is China and Russia, and the
5 changes -- I've commented in my opening statement that, when
6 Senator Ernst and Senator Sullivan and Senator Rounds and I
7 were over there, and with you and then on through that area,
8 it was very disturbing. During the trip, we came to the
9 conclusion that our allies are worried about the pace of
10 China, which is more evident, more visible than anything
11 that we're doing.

12 A key topic of discussion was China's built-up
13 militarization in the South China Sea. In fact, over 3,200
14 acres have now been -- they call it "reclamation." I don't
15 call it "reclamation," because there's nothing to reclaim.
16 It's creation of new land. There's no -- they don't have
17 the legal authority to do the things they're doing, but
18 they're doing them anyway. And that's gotten everyone's
19 attention. And these reclaimed lands are up to over 3,000
20 acres now, and they have, just an -- a shocking amount of
21 military equipment there, and it's very disturbing. It's
22 increased its military activities in the Sea to bolster its
23 territorial claims there, despite U.S. and international
24 efforts to maintain freedom of navigation. That's a serious
25 problem.

1 If you look at the location of these islands, it's
2 right in the navigation province, creating problems,
3 potentially, for us. It's also increased the pace of the
4 military activities. And the Trump administration's
5 National Defense Strategy, as I mentioned, places an
6 emphasis on improving our ability to expand the competitive
7 space against China.

8 Now, the thing that disturbs us -- and I think I speak
9 for all five of us who were over there just 2 weeks ago --
10 is the -- our allies are actually having a hard time
11 choosing between China and us because of the visibility of
12 what they're doing. And I'm talking about allies that I
13 mentioned in my opening statement. We talked to the
14 Philippines, Taiwan, South Korea, Japan, and they all seem
15 to be divided between the leadership -- their Secretaries
16 that -- or Ministers of Defense and their Foreign Ministers
17 are each taking a different side. So, it was -- that was an
18 awakening to us to see that happen.

19 So, starting with China, on the -- I'll just ask you
20 the question. You've covered it pretty well. You talked
21 about, "China's intent is clear." Well, let me ask you. Do
22 you consider China's buildup in that area as a direct threat
23 to the United States and its allies?

24 Admiral Harris: Senator, I do believe that China's
25 actions and what they've done in the South China Sea does

1 threaten our position there. I think they're reaching a
2 point of position on advantage in the South China Sea. And
3 if it comes to a conflict, we'll have to deal with that.

4 Senator Inhofe: Yeah.

5 Admiral Harris: I do believe that China gains when we
6 don't call them out publicly. And it's important that we
7 maintain that public criticism of China.

8 Now, I've talked, in the past, that we should
9 compliment China and thank them for the things that they are
10 doing in the international space that's good for the order,
11 things like counter-piracy operations, their work to help
12 the effort to remove chemical weapons from Syria, and on and
13 on. These are positive things. And most recently, their
14 work in the U.N. sanctions regime against North Korea. We
15 should thank them for that, and appreciate that.

16 Senator Inhofe: Yeah. And I understand that.

17 Admiral Harris: But, at the same time, we should hold
18 them accountable for the things they're doing that are
19 provocative and aggressive to their neighbors and to us. We
20 do have to counter their perception, as I mentioned in my
21 comments, that the U.S. is either a declining power, which I
22 don't believe, or a disinterested power, which I also don't
23 believe. But, that is the perception, and we must work to
24 counter that, in my opinion.

25 Senator Inhofe: Well, I know that's the perception,

1 because we were there, and we heard that articulated, and
2 there is no doubt what their feelings are.

3 Just before I run out of time, I want to mention North
4 Korea. And, of course, Russia is the threat. But, North
5 Korea is something that is a changing scene. We had a
6 hearing, last week in this chamber, of our intel. We had
7 the DIA and the CIA here, and we talked about this in some
8 depth. And I just disagreed with them. I've never
9 disagreed with Dan Coats in my life until that -- until last
10 week. But, when he -- asked the question, "Do you really
11 think that this recent communication from Un to our
12 President was one that we cannot depend on having any
13 results?" And they all -- they both said, "No, we've gone
14 through this drill before. We've" -- to me, it's different
15 this time. We had a very direct, harsh response from our
16 President to Kim Jong Un when he made the statement about
17 having the button, "I'll press it," and all of that. And it
18 was immediately after that response that North Korea
19 communicated with South Korea and said, "We want to join in
20 now with the Winter Olympics," and then, of course, they
21 came out with this statement. And I can't help but think --

22 Look, his dad, Un's dad, never had the bargaining chip
23 that he has now. The fact that, November the 28th, that
24 they sent something over that can reach the United States,
25 that's something that he can use. People argue, "Well, it

1 didn't have a payload, it wouldn't have performed that well
2 with a payload." That doesn't give me any comfort at all.
3 They say it doesn't have the reentry capability. But, you
4 know, the fact that they can do that, that is -- puts him in
5 a position, I think, to be a negotiator. And I just -- is
6 there anything further concerning the threat from Un that
7 you want to share before I turn this over?

8 Admiral Harris: Sir, I'll just say that I do believe
9 that the strength of the pressure campaign plan was part --
10 a big part of bringing North Korea to the table, to the
11 offer of a summit.

12 Senator Inhofe: I --

13 Admiral Harris: And without the strength of the
14 pressure campaign plan and its effectiveness so far, I don't
15 think we would be where we are.

16 Senator Inhofe: I appreciate that very much.

17 Senator Reed.

18 Senator Reed: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

19 Thank you, Admiral Harris, not only for your testimony,
20 but for your service, particularly, as you've indicated,
21 this might be your final meeting. You've served the Navy
22 and the Nation very well. Thank you, sir.

23 Admiral Harris: Final meeting with this committee,
24 sir.

25 Senator Reed: With this committee, of course. There

1 are other committees, but let them --

2 Admiral Harris: Downrange. Yes, sir.

3 Senator Reed: Yes, sir.

4 North Korea. Part of our approach must be multilateral
5 with all of our allies, including South Korea and Japan.
6 Any insights on Japanese participation? The South Koreans,
7 of course, initiated these talks, and seem to be engaged --
8 President Moon. But, President Abe has his own problems in
9 Japan, but, also, they -- are they onboard? Are they going
10 to be 100 percent with us on this?

11 Admiral Harris: I believe they will be, sir. I think
12 that Japan is clearly an interested party in what happens on
13 the Korean Peninsula and this summit that's coming up. But,
14 I believe that Japan will be supportive of the outcome. And
15 they share our concerns about the trustworthiness of North
16 Korea. So, you know, we -- in the past, in talking about
17 other countries and stuff, you know, we tend to use the term
18 "trust but verify." In this case, I think it's "distrust
19 and verify." But, I believe that we are -- that Japan will
20 be with us as we go forward, here.

21 Senator Reed: And, you know, perhaps being overly
22 optimistic, but if there is a -- some type of an agreement,
23 that would require years and years of intense verification
24 and constant surveillance. So, we would be making a huge
25 but, I think, appropriate investment in terms of following

1 up the -- any type of agreement with the kind of oversight
2 and nonproliferation activities that would be essential.

3 Admiral Harris: I agree with you, Senator. I do
4 believe that our position will remain a complete, verifiable
5 denuclearization, irreversible denuclearization of the
6 Peninsula, as we go into this. I think we can't be overly
7 optimistic on outcomes. We'll just have to see where it
8 goes, if and when we have the summit.

9 Senator Reed: And just two other questions. I
10 presume, and I'll ask you to comment, that this would, at
11 its best, be a stepwise process, that the likelihood of a
12 total, complete agreement in one or two meetings would -- is
13 doubtful, that progress would be slow, that it would be a --
14 concessions followed further concessions, et cetera. Is
15 that your view, too?

16 Admiral Harris: I -- you know, I don't know, Senator.
17 We've never been in a position where the -- our -- a
18 President, our President, has met with a leader of North
19 Korea, ever. And so, I don't have a way to predict the
20 future. I just think that we have to go into this, eyes
21 wide open.

22 Senator Reed: And just so -- with respect to North
23 Korea, finally, a great deal of the pressure has been
24 generated economically by the Chinese participation. It's
25 actually -- they're getting better and better, in terms of

1 curtailing trade with North Korea. Do you sense any kind of
2 pullback now, based on other issues, like trade policies or
3 anything else that --

4 Admiral Harris: With regard to China?

5 Senator Reed: China.

6 Admiral Harris: No, right now, Senator. As I
7 mentioned earlier, I think that we should compliment China
8 for the work that they're doing to enforce the sanctions
9 that the United Nations have -- has put in place. And I'm
10 encouraged by China's activities in this space with regard
11 to North Korea. They have a vested interest in the outcome.
12 And I've said before that I think China remains the key to a
13 peaceful outcome on the Korean Peninsula. But, China is not
14 the key to all outcomes.

15 Senator Reed: Now, with respect to China and our
16 presence in the Pacific, the National Defense Strategy calls
17 for a much more forward presence, denser positioning of
18 platforms and personnel. That requires, obviously, the
19 cooperation of the countries of the Asia area. Their trade
20 relationships with China are increasing rather than
21 decreasing. Would that make them hesitant to invite us in
22 or support our efforts?

23 Admiral Harris: It could, because they have to value
24 -- they have to weigh a continued relationship and alliance
25 -- in some cases, an alliance; certainly partnership, in all

1 cases -- with the United States against economic advantages
2 of their relationships with China. But, I do believe that
3 the United States remains the security partner of choice.
4 The work that you all have done to fund the budget for the
5 next 2 years and stuff, I think that sends a strong signal
6 of America's resilience and continuing interest in the
7 Pacific, in the Indo-Pacific region. And I -- and that goes
8 a long way. The National Defense Strategy acknowledges that
9 we're in strategic competition with China. I think that
10 alone serves notice to not only China, but to our friends,
11 allies, and partners in the region.

12 Senator Reed: Thank you, Admiral.

13 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Reed.

15 Senator Fischer.

16 Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 Good morning, Admiral.

18 Last year, when you testified before the committee, you
19 and I discussed PACOM's need for ISR. And I'm proud to
20 represent Offutt Air Force Base and the 55th Wing, which
21 provides support for that mission out of Kadina Airbase in
22 Japan. Do you have enough ISR assets, including the RC-
23 135s, to be able to meet the demands in your area of
24 responsibility?

25 Admiral Harris: I do not, Senator.

1 Senator Fischer: Can you describe how you use the RC-
2 135 in PACOM?

3 Admiral Harris: Yeah, we're -- yes, ma'am. We use the
4 RC-35s, the Rivet Joint, for all -- not all, but for a large
5 portion of our signals intelligence requirements throughout
6 the western Pacific, whether it's in the northwestern
7 Pacific focused on North Korea, or whether it's in the South
8 China Sea area focused on China. But, RC-135 -- the Air
9 Force's RC-135 and the Navy's EP-3 are critical to signals
10 intelligence collection against our potential adversaries
11 and adversaries in the region.

12 Senator Fischer: When you said you don't have enough,
13 is that because demand's increasing?

14 Admiral Harris: I don't have enough because there
15 isn't enough to go around. And when you look at a fixed
16 amount of ISR assets, and all of the combatant commanders
17 have requirements, then that -- those requirements have to
18 be apportioned by some entity. And that entity is the Joint
19 Staff, through the global force management process. You
20 know, I think all of the combatant commanders would tell you
21 that none of us have all that we want.

22 Senator Fischer: Do you see demand increasing in the
23 --

24 Admiral Harris: I do see demand increasing, clearly.

25 Senator Fischer: North Korea's pursuit and aggressive

1 schedule of nuclear testing, in my understanding, is that
2 the WC-135s operating in PACOM provide valuable intelligence
3 on those activities. Is that correct?

4 Admiral Harris: That is correct.

5 Senator Fischer: And can you explain how that
6 information helps inform your decisionmaking with regard to
7 forces in the area of --

8 Admiral Harris: Well, the --

9 Senator Fischer: -- your responsibility?

10 Admiral Harris: -- the WC-135 is a service retain
11 asset that I have to ask for. And when I ask for it, I
12 always get it, which is a good thing. And WC-135 helps me
13 understand the nature of North Korea's nuclear testing.

14 Senator Fischer: You mention, in your testimony, the
15 fact that we risk losing the dominance of the air domain
16 that we've enjoyed for decades in the Pacific. And both
17 China and Russia are investing heavily in the A2AD and new
18 fifth-generation fighters, and are rapidly closing the gap.
19 Do you believe that we still have that air superiority in
20 the region?

21 Admiral Harris: I do believe we have that air
22 superiority. I think it's unquestioned now, but I can see a
23 path where it might not be, unless we continue to resource
24 it.

25 Senator Fischer: Under what scenarios do you believe

1 that we risk losing that superiority and, really, the
2 freedom of access that we have?

3 Admiral Harris: If we don't overturn the Budget
4 Control Act, if sequestration is the law of the land,
5 remains the law of the land, and we're -- and we fail to
6 resource our requirements in air superiority, then Chinese
7 development will continue apace, and there will be a line --
8 there will be a timeline -- a time of which those lines
9 cross, and we'll lose our air superiority. Today, I believe
10 we have it. I think the Congress's actions, as evidenced by
11 the bipartisan agreement last month -- I think that sends a
12 strong signal and will help us maintain that advantage, at
13 least through '19 -- FY19.

14 Senator Fischer: When you talk about the advances that
15 the Chinese are having, are you speaking of the technologies
16 --

17 Admiral Harris: I'm --

18 Senator Fischer: -- that they're --

19 Senator Fischer: -- speaking both the technologies, in
20 terms of Chinese development of fifth-generation fighters,
21 and the weight of their numbers, alone. You know, I've
22 often said, in -- that quantity has a quality all its own.
23 And so, while the U.S. equipment and personnel, in terms of
24 quality, far exceeds that of any of our competitors or
25 potential competitors, quantity has a quality all its own.

1 Senator Fischer: Can you speak to any certain
2 technologies that you believe might seriously threaten us?

3 Admiral Harris: I believe China's development and
4 research into hypersonic glide weapons is one of those
5 technologies that they're working on that could threaten us
6 significantly.

7 Senator Fischer: Okay. Thank you.

8 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Fischer.

9 Senator Peters.

10 Senator Peters: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 Thank you, Admiral, for being here once again.

12 Admiral Harris, I'd like to ask you about Australia.
13 Australia, as you're well aware, has been a very consistent
14 U.S. ally for decades, but a recent article in Foreign
15 Affairs discusses how China interferes in Australia, working
16 covertly to manipulate the Australian political system by
17 access and influence, and stealing research and intellectual
18 property to aid China's military. Australia is also very
19 closely linked, economically, to China, with about a third
20 of their exports going to China, as well. But, despite
21 these very strong economic ties, Australia has taken steps
22 to resist China's influence, with public warnings that have
23 been amplified by the press, including investigations into
24 links between major political donors in Australia and the
25 Chinese Communist Government.

1 Admiral Harris, could you elaborate a little bit on
2 what you are seeing in Australia and their work? And are
3 there perhaps lessons that we should learn as a country,
4 based on Australia's experience with China?

5 Admiral Harris: Senator, surely.

6 I was in Australia last week as a part of the -- my
7 counterpart -- I visited with the Chief of Defense there,
8 Air Chief Marshal Binskin. I believe that Australia is one
9 of our strongest allies. They have been with us for
10 literally 100 years. This year is the 100th anniversary of
11 the first time American troops fought under a foreign
12 leader, and that was General John Monash in 1918, in World
13 War I. So, I have no doubt -- there is no question about
14 the solidness and strength of the American-Australian
15 alliance.

16 Specific to your questions about Chinese influence, it
17 is real in Australia. There is a book out that complements
18 the article that you spoke about, called "Silent Invasion,"
19 and it talks about malign Chinese influence in Australia. I
20 think Australia understands that. They get it. And they're
21 going after it.

22 Senator Peters: Well, we should, and follow how they
23 are doing. It's successful, you believe? Are those --

24 Admiral Harris: I believe there are --

25 Senator Peters: -- are there some lessons there for

1 us?

2 Admiral Harris: -- I believe there are lessons to be
3 learned in the Australian case that are applicable to our
4 situation.

5 Senator Peters: Right. Thank you, Admiral.

6 Admiral, in your written testimony, you talk about the
7 Communist Party General Secretary promising military
8 development that would remain a national priority in China,
9 and that he pledges to modernize by 2035 and achieve, quote,
10 "world-class status by 2049." You go on to say that you
11 believe that those -- that they will achieve it well before
12 those kinds of deadlines. So, talk a little bit about that
13 progress. And, perhaps, are there any benchmarks that we
14 should look at to measure that progress, ones that should
15 raise particular alarms to us?

16 Admiral Harris: Yeah. So, I believe the development
17 of hypersonic weapons is a benchmark. I think the
18 development of China's fifth-generation fighters -- fighter
19 aircraft is another benchmark. They are beginning to field
20 fifth-generation fighters now, the J-20, and they're
21 developing the J-31. So, I think these are things that we
22 should watch carefully. As we watch them, observe them
23 militarize their bases in the South China Sea, they're doing
24 the vertical improvements on them now, and they're turning
25 these islands that they've built into military bases,

1 clearly. So, I think we have to keep our eyes on that.

2 I think the new move, politically, inside China is
3 already a benchmark. Now, that -- by that, I mean their
4 decision to remove the term limits that has been in place in
5 China since Deng Xiaoping became the leader there, and to
6 have a president for life. I view that with concern. I
7 mean, there is a possibility that, in 2049, the centennial
8 of the Modern People's Republic of China, Xi Jinping could
9 be the president then. And I think that's -- we should view
10 that with concern. And the kind of country, the kind of
11 nation that China could be, we're getting a sense of that
12 now, with this move to remove term limits for its leader.

13 Senator Peters: So, given these challenges -- and
14 we've talked about many of them, and there will be many more
15 challenges we'll talk about during this hearing -- you also
16 mentioned, in your opening comments, that we need to figure
17 out a way to help China become a peaceful, cooperative
18 partner with the United States. What sort of things can we
19 do to, hopefully, get to that point?

20 Admiral Harris: Well, I do believe that we should
21 continue to encourage China to be a peaceful, responsible
22 partner. But, we shouldn't do that through rose-colored
23 glasses. Our experience in the past has been that, if we --
24 or our hope in the past, rather, has been that if we bring
25 China into organizations like the World Trade Organization,

1 and include China in our military exercises and the like,
2 that somehow China will become like us. "Us" being not the
3 United States only, but our democratic friends, allies, and
4 partners. And I think the expectation is, the reality is,
5 that that's simply not true. China has taken advantage of
6 our openness with China to continue on the path that they've
7 always been on. And we're seeing that play out now, in
8 2018. Certainly over the next 20 years or so, it'll be of
9 concern to us. But, that shouldn't obviate the need to try.
10 But, we should do so with eyes wide open.

11 Senator Peters: Thank you, Admiral.

12 Admiral Harris: You bet.

13 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Peters.

14 Senator Cotton.

15 Senator Cotton: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 Thank you, Admiral Harris, for your testimony and, once
17 again, for your service.

18 I want to speak about critical munitions; specifically,
19 ammunition. For all the fancy weapons we have in our
20 military, if you don't have enough rounds, then you don't
21 have much. The U.S. Navy has identified a number of
22 shortfalls and unfunded priorities, going forward, in this
23 area, including LRASM, Harpoon Block II, AIM 96, and Mark
24 48. What would a shortfall of these munitions mean for you
25 in the PACOM area of operations?

1 Admiral Harris: Ultimately, Senator -- depending on
2 the size of the shortfall, ultimately, it could mean we lose
3 in war. I mean, you've got to have the munitions to beat
4 the enemy.

5 Senator Cotton: Yeah. So, as -- safe to say, then,
6 that, given the budget deal we reached last month and the
7 additional funding for our military, that if this committee
8 and this Congress can find more money for those munitions,
9 that's something you would support?

10 Admiral Harris: The budget deal was very much
11 appreciated, Senator. Thank you very much for that.

12 Senator Cotton: But, you would support additional
13 funding for those critical munitions?

14 Admiral Harris: I would.

15 Senator Cotton: Thank you.

16 One kind of munition this country lacks -- only country
17 in the world that lacks it now -- is a ground-launched
18 intermediate-range cruise missile, because of the INF
19 Treaty. Russia is not supposed to have those. We now know
20 that Russia does, because they've been cheating on that
21 treaty. Last year, we discussed this topic, and you stated,
22 quote, "The aspects of the INF Treaty that limit our ability
23 to counter Chinese and other countries' land-based missiles,
24 I think is problematic," end quote. Over the last year,
25 China has continued to produce the DF-21, the DF-26

1 missiles. So, I think it's safe to assume that those
2 challenges have continued to increase.

3 If this country were no longer a part of the INF Treaty
4 and we could produce ground-launched intermediate-range
5 cruise missiles, could you explain what that would do to the
6 military balance of power in the PACOM --

7 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.

8 Senator Cotton: -- area of operations?

9 Admiral Harris: I think that we are at a disadvantage
10 with regard to China today, in the sense that China has
11 ground-based ballistic missiles that threaten our basing in
12 the western Pacific and our ships. They have ground-based
13 ballistic anti-ship missiles. And we have nothing -- we
14 have no ground-based capability that can threaten China,
15 because of, among other things, our rigid adherence -- and
16 rightfully so -- to the treaty that we signed on to, the INF
17 Treaty.

18 That said, there are good aspects of INF, and that is
19 the nuclear piece of it, which we also adhere to. And I
20 think that's important. So, I'm not calling for us to pull
21 out of the INF. I am asking and -- suggesting, rather --
22 that we consider ways to work within the INF regime to
23 overcome these shortfalls that are presented to us by China.
24 Because INF, as you know, only affects us and Russia and the
25 successive republics from the Soviet Union. It does not

1 include China. China's not a signatory to it. We can't
2 reasonably expect, nor should we expect, that China adhere
3 to a treaty that they're not a signatory to. But, it puts
4 us at a disadvantage in the western Pacific. So, we could
5 do anything from one extreme, to pull out, to the other
6 extreme, to do nothing. And I think we should look at ways
7 to maximize our operational flexibility with regards to the
8 advantage that China has over us, in terms of ground-based
9 ballistic missiles.

10 Senator Cotton: Thank you.

11 One final question about the impact of the recent
12 sanctions legislation this Congress passed, designed
13 primarily with Russia in mind, and specifically countries
14 that continue to use Russian military hardware and systems.
15 I supported that legislation. I still do. But, I do have
16 some concerns about potential unintended consequences among
17 countries that, for various historical reasons, still have
18 Russian hardware, and it would be hard to avoid Russian
19 hardware. Is that a area of concern in PACOM?

20 Admiral Harris: It is, Senator. And we're speaking
21 here about the CAATSA legislation. Secretary Mattis has
22 sent a letter -- it's classified in its entirety -- to you
23 all, asking for some relief from CAATSA. I can't get into
24 the specifics of the letter, because of its classification,
25 but I -- my own opinion is that countries like India, where

1 we are -- we've made a key partner -- I believe that India
2 is a great strategic opportunity for the United States.
3 Seventy percent of their military hardware is Russian in
4 origin. You can't expect India to go cold turkey on that.
5 I think they're -- we ought to look at ways to have a
6 glidepath so that we can continue to trade in arms with
7 India. So, CAATSA affects that, and I hope that we can, you
8 know, achieve some relief for the rigidity that's in that
9 legislation.

10 Senator Cotton: Thank you. And your point -- and I
11 assume Secretary Mattis's point in his classified letter --
12 is that you have a country like India that's a close ally,
13 and growing ever closer, but, for historical reasons going
14 back decades, they just rely on a lot of Russian equipment,
15 and it would really impair them, and therefore our
16 relationship with them, to try to ask them to go cold turkey
17 immediately.

18 Admiral Harris: You are correct.

19 Senator Cotton: Okay.

20 Well, thank you very much for your testimony. I know
21 you said this is the last time you'll appear in front of the
22 Armed Services Committee. But, I know you'll have a hearing
23 coming up soon in the Foreign Relations Committee, so you'll
24 get to continue to tell the noble lie that it's a pleasure
25 to be in front of Congress again today. But, most

1 importantly, I know that I and probably most members of this
2 committee will look forward to supporting your nomination to
3 be our Ambassador in Australia. And I'm very grateful
4 you're willing to continue to serve in a new capacity.

5 Thank you, Admiral Harris.

6 Admiral Harris: Thank you, Senator.

7 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Cotton.

8 Senator King.

9 Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10 Several things you have mentioned today, you've talked
11 about China's activities in the South China Sea, and you
12 also talked about Russian activities in the Arctic. In your
13 view, would it be in the United States national security
14 interests for us to be signatories of the U.N. Convention on
15 the Law of the Sea?

16 Admiral Harris: My opinion, Senator, has not changed
17 over the past decade or so. I'm an advocate of the United
18 Nations Convention on Law of the Sea.

19 Senator King: And, in fact, we're relegating ourselves
20 to the sidelines as these disputes about continental shelf
21 and relationships are being adjudicated.

22 Admiral Harris: I believe that UNCLOS gives Russia the
23 potential to, quote/unquote, own almost half of the Arctic
24 Circle. And we will not have that opportunity because of --
25 we're not a signatory to UNCLOS.

1 Senator King: We won't be in the discussion.

2 Admiral Harris: That is correct.

3 Senator King: Thank you.

4 There's a great deal of discussion about a potential
5 summit meeting between our President and Kim Jong Un. What,
6 in your view, would Kim Jong Un want to get out of these
7 discussions? In other words, number one, is it realistic
8 that he would put his nuclearization on the table? And,
9 number two, if he did so, what would he want in return?

10 Admiral Harris: Senator, I don't know what Kim Jong Un
11 actually wants out of the summit, but I do believe that, in
12 a general sense, Kim Jong Un seeks reunification of the
13 Korean Peninsula under his leadership, he seeks respect and
14 status that nuclear weapons gives him, and he seeks
15 security, which he believes the nuclear weapons give him.

16 Senator King: What you said at the beginning was very
17 important, reunification of the Korean Peninsula. What
18 would be the impact on his calculus if we removed our troops
19 from -- and various security arrangements -- from the --
20 from South Korea?

21 Admiral Harris: I believe he would do a victory dance.

22 Senator King: In Seoul, probably.

23 Admiral Harris: He -- I think he'd be a happy man if
24 we abrogated our alliance with South Korea and with Japan.

25 Senator King: Let's talk about China for a minute.

1 I've thought for a long time that China's primary intention
2 was commercial and regional hegemony, but their military
3 buildup, it seems to me, indicates greater ambitions.

4 What's your view of China's ultimate goal, here? And then
5 I'll ask a second question about President Xi's ascension.

6 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir. I agree with you that I
7 believe that China seeks regional hegemony. And that means
8 pushing the United States out of the Indo-Pacific region.

9 Senator King: Do you think they have greater
10 ambitions? They've now built a military base in Djibouti or
11 --

12 Admiral Harris: I do. I think that -- you know, as I
13 said in my opening statement, just take them at their word,
14 and they seek to be a global military and a global force.
15 That, of itself, is not a bad thing. A country with great
16 economic power ought to be able to buy and build the
17 military that they choose. But, it's how they go about it
18 that's of concern. I think their actions speak for
19 themselves, their provocative nature and their aggressive
20 nature and how they deal with their neighbors. We see that
21 play out in India -- I mean, I'm sorry, we see that play in
22 the Indo-Pacific on a daily basis.

23 Senator King: And, as we see them develop this
24 capability, my concern is, right now they may not have the
25 will to be an aggressive territorial nation, but if they

1 develop the capability, the will could change overnight.

2 Admiral Harris: I believe they do have the will. They
3 don't have the capability.

4 Senator King: But, they're building the capability.

5 Admiral Harris: They're clearly building to that
6 capability.

7 Senator King: And I read recently -- one commentator
8 said they thought the greatest geopolitical development of
9 recent years was President Xi's ascension to unlimited
10 length, in terms of his authority. How do you see that --
11 long term, do you see that as an advantage or a
12 disadvantage?

13 Admiral Harris: I don't know, to be honest with you,
14 Senator. There hasn't -- you know, we haven't seen it play
15 out. We just know the fact of it. I'm concerned about it.
16 I mean, I think countries, at least historically, that
17 choose presidents for life, it doesn't end well for their
18 own people. And -- but, I don't know how it will play out.
19 But, it's something that we must -- we must watch closely to
20 see how it goes.

21 Senator King: Finally, you mentioned, in your earlier
22 comments, Russia's role in North Korea. I think you used
23 the term "spoiler." What do you see Russia -- are they just
24 going to -- my father used to use the term "officious
25 intermeddler" -- are they going to just try to mess things

1 up?

2 Admiral Harris: I do believe they're trying to mess
3 things up. I think they'll meddle. I believe that if the
4 sanctions that are in -- put in place over North Korea are
5 too hard on North Korea, including the sanctions that China
6 is following -- are following -- I believe that Russia will
7 seek to relieve the pressure of the sanctions regime in the
8 pressure campaign plan.

9 Senator King: Thank you.

10 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator King.

12 Senator Perdue.

13 Senator Perdue: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

14 Admiral, you called us out about President Xi Jinping's
15 move. In '82 Deng Xiaoping put term limits in after the
16 excesses of Chairman Mao's cultural revolution. We saw 30
17 years of economic development. Today, we have a leader for
18 life in China. I see that development, along with the Belt
19 and Road strategy that you so eloquently have called out
20 over the last year, as two major initiatives that I think
21 give us a hint at their long-term strategy. And it looks
22 like, if you look at the global map, a new world order could
23 be in mind, here, between Europe, Asia, and Africa. In
24 Africa, alone, they've got over 20 ports that they've
25 invested in and developed. Today, they have \$200 billion in

1 loans in Asia, the Pacific, Africa, and Europe. They've
2 promised over \$1.2 trillion of future loans. That's ten
3 times the size of the Marshall Plan that rebuilt Asia and
4 Europe earlier -- or in the middle part of last century.

5 Sir, my concern is that we already see their intent.
6 The Marshall Plan was not loans, primarily. It was
7 philanthropy. This investment, the 1.2 trillion that's
8 coming, is mostly in the form of loans. And in Africa, as
9 an example, they're loaning money into these ports, in the
10 ports' development. Sri Lanka, we already have an example
11 where some of those loans went bad, and they -- China
12 foreclosed, and now China, for 99 years, has a port in Sri
13 Lanka, in addition to Djibouti and in addition to what
14 they're doing in the Belt and Roads strategy.

15 Can you tie together that for us, the danger it has to
16 the world order we enjoy today, where representative
17 democracies in the free world dominate the
18 cultural/political situation? Do you see it this way? And
19 are you calling that out for us to think about this in a
20 longer-term perspective regarding to what we see evidence of
21 right now, in terms of the China strategy with the Belt and
22 Road, and also with President Xi Jinping's change to a
23 lifetime leader?

24 Admiral Harris: Senator, I do see it that way. As I'm
25 -- as I said earlier, I do believe that, for those of us,

1 myself included, who wonder the kind of country that China
2 will be in 2049, I think we're seeing that now. We're
3 seeing that play out with this move toward a leader for
4 life. We're seeing it play out in OBOR, One Belt, One Road,
5 or the Belt-Road Initiative, which is not only about
6 development, which, of itself, is a good, but it's not about
7 development as much as it is about malign influence
8 throughout the region, making China the security partner of
9 choice and pushing the United States and our friends,
10 allies, and partners out of the region. So, I think it has
11 a strategic impact beyond simple development.

12 China announced, a few weeks ago, the Polar Silk Road.
13 And that's a clear indication that China views the Arctic as
14 a sphere of influence for them. They are some -- there are
15 some Chinese scholars that would actually suggest that the
16 resources in the Arctic, a portion of those resources,
17 should be China's because they have a fifth of the world's
18 population.

19 So, I think we should look at that carefully, consider
20 what that means in the long term. China is putting their
21 money where their mouth is. They have four icebreakers, and
22 building to a fifth. I think that's significant. You know,
23 why would a country have that kind of capability if it has
24 no border on the Arctic or Antarctic? Because they're
25 interested in the resources that are there, because they've

1 called that out and named it the Polar Silk Road.

2 Senator Perdue: Thank you, sir.

3 Following up on that, the committee took the lead
4 recently in establishing the Southeast Asia Maritime
5 Security Initiative in the FY16 NDAA to support maritime
6 domain awareness capabilities of our partners and allies
7 confronting sovereignty challenges in the South China Sea.
8 You've called out the dangers in South China Sea. You talk
9 about thousands of acres of reclaimed property there, used
10 primarily for military use. This program, the Southeast
11 Asia Maritime Security Initiative, is now ramping up, with
12 \$98 million requested in the FY19 budget. Would you please
13 give us your assessment of the strategic importance of the
14 Maritime Security Initiative? And, in your view, what
15 signal would it send if this initiative did not receive full
16 funding?

17 Admiral Harris: Senator, I'm a big believer in the
18 Maritime Security Initiative. It's \$425 million across 5
19 years. It's not a lot of money. But, we have put the \$190
20 million or so over the past 3 years, including this year, to
21 good use. We've put it to use to improve maritime domain
22 awareness. And the Maritime Security Initiative affects our
23 Southeast Asian partners, principally Indonesia, Malaysia,
24 the Philippines, and Thailand, and Vietnam. And we're using
25 this funding to improve their maritime domain awareness, so

1 they can understand what's happening in their water space.
2 We're using it to improve things like the Zulu Sea
3 Initiative, which goes after sea crime, kidnap for ransom,
4 and piracy in the Zulu Sea, in the Gulf of Thailand area.
5 These are important things that signal our interest and our
6 willingness to help our friends and allies and partners that
7 are affected by the Maritime Security Initiative.

8 To cut that funding or to pull us out of it would send
9 the wrong signal at the wrong time, in my opinion.

10 Senator Perdue: Thank you, Admiral.

11 And I just want to echo the voices of my colleagues in
12 thanking you for your decades of service, and for your
13 willingness to continue that service in Australia. It's a
14 very critical post, as you well know and as we heard earlier
15 in question. And I just thank God for your career and your
16 help for the United States of America.

17 Thank you, sir.

18 Admiral Harris: Thank you, Senator.

19 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Perdue. We all
20 agree with that.

21 Senator Hirono.

22 Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 Admiral Harris, this being your last testimony before
24 this committee, I certainly join my colleagues in thanking
25 you for your distinguished service throughout your career,

1 and especially your last two tours in Hawaii as Commander of
2 Pacific Fleet and your current assignment as Pacific
3 Commander -- PACOM Commander. And we, in Hawaii, will miss
4 you and your wife, Bruni, who I also had the privilege of
5 getting to know, for your leadership and your participation
6 in our -- support of the community in Hawaii. And, of
7 course, we wish you well as you move into your next chapter
8 of life. And you and Bruni will always be a part of our
9 Hawaii ohana.

10 There's no question that we're now in a period of
11 great-power competition with China and Russia. And I think
12 China's goal is to become a global military and economic
13 power. And, as you say, it's how they go about it that's
14 concerning. They do not play fair. And I'm glad that you
15 are very clear in your support for the United States signing
16 on to UNCLOS. And there might have been a time when our
17 country not being a signatory to UNCLOS maybe didn't matter
18 that much, but now, with global warming and climate change,
19 places like the Arctic Circle become very attractive to
20 countries such as Russia. And, as you note, there is a
21 potential that Russia will control almost one-half of the
22 Arctic Circle. So, I would say that it is time for Congress
23 to visit the issue of signing on to UNCLOS, and we should
24 sign on.

25 In past hearings, you and I have discussed the

1 importance of the whole-of-government approach to what we do
2 and concerns with the administration's cuts to the State
3 Department and Treasury, along with the effects that these
4 cuts would have on foreign diplomacy, your mission, and the
5 ability to combat our adversaries in the Pacific region.
6 And, in your testimony, you specify that countering violent
7 extremism in the Indo-Pacific requires close collaboration
8 with U.S. Government interagency partners, such as the
9 Department of State, Treasury, the FBI, USAID, and other
10 intel agencies. Can you discuss briefly the importance of
11 this whole-of-government approach to accomplish PACOM's
12 mission? And what are the effects of cuts to the State
13 Department and Treasury personnel on your mission? How do
14 these cuts impact your ability to counter threats in the
15 Indo-Pacific region?

16 Admiral Harris: Thank you, Senator.

17 I do believe that the challenges that we face are not
18 solely military challenges, even though I'm a military
19 officer in charge of a geographic combatant command. I
20 believe that a strong State Department complemented by a
21 strong Defense Department, and diplomats complemented by
22 military personnel, is the key to a strong American
23 position. A weak State Department funded -- in terms of
24 funding, a weak State Department means you have to have a
25 stronger Defense Department. And I think it would be so

1 much better to have both funded to the level they should be
2 funded.

3 Senator Hirono: So, at 26-percent cut to the State
4 Department will be concerning to you, in terms of your
5 ability to carry out your mission.

6 Admiral Harris: As I understand the State Department,
7 it would be. But, I suppose that -- you know, I mean, the
8 devil's in the details. It depends on how it's cut, what's
9 cut, and so on. But, in generally -- generally speaking, I
10 think we need a funded -- fully funded State Department
11 complemented by a fully funded Defense Department to project
12 American power correctly, in my opinion.

13 Senator Hirono: And as we see what's going on with
14 North Korea, it is not helpful at all. I believe you have
15 said that we should have an Ambassador to South Korea
16 appointed.

17 Admiral Harris: I don't believe I said that, per se.

18 Senator Hirono: Or others have said.

19 Admiral Harris: I'm --

20 Senator Hirono: Do you join that?

21 Admiral Harris: I'm pleased with Constable -- with the
22 Charge, rather, Mark Knapper. I think he's doing a great
23 job. And he works very closely with General Vince Brooks.
24 And I think our Korean allies know who to turn to for
25 questions they have, whether they're diplomatic questions or

1 military questions.

2 Senator Hirono: And yet, we don't have an Ambassador
3 to South Korea, and also, the Envoy to South Korea from the
4 State Department also left. So, these are not helpful
5 conditions.

6 As you know, the U.S., Japan, India, and Australia have
7 a quadrilateral regional cooperation supporting a free and
8 open Indo-China region. Can you discuss briefly the
9 importance and impact of the quadrilateral regional
10 cooperation to the U.S., its allies, and on your PACOM
11 mission?

12 Admiral Harris: I believe that the Quad is important.
13 I think these are -- the -- Japan, United States, Australia,
14 and India form a naturally -- grouping, if you will -- a
15 natural grouping of democracies to face the challenges that
16 are out there in the region. So, I'm pleased with the Quad.
17 I don't think the Quad, that it has to be four. I mean, I
18 think the Big Ten has 12 teams, and the Big 12 has 14 teams.
19 So, I don't think we're obligated to the number four. But
20 the nature of it, the sense of it is that these are
21 democracies that are linked, in terms of values and in
22 military relationships, and we should advocate for this.

23 Senator Hirono: Thank you.

24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 Senator Inhofe: Thank you.

1 Senator Sullivan.

2 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

3 And I do want to just mention, because I know Senator
4 Hirono's mentioned it, Senator Warren -- you know, I think
5 there's -- and the -- this comes up in the Armed Services
6 hearings a lot lately, is, you know, this concern about not
7 getting enough nominees out to the State Department, for the
8 Department of Defense, from the White House, from the
9 administration. I think they could do a better job. But, I
10 do think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle
11 then don't talk about the next issue, which is how there's
12 unprecedented -- historically unprecedented blocking of
13 nominees. So, my colleagues, they can't have it both ways.
14 We'll encourage the administration, get more people out -- a
15 South Korean Ambassador, Assistant Secretaries of State and
16 Defense -- but, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle
17 can't then just say, "Now we're going to take 30 hours for
18 every nominee that comes before the Senate." It's not --
19 you can't have it both ways. So, let's work on getting
20 nominees, and then you guys can help us stop the historic
21 obstruction of these nominees. I think that would be a good
22 compromise, and I'm certainly ready to do that.

23 I know that's not your issue, Admiral, although it
24 might be your issue when you're nominated to be Ambassador
25 to Australia. I certainly hope my colleagues don't block

1 you for 7 months. I think the German Ambassador has been
2 blocked for months now, and few people on the other side
3 want to talk about that.

4 Admiral, I want to show you a slide. It's -- I think
5 you have a copy, and it's right there on that chart -- but,
6 it's the evolution of how China has been talking about the
7 South China Sea militarization. As you see there, in
8 September in the Rose Garden with President Obama, Xi
9 Jinping essentially said, "We're not going to militarize."
10 So, that's standing next to the President of the United
11 States. And then, slowly but surely, they've come out and
12 -- with the most recent Global Times Voice of China,
13 essentially saying, "Hey, you know, we're going to be a big,
14 strong military power. Yeah, maybe we will." So, how do
15 you interpret that evolution? And, you know, I don't think
16 it's very useful to have the leader of a country standing
17 next to the leader of our country, saying they're not going
18 to do something, when -- do you think, in 2015, the master
19 plan was to do it, even though they said they weren't?

20 Admiral Harris: I do believe that, in 2015, China had
21 a plan to militarize the South China Sea. I don't think
22 there's -- this is a pretty good graphic. I -- it's --
23 there's nothing to -- there's no interpretation needed,
24 here. Clearly, China is militarizing the South China Sea.

25 Senator Sullivan: And, in terms of their -- I have

1 very much appreciated your policy statement, which is,
2 "We're going to cooperate, where we can, but confront." I
3 think sometimes China has come out and said, "Well, we were
4 forced to do this because you're running Freedom of
5 Navigation operations in that region." How long have we
6 been running FONOPs in the South China Sea as a U.S. Navy?

7 Admiral Harris: Senator, as a policy item, Freedom of
8 Navigation Operations, we've been doing those for decades.
9 The U.S. Navy and the U.S. Air Force have conducted
10 operations in and above the South China Sea for even longer
11 periods of time. We have been a presence -- we, the United
12 States -- we have been a presence in the western Pacific for
13 over 70 years.

14 Senator Sullivan: And your point about how, in some
15 ways, that was key to the rise of China, because keeping sea
16 lanes open has helped the international order, and no
17 country's benefited more from that --

18 Admiral Harris: Right.

19 Senator Sullivan: -- than China. I think it's a
20 really important one.

21 Let me, next, go to -- you mentioned the Polar Silk
22 Road. And I'd just like to, you know, note that we're
23 trying -- right now, Russia has 40 icebreakers, and they're
24 building 13 more. China has four, and you say they're
25 building a fifth. We have two, and one is broken. And yet,

1 we're an Arctic nation. We're an Arctic nation because of
2 my State. And they're not. So, what do you, again, think
3 their intentions are there?

4 Admiral Harris: I believe their intentions are clear.
5 They're interested -- China is interested in the resources
6 in the Arctic Circle. Russia is interested in the security
7 aspects of the Arctic Circle. Russia is using UNCLOS to its
8 advantage. And I think that we are at a disadvantage
9 because we don't have the icebreakers and stuff that the
10 other countries have. But, I do want to acknowledge and
11 thank the Congress for putting icebreaker in the '19 budget.

12 Senator Sullivan: Well, we're -- that's progress, but
13 we need to make a lot more progress.

14 Let me ask one final question, Admiral. So, I think we
15 should acknowledge that China has actually been helpful with
16 the administration's approach to North Korea. I think that
17 they've done more than they ever have previously. I think
18 we've made more progress on this maximum pressure campaign
19 than previously done, including good work at the U.N.
20 Security Council. Do you see China being helpful in the
21 future on this? And what do you think their strategic
22 calculation is with regard to North Korea? -- when, so far,
23 they have moved pretty far. And I think it's important that
24 we acknowledge that. What do you anticipate, particularly
25 as we get to this moment where, if the President's going to

1 meet with Kim Jong Un, obviously there's going to be a lot
2 of diplomatic focus, and focus with regard to our allies in
3 countries like China on the importance of this issue?

4 Admiral Harris: Yeah, I -- Senator, I believe, in
5 2018, that China is probably -- I mean, I don't know for a
6 fact, but I believe that China is probably as worried about
7 the path that North Korea is on, vis-a-vis its nuclear
8 weapons, as we are. I think, in the past, China viewed
9 North Korea as a way to pressure the United States. It
10 could -- and all that that entails. But, today I think what
11 happened in 2017, in 2016, was a wake-up call for Beijing to
12 -- and it made them realize what a danger North Korea poses,
13 not just to the United States or South Korea or Japan, but a
14 danger it poses to China and the danger it poses to
15 stability in the Indo-Pacific. So, now they're helpful.
16 And I appreciate that help. And, as you say, we should
17 compliment and acknowledge them for the work that they're
18 doing.

19 Senator Sullivan: Right. Thank you.

20 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Sullivan.

22 Senator Warren.

23 Senator Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24 And thank you, Admiral. Thank you for your many years
25 of service. Thank you for being here today.

1 I'd like to spend my limited time this morning on our
2 National Defense Strategy. The Trump administration
3 recently released its National Defense Strategy report, and
4 the unclassified version says that, quote, "Long-term
5 strategic competitions with China and Russia are the
6 principal priorities for the Department of Defense. The
7 strategy stresses the need to modernize existing equipment,
8 invest in advanced capabilities, and enhance the readiness
9 of the joint force for a high-end fight."

10 Admiral, I know you've been focused on managing the
11 challenge posed by China, but your area of responsibility
12 also includes China's neighbor, North Korea. Many analysts
13 estimate that a conflict on the Korean Peninsula could bog
14 us down for years, degrading our equipment and potentially
15 resulting in thousands of casualties both to our allies and
16 to our own troops. So, let me ask, Admiral, What would be
17 the impact of a long-term conflict on the Korean Peninsula
18 on our ability to prepare for a high-end conflict like the
19 kind described in the Defense Strategy?

20 Admiral Harris: Thank you, Senator.

21 I do believe that a conflict on the Korean Peninsula
22 will result in thousands of casualties. And I believe that
23 China could be opportunistic, in terms of what they do in
24 their area if we're bogged down in Korea. But, I don't
25 believe that we should allow our concern or fear for what

1 could happen with China detract us from our treaty
2 obligations with South Korea and to defending our own
3 homeland, which is the threat posed by North Korea.

4 Senator Warren: I appreciate that, Admiral. I'm
5 asking about the difficulties that are posed, here. So, let
6 me just ask a different question related to this. Would we
7 be able to maintain our technological investments to counter
8 China if we were engaged in a sustained ground war in North
9 Korea?

10 Admiral Harris: I think we would be able --

11 Senator Warren: All right.

12 Admiral Harris: -- to do that.

13 Senator Warren: You know, I was glad to see other
14 President's renewed interest in diplomacy last week. I'm
15 not sure if he recognizes the enormous complexity of these
16 negotiations and the fact that a breakthrough may not occur
17 overnight, but I think we should all be hoping for success,
18 because a ground war on the Korean Peninsula would be
19 devastating to our long-term strategic interests in the
20 Indo-Pacific region and around the world.

21 Admiral Harris, while I have you -- and I still have 2
22 minutes left -- I want to ask one other question. I know
23 that you support CFIUS, which reviews acquisitions by
24 foreign companies for threats to our national security. And
25 you support reform to capture a wider range of transactions

1 and technologies, particularly as they relate to China. You
2 have made the point that China is blurring the lines between
3 military and civilian activity and exploiting America's open
4 system to gain access to sensitive technologies.

5 I agree with you that we need to protect our most
6 advanced technologies. But, there are two sides to this
7 coin. Our adversaries will be interested in stealing from
8 us only as long as we continue to produce the most
9 innovative science and technology in the world. And being
10 at the top of that heap is not a guarantee, it's not a
11 birthright, and, in fact, right now China is also investing
12 heavily in R&D, including in areas like physics, robotics,
13 high-performance computing, nanoscience.

14 So, Admiral, do you think that government investment in
15 research and development helps maintain our military
16 advantage? And would we improve our chances of maintaining
17 technological superiority over China by increasing our R&D
18 investments in advanced technologies?

19 Admiral Harris: I do. Senator, I'll also add that
20 government investment can't be the only source of innovation
21 in the United States, and it hasn't been in the past, nor
22 should it be in the future. I'm a big supporter of what we
23 colloquially call CFIUS 2.0. I wrote a letter to Senator
24 Cornyn about FIRMA, the new law on this. I believe we have
25 to be sensitive to our open society and what that does for

1 our adversaries, how -- the advantages that it gives our
2 adversaries.

3 In terms of China, that's manifested in both technology
4 and technological change and in a Chinese acquisition of
5 large tracts of land that are adjacent to our training and
6 electronic ranges.

7 Senator Warren: Yeah. Well, I do see this as -- both
8 sides. And I think we're in agreement on this, that, on the
9 one hand, we've got to be very sensitive about what they're
10 trying to steal from us; but, on the other, we've got to
11 continue and even, I believe, ratchet up our investments so
12 that we maintain our technological superiority.

13 Admiral Harris: Absolutely. No argument from me on
14 that.

15 Senator Warren: Good. I'm glad to hear it. Thank
16 you, Admiral.

17 Admiral Harris: Yeah.

18 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Warren.

19 Senator Tillis.

20 Senator Tillis: Good morning, Admiral Harris. It's
21 good to see you again. And thank you for your service.

22 I was thinking about you. You know, I'm from North
23 Carolina, so, when I was filling out my bracket, I had to
24 pick the Tarheels to go all the way. But, then I got
25 another bracket so I could pick the Volunteers. So --

1 Admiral Harris: Thank you, Senator.

2 Senator Tillis: -- I want you to know the --
3 Tennessee's got a special place in my heart. And I know it
4 does for you.

5 Just two questions. One, there were some press reports
6 about the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Treaty that you
7 have expressed some concern over, or at least there were
8 some reports. Could you expand on that for the purposes --

9 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.

10 Senator Tillis: -- of this committee?

11 Admiral Harris: The INF Treaty is an important piece
12 of diplomacy. It was formed and signed in 1987 by
13 Presidents Reagan and Gorbachev of the Soviet Union. It was
14 the right treaty for that time, when we were in a bipolar
15 world.

16 Today, we're not in a bipolar world, we're in a
17 multipolar world. I think the restrictions that the INF
18 Treaty places on us ought to be looked at, particularly when
19 we -- when you consider that countries like China and Iran
20 are not signatories to the treaty, and there is no
21 obligation for them to follow any part of the treaty. We
22 follow it to the letter, because we're America, and we do
23 what we are -- we sign on to do. As has been mentioned
24 earlier, Russia has violated the Treaty routinely for the
25 last number of years. So, I think there are aspects of the

1 treaty that we ought to look at.

2 The nuclear restrictions in the treaty, I think are
3 important and commendatory, and we should keep those in
4 place. But, the treaty also restricts our ability to deploy
5 ground-based ballistic missiles that counter ballistic
6 missiles that are -- that threaten us, our ships and our
7 bases, from countries like China.

8 Senator Tillis: Thank you. The -- you're going to be
9 moving -- and I hope you will be swiftly confirmed as
10 Ambassador to Australia. I'll be supporting your
11 nomination. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the
12 aisle will let us get that done quickly. But, one of the --
13 I believe, when we met with you in PACOM a couple of years
14 ago, we talked a little bit about trade and how alliances
15 with -- you know, how the economic alliances are pretty
16 important. We know where TPP ended up. But, what's your
17 opinion on the -- on that side of the equation? When you go
18 to Australia, for example, who would have been one of the
19 TPP partners, what do you think we need to do down there, at
20 an economic level or strategic level, to make our military
21 relationship stronger?

22 Admiral Harris: Senator, I was interested in the TPP,
23 when it was first postulated, because of the security
24 linkages that I saw TPP affording us and our friends,
25 allies, and partners that were also part of TPP, when it was

1 the TPP 12. I talked to some folks yesterday. You know,
2 there are very few things that are -- that engender
3 bipartisan support today. One of those was pulling out of
4 TPP. Both parties were opposed to it, and both candidates
5 were opposed to it.

6 That said, the other 11 countries that were involved in
7 TPP, they went ahead and formed, on their own, TPP 11. And
8 I think that, if we can get a fair and equitable and -- a
9 trade pact with them, that we might want to consider getting
10 into it.

11 But, I'm not a trade expert or an economics expert, for
12 that matter. You know, my theory in life has been to buy
13 high, sell low. And it hasn't worked well for me. So, here
14 I am today.

15 And I look at the security parts of it, though, and
16 there were clearly advantages, because it links us, in the
17 security space, with these countries. There are aspects of
18 the original TPP that included cybersecurity, intellectual
19 property security, and that kind of stuff, which I thought
20 was important, and it merited some -- it merited a deeper
21 look.

22 So, I don't know where we're going to be with regard to
23 TPP 11, whether we'll join it or not, but I think that the
24 -- it's an important grouping, and we'll have to look at it
25 and see if there's a way that we can achieve what the

1 President seeks, in terms of fair and equitable trade.

2 Senator Tillis: Well, thank you very much. And I
3 appreciate your many years of service to the Nation. I look
4 forward to your continued service in the position as
5 Ambassador.

6 Thank you.

7 Admiral Harris: Thank you, sir.

8 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Tillis.

9 Senator Donnelly.

10 Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 Admiral, thank you very much.

12 As you may know, last year's NDAA included a provision
13 I authored requiring the White House to submit a report on
14 North Korea strategy within 90 days. The report was
15 supposed to include, among other components, a detailed
16 roadmap that identifies U.S. objectives and a desired end
17 state, a clear timeline, and an assessment of unilateral and
18 multilateral policy options with respect to the situation in
19 the Korean Peninsula. The administration is late on that
20 report at the present time.

21 In light of the recent developments that we've seen on
22 a possible meeting between the President and Kim, I'm even
23 more convinced than ever that the administration needs to
24 have a clear vision and a comprehensive strategy, and they
25 need to present it to Congress.

1 So, I'm asking you, What do you think are our interim
2 objectives for these talks with North Korea?

3 Admiral Harris: Sir, I believe that we'll go into
4 these talks, hopefully, eyes wide open, and that, you know,
5 we continue to seek what we've said all along, a complete
6 and verifiable and irreversible Korean -- denuclearized
7 Korean Peninsula. I think that's what we're going into
8 those talks with, and hopefully we'll come out in -- with a
9 framework that satisfies the President.

10 Senator Donnelly: Do you consider it a success if
11 there's no discussion of denuclearization on the Korean --
12 on the North Korean side, but simply just, "We'll stay where
13 we are right now"?

14 Admiral Harris: I don't know where we're going to end
15 up with the talks. I don't think that the talks will be
16 such that we accept as a positive that we end up where we
17 are. But, I'll go back to what Churchill once said, you
18 know, "It's better to talk, talk, talk than shoot, shoot,
19 shoot."

20 Senator Donnelly: Right.

21 Admiral Harris: So, the fact that we're talking at all
22 has a positive framework around it.

23 Senator Donnelly: What do you think happens if, after
24 these talks, there's no agreement made? Does that change
25 how things continue moving forward after that point?

1 Admiral Harris: I couldn't tell you, looking into the
2 future. But, I think that the fact that we talked, that has
3 a value. If the talks produce nothing, you know, the -- I
4 mean, we're not -- you know, we're talking about talks in
5 April or May, I guess -- soon, anyway -- so we haven't lost
6 anything by talking. So, the opportunity to engage is --
7 has value of itself, regardless of the outcome.

8 Senator Donnelly: In -- I'm just curious, what do you
9 think Kim is hoping to get out of this? And obviously, I'm
10 not holding you to an exact replication after the talks are
11 over, but what -- you know, you're in a position of great
12 influence and have done extraordinary service for our
13 country. What do you think Kim is looking for out of this?

14 Admiral Harris: Well, if you're asking me to read his
15 mind, I mean, that's a dark place. I'm --

16 Senator Donnelly: I'm not asking you to read his mind.

17 Admiral Harris: But --

18 Senator Donnelly: I'm asking, your years of
19 experience, to give me an idea.

20 Admiral Harris: I believe that he seeks security and
21 he seeks respect and he seeks a reunification of the Korean
22 Peninsula under his leadership. Those are his ultimate gain
23 -- ultimate objectives, in my opinion. And the talks, if
24 they produce results, or if they produce further talks to
25 hopefully produce some good results, that'll be where the

1 details lie.

2 Senator Donnelly: What do you see as the biggest
3 challenges with North Korea now? And what can we do to help
4 you solve those?

5 Admiral Harris: I think the biggest challenge with
6 North Korea is their nuclear program, their -- both their
7 missile development program and their weapons, themselves.
8 I think that one of the areas that I need help in that I
9 don't have is persistent ISR -- intelligence, surveillance,
10 and reconnaissance -- so I can keep eyes on, an unblinking
11 eye on North Korea, which we do not have today.

12 Senator Donnelly: Well, let me just change, for one
13 second -- I've just got a little bit of time left -- on
14 Conventional Prompt Strike. It's my understanding that
15 PACOM, alongside STRATCOM and EUCOM, has identified the
16 development and fielding of a Conventional Prompt Strike
17 system as a high priority. Is that correct? And, if so,
18 could you elaborate on --

19 Admiral Harris: It is correct, Senator, but I would
20 like to respond to that question in a classified manner for
21 the record.

22 Senator Donnelly: Okay.

23 Admiral Harris: I'll take that question, as well.

24 Senator Donnelly: That would be great.

25 [The information referred to follows:]

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

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

1 Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Donnelly.

3 Senator Sasse.

4 Senator Sasse: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 Admiral, thanks for being here.

6 Could you say publicly on the record some of what
7 you've said to a number of us in private the last 2 or 3
8 days about how big China's Belt and Road Initiative is?

9 Admiral Harris: Senator, what I said the last couple
10 of days was, it's probably the biggest development program
11 in the world. It's five times the amount of money that the
12 United States -- corrected for 2018 dollars, what the United
13 States put into the Marshall Plan. It's a significant
14 investment by China. The difference, as was mentioned
15 earlier, was, the Marshall Plan was philanthropic in nature
16 and was designed to lift up the countries in Europe
17 following World War II. And One Belt, One Road is designed
18 to lift up China.

19 Senator Sasse: Yeah. I think, just to underscore
20 that, the Marshall Plan, which was foundational to the 75
21 years of military alliance across the Atlantic and of
22 economic prosperity that benefited the U.S. and all of our
23 allies, this current Chinese initiative is more than five
24 times larger in net present value. Is the Belt and Road
25 Initiative partially intended to marginalize the U.S.

1 influence in the Pacific?

2 Admiral Harris: I agree.

3 Senator Sasse: What do our allies think right now --
4 our military allies, think about China's Belt and Road
5 plans?

6 Admiral Harris: Well, our allies, as well as our
7 friends and partners, are -- you know, they have to balance
8 their own national interests, and they have to balance China
9 with the United States. You know, we're not asking them --
10 or any country, for that matter -- to choose between China
11 and the United States. We're -- what we hope is that -- you
12 know, that they'll see One Belt, One Road potentially for
13 what it is. And I think that, you know, our allies are
14 smart enough to do that, and they'll make the decisions that
15 benefit them -- and us, in terms of our alliances.

16 Senator Sasse: I'd certainly agree with you that we
17 view a world where people should have commerce and peace
18 with lots and lots of their neighbors, even in a multipolar
19 world where the U.S. and China, over the coming decades, are
20 going to be outsized, relative to everyone else. And yet,
21 people are partly -- nations are partly going to be forced
22 to choose between a rules-based international order and a
23 Chinese system that is more interested in lifting up China
24 with more vassal state supplicant near neighbors.

25 I know that you're not allowed, given your current

1 calling and position, to answer a question as direct as, Was
2 it wise or foolish for the U.S. to pull out of TPP? But,
3 you can speculate with us. Is China happy that the U.S.
4 pulled out of TPP?

5 Admiral Harris: I believe that China took advantage of
6 the fact that we're not in TPP to try to drive a wedge
7 between us and our TPP partners. China had a plan, the
8 RCEP, the Regional Comprehensive Economic Program, as a
9 counter to TPP. And most of the countries -- not all, but
10 most of the countries that were in the original TPP
11 formulation are in RCEP. So, that should tell you, right
12 there, that China sought to drive a wedge between us and our
13 TPP partners.

14 Senator Sasse: And toggling between your current
15 calling and where you're likely headed next -- and I'm, here
16 with everybody else on this committee, sure that you're
17 going to be easily confirmed as Ambassador, and we're
18 grateful for your continued service -- when you look at your
19 current calling and your next calling, the TPP without the
20 U.S., can you speculate a little bit about what the
21 potential ways that we might get back in might be?

22 Admiral Harris: I can't, Senator, other than to say
23 that, if we can reach a fair and equitable trade agreement
24 with the TPP 11 countries, then that's probably the key to
25 us getting back in. But, as I said before, I'm focused on

1 the security aspects of any relationship like TPP, rather
2 than economic aspects, of which I'm not an expert.

3 Senator Sasse: Thank you very much, sir.

4 Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Sasse.

5 Senator Nelson.

6 Senator Nelson: Senator Sasse, I asked Admiral Harris,
7 upon him taking over as Pacific Commander, what was one --
8 this is now 3 years ago. And congratulations to you. This
9 is a perfect position for you to go into as Ambassador. I
10 asked, What's one of the most important things for our
11 national security in the Pacific region? Three years ago,
12 the Admiral said passing the Trans-Pacific trade agreement.

13 Okay. So, 3 years have passed, and all of this has
14 happened. And, as brought out by your questioning, that
15 puts us at a significant economic disadvantage.

16 So, Admiral, you're going to be a diplomat in a short
17 period of time. Now, of course, as a Commander and as a
18 warrior, you've also been a diplomat, to wear those four
19 stars. But, you're going be a real Ambassador. What do we
20 do now to make up for the lost last year and a half?

21 Admiral Harris: I'm not sure what we've lost in the
22 last year and a half, Senator, I'm sorry.

23 Senator Nelson: Well, how do we gain back the economic
24 advantage in the Pacific?

25 Admiral Harris: Well, I think we have to stay with it.

1 You know, we have to keep at it. I mean, there -- it's not
2 just the economic issues that are resident in the Pacific
3 that are important to America. It's the security
4 relationships and the whole framework that's informed by
5 security, on one part, the economy, on the other part, and
6 cultural ties that bind us to the countries in the Indo-
7 Pacific region.

8 Senator Nelson: Okay, understood. Are you in a
9 position to offer an opinion with regard to trying to
10 resurrect something of a Pacific trade agreement?

11 Admiral Harris: I am not in that position, Senator.

12 Senator Nelson: Will you be, as Ambassador?

13 Admiral Harris: I might be, depending -- I mean, I'm
14 -- I've never been an Ambassador, so I'm not sure what
15 challenges will cross my desk then if I am -- if I'm given
16 that opportunity, if you all give me that opportunity, but
17 I'll take it on and do what I have to do, you know, if I'm
18 fortunate enough to be confirmed.

19 Senator Nelson: You will be confirmed.

20 Admiral Harris: Thanks.

21 Senator Nelson: And, as Ambassador to one of our
22 important -- very important allies in the region of the
23 Pacific, I think it's going to be exceptionally important
24 for you to weigh in on this, because I -- this Senator, and
25 by the implication of the Senator previously questioning, by

1 his implication, his opinion that we're losing ground
2 economically, that they're getting in ahead of us.

3 Tell me, in your prepared testimony, you highlighted
4 the threat of China's growing arsenal of intermediate- and
5 short-range ballistic missiles and on their threat to our
6 forces. That certainly is a greater threat. How do we best
7 defend against this threat, and particularly protect our
8 people in the region and ensure their ability to operate?

9 Admiral Harris: Senator, I think it's key that we
10 maintain our credible combat power. I'm -- I think it's
11 important that we fully resource the Department's needs.
12 I'm grateful to the Congress for doing that in this 2-year
13 budget deal. I'm hopeful that we'll get an appropriation to
14 match the deal. But, that's the most important thing, that
15 we demonstrate to our friends, allies, partners, and
16 adversaries that the United States is neither a
17 disinterested or a declining power globally and in the
18 region.

19 Senator Nelson: Do we need additional THAAD missiles
20 in the region?

21 Admiral Harris: Today, I'm satisfied with the
22 ballistic missile defense architecture that's resident in
23 the region: THAAD, in Korea; THAAD, in Guam; Patriots,
24 throughout the area; and Japan's intent to buy Aegis Ashore;
25 and our Aegis ships, and our ally -- and Japan's Aegis

1 ships. That architecture works today.

2 I'm concerned about the North Korean missile
3 development and where it'll be in the future. I'm grateful
4 that we funded -- that you all have funded the defense of
5 Hawaii radar, the homeland defense radar for Hawaii. That's
6 an important thing. I've asked the Missile Defense Agency,
7 the MDA, to look at, to study, whether we should have
8 ground-based interceptors in Hawaii, or not. I'm not smart
9 enough on that to know, but I think we ought to study it in
10 advance of where we think North Korea's missile development
11 will go. Today, the architecture is sufficient, but it
12 might not be, in the mid-2020s.

13 Senator Nelson: In the mid-2020s, what we know about
14 national missile defense, do you have the information, on
15 the top of your head? What is our ability to hit an ICBM
16 out of North Korea today with our national missile defense
17 -- with those radars in Alaska?

18 Admiral Harris: Sir, without getting into the
19 classified area, where -- which I'm skirting pretty
20 carefully right now with that question --

21 Senator Nelson: Understood.

22 Admiral Harris: -- I'm confident in our systems today.
23 And I don't own those systems for us. You know, that's
24 Northern Command. And I'm confident in Lori Robinson's
25 ability to do that today.

1 I'd like to respond to that more fully, more fulsomely,
2 with a classified question for the record.

3 Senator Nelson: That would be good, especially for
4 2020 and beyond.

5 [The information referred to follows:]

6 [COMMITTEE INSERT]

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Nelson: I thank you, Admiral.

2 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.

3 Senator Nelson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 Senator Inhofe: Thank you.

5 Senator Nelson: And congratulations, again, to you.

6 He's a Pensacola boy. Florida makes good again.

7 Admiral Harris: Thank you, sir.

8 Senator Inhofe: Good.

9 Senator King -- Kaine.

10 Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11 And, Admiral Harris, I'll add my congratulations to you
12 for wonderful service in this area. Look forward to working
13 together with you in new ways.

14 I want to ask you a couple of things. Might have been
15 covered, but they matter to me, and I'll -- and they're
16 important.

17 So, we've seen, in the press, discussion of, obviously,
18 not just the concerns that we legitimately have about North
19 Korea, but there's been a phrase that's been used publicly
20 about, well, whether we could engage in sort of a "bloody
21 nose," some kind of a preemptive strike against North Korea.

22 That makes it sound, you know, pretty de minimis. But, my
23 assumption would be, in calculating the validity of any such
24 step, you would need to calculate what a likely response
25 would be by North Korea. You couldn't go in with the

1 expectation that it would just be sort of a one-off thing
2 and a -- and -- with a guarantee of no response. And I
3 think the response you'd have to contemplate would be
4 twofold. One would be, What would -- North Korea's response
5 would be? But also, If the U.S. took some sort of
6 unilateral or preemptive action, might it draw others into a
7 conflict -- China, for example -- with the historical
8 precedent of the Korean War as an example? And I'm assuming
9 that, as the DOD contemplates its own options, those sort of
10 downstream consequences are things that you definitely think
11 about. Am I correct in my assumption?

12 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir. We have no "bloody nose"
13 strategy. I don't know what that is. The press have run
14 with it. I'm charged with developing, for the National
15 Command Authority, a range of options through the spectrum
16 of violence. And I'm ready to execute whatever the
17 President and the National Command Authority directs me to
18 do. But, a "bloody nose" strategy is not contemplated.

19 Senator Kaine: And again, I'm not going to ask you
20 about what you advised the President. I'm going to ask you
21 about your military judgment. It would not be a smart thing
22 to think we could take some affirmative action against North
23 Korea and then assume that there would be no action in
24 response, either against us or maybe against South Korea.
25 And we couldn't also assume that it wouldn't draw other

1 adversaries, potentially, into the conflict, correct?

2 Admiral Harris: Right. I believe, Senator, that if we
3 do anything along the kinetic region in the spectrum of
4 conflict, that we have to be ready to do the whole thing.

5 Senator Kaine: Yeah.

6 Admiral Harris: And we are ready to do the whole
7 thing, if ordered by the President.

8 Senator Kaine: Thank you.

9 You and I talked -- and I'm -- and I know you've talked
10 a bit about this, but I'm really intrigued with the notion
11 of the Quad that has been discussed in some public hearings
12 at Munich Security Conference, the notion of deepening the
13 relationships between the U.S., Japan, Australia, and India
14 around security cooperation. Senator King and I visited
15 India in October of 2014, and visited the shipbuilding
16 industry in India. And, under the Mothi government, it does
17 seem like there's new opportunities for us to be partners.
18 The Indian navy sent a delegation to the United States a
19 year or so later to look at our shipbuilding capacity. So,
20 talk a little bit about the Quad, and maybe, in particular,
21 since we've had longstanding security cooperation with
22 Australia and Japan, how the addition to India to some of
23 our security cooperation enhances American interests in the
24 area.

25 Admiral Harris: Senator, I've said, for the last 2 and

1 a half, almost 3 years, that I think India is the biggest
2 strategic opportunity for the United States. We share
3 democratic values, we share the same concerns, and we
4 operate more frequently in the Indo-Pacific region together.
5 I think the Quad is an important construct of like-minded
6 nations that can go after the challenges that are in the
7 Indo-Pacific region. So, that's Japan, United States,
8 Australia, India. But, as I said earlier, you know, it's
9 not -- the Quad is an idea. It's not rigid, I don't
10 believe.

11 Senator Kaine: It's not exclusive.

12 Admiral Harris: Right. I mean, as I said, I think the
13 Big 10 has 12 teams, and the Big 12 has 14 teams, or
14 something like that.

15 Senator Kaine: That's a very astute observation that
16 you made.

17 Admiral Harris: So, I mean, we're going into March
18 Madness now. So, I think the Quad is an idea. And it's an
19 important idea that I think the countries are starting to
20 get their arms around, including the United States. But,
21 India presents a great opportunity for us. And I think we
22 present a great opportunity for India.

23 Senator Kaine: You also have said, and I agree with
24 you, that Vietnam presents an opportunity. It's an
25 opportunity with some challenges, obviously, and yet the

1 Carl Vinson just was in Vietnam. I think it's the first
2 carrier visit to Vietnam. That's a pretty big thing, in
3 terms of showing the relationship of our nations. If you
4 could, just maybe address opportunities there, as well.

5 Admiral Harris: Yeah, Vietnam is an important country
6 to the United States and to the region. What Vietnam says
7 matters, regionally and globally. They stand up to China.
8 They're concerned about Chinese expansion and aggressiveness
9 in the South China Sea. And, to your point about Carl
10 Vinson, the USS Carl Vinson was the first carrier to visit
11 Vietnam since World -- since the Vietnam War, was a very
12 successful visit. And I was ecstatic about the visit,
13 itself, the welcome by the Government of Vietnam, and the
14 outcomes of the visit.

15 Senator Kaine: And, if I could, Mr. Chair -- I'm over
16 time, but just to comment, sort of, for the committee as
17 much as for Admiral Harris -- I don't think anything shows
18 the possibility of American magnanimity in the world more
19 than a picture of the USS John McCain docked in Da Nang
20 Harbor or the Carl Vinson in Vietnam, the fact that, with a
21 former adversary, where the scar tissues are still very
22 alive in the American public and Vietnam War veterans, this
23 is an adversary that deeply wants a partnership with the
24 United States, just as Japan and Germany deeply wanted
25 partnership with the United States after World War II. That

1 shows that people recognize the United States, for all its
2 imperfections and warts, is still a country with high values
3 and it's still a country that they want to be in partnership
4 with. And I think that's a positive sign.

5 Admiral Harris, thank you for your testimony.

6 Admiral Harris: We are the security partner of choice
7 for many countries, including Vietnam.

8 Senator Kaine: Thank you, Admiral.

9 Senator Inhofe: Agreed. And, having just returned
10 from viewing the repairs that were taking place on that, I
11 agree with you.

12 Thank you so much, Admiral Harris.

13 Before someone else shows up, we're going to adjourn
14 this meeting. And appreciate very much your patience and
15 your service.

16 [Whereupon, at 11:13 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25