

**Advance Policy Questions for Randall Schriver**  
**Nominee for Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs**

**Department of Defense Reforms**

**The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 included the most sweeping reforms since the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986.**

**Do you support these reforms?**

The reforms included in the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2017 deserve careful attention. If confirmed, I look forward to working with Department personnel and the defense committees to understand their impact and how best to implement them for the future of the Department.

**What other areas for defense reform do you believe might be appropriate for this Committee to address?**

I support continued dialogue with the Committee to develop and improve the Department's organization and processes to address the challenges of today's security environment. Our current security environment involves rapidly emerging and varied threats that require the Department and Joint Force to be more flexible and responsive. If confirmed, I will look carefully at the Department's efforts within my areas of responsibility, and will advise the Committee of any further appropriate reforms.

**Duties**

**The duties of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs are not specified in title 10, United States Code.**

**What is your understanding of the duties and functions of this position?**

As I understand it, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs (ASD (APSA)) is the principal advisor to the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy (USD(P)) and the Secretary of Defense on international security strategy and defense policy on issues related to the Asia and Pacific region. The ASD (APSA) is responsible for developing regional security and defense strategy; formulating and coordinating regional defense policies in support of the Secretary's objectives; overseeing operational execution of the Secretary's approved policies for the region; and fostering and managing bilateral and multilateral security relationships in the region. This position is the focal point for Asia policy within the Department of Defense for the Department of Defense Components, the U.S. Pacific Command, and the U.S. Central Command. The ASD (APSA) also represents the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) in interagency policy deliberations and defense-related international negotiations in the Asia and Pacific region.

**If confirmed, what duties and functions do you expect that the Secretary of Defense would prescribe for you?**

If confirmed, I expect my duties and functions will include managing defense relationships with foreign governments in the regions that fall under the ASD (APSA) portfolio, developing region and country-specific strategies that embody DoD policy objectives, and acting as the Department's representative in negotiations and deliberations related to the regions, among other duties.

**Qualifications**

**What background and experience do you possess that qualify you for this position?**

I have been working on Asia-Pacific Security issues most of my adult life. Following under graduate studies which included three years of Mandarin language, I served in the United States Navy as an intelligence officer based in the Pacific. After graduate studies, I worked in the Office of the Secretary of Defense as the Senior Country Director for China, Taiwan and Mongolia. After PhD studies, I served at the US State Department including service as a Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for East Asia. Since leaving the government, I've done extensive private sector work in Asia, and since 2008 I've been the President of a small think tank dedicated to the study of security trend lines in Asia. In addition to subject matter knowledge, I think I'm qualified as a leader and manager to lead the men and women in APSA successfully.

**Major Challenges and Priorities**

**If confirmed, what broad priorities will you establish?**

I agree with Secretary Mattis' characterization of the Indo-Pacific region as a priority theater that is crucial to the long-term vital national interests of the United States. I believe this priority focus was reflected in Secretary Mattis' decision to make his first trip as Secretary of Defense be to Asia.

If confirmed, I would carefully evaluate current strategies and efforts to determine if a reordering of priorities, applicable to ASD (APSA), is in order, and I will work to ensure that the U.S. military is postured to protect and advance U.S. interests. With that said, I believe that some of the key priorities to focus on include achieving the peaceful denuclearization of North Korea and addressing the threats posed by its ballistic missile program; modernizing existing alliances, enhancing our relationships with strategic regional partners, and supporting regional institutions and frameworks to buttress an open and free Indo-Pacific region; working on a constructive and pragmatic relationship with China while ensuring we are well-positioned to prevail in our long term strategic competition with China; and working in support of the President's South Asia Strategy to prevent the reemergence of safe-havens in the region from which terrorists can plan and launch attacks against the U.S. homeland, U.S. citizens, or our allies and partners, as well as preventing the emergence of terrorist organizations in Southeast Asia.

**What are the major challenges you would expect to confront if confirmed?**

I believe that the most significant challenge is managing a changing and complex security environment in one of the most crucial and dynamic parts of the world.

Toward that end, I believe that the major challenges the next ASD (APSA) will face include: addressing the nuclear and ballistic missile threats posed by North Korea; managing relations with China while upholding the rules-based order, as well as ensuring we are well-positioned to prevail in our long term strategic competition with China; building and ensuring long-term stability in Afghanistan and South Asia, consistent with the President's South Asia Strategy; and preventing the emergence and proliferation of terrorist organizations and activities in the wider region, particularly in Southeast Asia.

Meeting these challenges will require us to have a clear-eyed view of China, and for us to strengthen alliances and key partnerships in the region. This will enable us to more effectively manage both traditional and non-traditional threats and maintain an open and free Indo-Pacific region.

**If confirmed, what management actions and timelines would you establish to address these challenges?**

If confirmed, I would work closely with others in the Department, interagency partners, and our international allies and partners to understand and identify ways to address these challenges more effectively. This would include, among other things, analysis of current strategies and assessments, involvement in ongoing policy reviews, and continued senior-level engagement with allies and partners in the region. If confirmed, I look forward to collaborating closely with Congress on the range of challenges and opportunities in the region.

**Relations with Congress**

**What are your views on the state of the relationship between the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs and the Senate Armed Services Committee in particular, and with Congress in general?**

I have not had much visibility on the relationship between APSA and the SASC and the Congress to date, but I'm advised the relationship has been good.

**If confirmed, what actions would you take to sustain a productive and mutually beneficial relationship between Congress and your office?**

I strongly believe the Defense Department benefits from effective oversight from the Congress. Further, I believe the Congress can be a key partner to DoD in pursuit of optimal security policies in the region. If confirmed, I intend to make myself and my staff available to members and their staffs when requested. If confirmed I fully intend to seek an excellent working relationship with colleagues from the Congress, as well as explore initiatives on which the Executive and the Congress can work with one another.

## **Torture and Enhanced Interrogation Techniques**

**Do you support the standards for detainee treatment specified in the revised Army Field Manual on Interrogations, FM 2-22.3, issued in September 2006, and in DOD Directive 2310.01E, the Department of Defense Detainee Program, dated August 19, 2014, and required by section 1045 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92)?**

Yes, I support the standards for detainee treatment specified in the revised Army Field Manual on Interrogations, FM 2-22.3, issued in September 2006, and in DoD Directive 2310.01E, the Department of Defense Detainee Program, dated August 19, 2014, and required by section 1045 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114-92). Individuals in the custody or control of the U.S. Government may not be subjected to any interrogation technique or approach, or any treatment related to interrogation, that is not authorized by, and listed in, the Army Field Manual.

## **U.S. Strategic Vital Interests**

**It is important to delineate between the United States' strategic vital interests and other interests. Strategic vital interests must represent those for which the United States is willing to commit the nation's blood and treasure.**

**Within the Indo-Asia-Pacific region, what and where are the United States' strategic vital interests?**

In my personal view, protecting the U.S. homeland, U.S. citizens, and our interests abroad, including upholding our commitments to our allies and partners, remains a paramount, strategic vital interest. To that end, I believe ensuring a safe, secure, prosperous, and free Indo-Pacific region is a top priority for the United States. This implicitly means we should seek to prevent an illiberal power such as China from gaining enough strength to dictate the rules of the road in Asia. I understand that the forthcoming National Security Strategy will further articulate our vital national interests.

**How do these overlay with existing and emerging threats around the world?**

Today's threat environment presents challenges to U.S. interests around the globe, since the current international security environment includes challenges that can cross regions, can include multiple domains (i.e., land, sea, air, space, cyber), and can involve multiple types of capabilities. Nowhere are these varied and complex challenges more evident than in the Indo-Pacific region, where we face specific challenges from North Korea's development of nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them, in seeking to prevail in our emerging strategic competition with China, in buttressing a free and open region predicated on respect for and adherence to international laws and norms, and in building and ensuring stability in South Asia. I believe addressing these and other complex challenges will require us to develop whole-of-

government strategies and work in concert with our international allies and partners. If confirmed, I look forward to engaging in these efforts.

## **Indo-Asia-Pacific Security and Strategy**

### **What are U.S. security priorities for the Asia-Pacific region?**

I understand that ensuring a safe, secure, prosperous, and free Indo-Pacific region is a top priority for the United States. If confirmed, I will work to continue efforts not only to deter conflict, but also to deter coercion as sovereign countries in the Indo-Pacific region have the right to make decisions freely.

### **What are the objectives and key attributes of the Administration's strategy in the region? What are the key strategic challenges that the strategy should prioritize and address?**

I understand that the Administration is still developing its regional strategy and, if confirmed, I look forward to working closely with others in the Department, and with our interagency partners, in support of this effort. That being said, I believe that the Administration is rightly focused on ensuring a free and open Indo-Pacific region, while also addressing specific challenges, such as those posed by North Korea, managing a rising China and its increasingly assertive attempts to undermine the rules-based order, building stability in South Asia, and confronting the scourge of terrorism wherever it emerges.

### **Will the Administration continue the rebalance toward the Indo-Asia-Pacific region? If so, what does the term "rebalance" mean in terms of force structure, posture, basing, capabilities, and funding?**

I believe the Indo-Pacific region is likely to remain the most consequential region for the United States for decades to come. If confirmed, I will support the Secretary of Defense in taking steps to preserve and enhance the U.S. military advantage in the region.

### **How do you assess the strength and health of our alliances in the region?**

In my view, our alliances form the foundation of U.S. engagement in the Indo-Pacific region and have done so for decades. If confirmed, I will work to ensure that we are positioned to defend and advance U.S. interests in the region, including fulfilling our obligations and commitments to our allies and partners.

### **What is your opinion on the force planning construct that the Administration should advocate for in the region, and why?**

The force planning construct is a useful mechanism to help plan for the potential requirements for which the Joint Force may be called upon to address, in order to inform how the Military Departments set their priorities for manning, training, and equipping. Consistent with the

National Defense Strategy, the force planning construct should reflect the Secretary's expectations for those missions the force should be able to conduct.

**What are the key elements of strategic deterrence in the Asia-Pacific region?**

The key elements of strategic deterrence in any region are capability and resolve. I understand the ongoing Nuclear Posture Review and National Defense Strategy are looking at what is required to ensure the United States maintains a modern, flexible, and tailored nuclear deterrent to serve as the backstop to our overall conventional deterrence posture.

**How would you prioritize resource distribution for U.S. security interests in the region? Do you plan to take advantage of the Indo-Asia-Pacific Stability Initiative, slated to be authorized by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018? If so, what would be your recommended objectives and priorities of the Defense Department and how should it use the funding, if appropriated?**

I share the Secretary of Defense's view that the Indo-Pacific region is a top priority for the United States and, if confirmed, will work to make appropriate recommendations to the Secretary on resourcing this priority.

**Does the Fiscal Year 2018 budget request sufficiently support the attainment of the national security objectives of the United States in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region?**

The President's Fiscal Year 2018 defense budget submission is an essential step in supporting Secretary Mattis' direction that the Department, guided by a new National Defense Strategy, develop a larger, more capable, and more lethal Joint Force. The budget does this through investment in a number of critical areas, including warfighting readiness and power projection capabilities. However, U.S. defense spending remains near historic lows as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP), and a great deal of damage has been done by years of force reductions and budget cuts. Additional investments are badly needed to restore the capacity, capability, and readiness of the current and future U.S. joint force.

**The United States and Russia are the only two states party to the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF), which prohibits the testing and deployment of ground-launched missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers. China is not a party to the treaty and is therefore not bound by this limitation. Admiral Harry Harris, Commander of U.S. Pacific Command, stated in testimony before this Committee on April 27, 2017: "... I worry about [China's] DF-21 and DF-26 missile programs, their anti-carrier ballistic missile programs, if you will. INF doesn't address missiles launched from ships or airplanes, but it focuses on those land-based systems. I think there's goodness in the INF Treaty. Anything you can do to limit nuclear weapons writ-large is generally good. But the aspects of the INF Treaty that limit our ability to counter Chinese and other countries' land-based missiles, I think, is problematic."**

**In your opinion, does the INF Treaty constrain U.S. military operations in the Pacific theater? If so, how?**

I endorse and associate myself with Admiral Harris' comment that China's missile programs and deployments are highly problematic. It is critical that our forces possess the capabilities necessary to continue to safeguard U.S. interests in the face of evolving regional and global security challenges while also continuing to uphold our international commitments. If confirmed, I will closely consider this issue in order to provide sound recommendations to the Secretary of Defense.

**Do you think it could cause instability issues with other theaters like EUCOM?**

Issues pertaining to the INF treaty, U.S. operations, and possible regional stability implications should be considered within the full context of Departmental expertise and ongoing discussions. If confirmed, I will closely consider this issue and participate in ongoing deliberations in order to provide sound recommendations to the Secretary of Defense.

**North Korea**

**In your view, what should be the U.S. overall strategy to mitigate the threat posed by North Korea to our allies in the region and to the United States?**

I believe the United States should work toward the stated end goal of a denuclearized Korean Peninsula, and I support the Administration's ongoing strategy to bring together an international coalition to apply diplomatic and economic pressure on North Korea. To do this, the United States must communicate and coordinate closely with its allies, such as Japan and the Republic of Korea, in addition to other States that play a large role in the region, including China. To deter North Korean aggression or even respond to any provocation, we must also work on strengthening our defensive capabilities. Diplomacy is the preferred path to pressure North Korea to resolve the nuclear challenge, but these efforts must be reinforced by credible military options.

**What recommendations would you have concerning the U.S. approach to the latest North Korean nuclear and ballistic missile provocations? What are the core elements of a strategy to contain or deter the North Korean threat?**

To address the North Korean missile and nuclear threat, I believe the United States should work with our regional allies to continue to bolster our defense posture in the region. We should also increase military cooperation and interoperability with allies in the region, as well as maintain close communication with our allies open to ensure coordination. Finally, we should continue to support our allies' efforts to strengthen their own defense capabilities against the North Korea threat, as well as promote multilateral cooperation and international investment in resolving the issue. The North Koreans must understand that the only path to stability and peace is to cease its provocative actions and to abandon its missile and nuclear programs.

**The United States has never fought a conventional war against a nuclear armed state. How should that fact change the calculus for readiness for U.S. Forces Korea?**

I believe North Korea's illicit nuclear program presents a clear and grave threat to the United States, our interests, and our allies and partners. We currently maintain a strong military posture in the Republic of Korea and Japan. We must continue to strengthen our posture in order to successfully deter a large-scale North Korean attack on our allies. Finally, we must continue to bolster our homeland missile defense architecture.

**What steps would you recommend the Administration take to ensure the safety and security of South Korea and U.S. forces stationed in the region?**

North Korea has openly stated that its ballistic missiles are intended to deliver nuclear weapons to strike cities in the United States and the Republic of Korea. If confirmed, I would recommend that the Administration continue to support our allies in the face of the escalating North Korea threat. We should reiterate our commitment to defend our allies with the full range of U.S. military capabilities, including the U.S. nuclear umbrella and conventional capabilities. I would recommend that we, together with our allies, continue to acquire critical military capabilities, including bolstering our ballistic missile defense, to ensure the defense of South Korea, Japan, and the U.S. forces stationed in the region.

**What policy recommendations would you make to ensure U.S. and allied forces have the capability to defeat sites in North Korea containing weapons of mass destruction?**

North Korea continues to pursue asymmetric advantages through its weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs, including uranium enrichment, as well as its illicit proliferation of weapons. This produces a serious threat to the United States, as well as our allies in the region and in the international community. It is first and foremost imperative that we understand what our forces have and what they need to defeat sites in North Korea containing WMD. If confirmed, I will consult closely with other Department leaders, including U.S. Pacific Command and U.S. Forces Korea (USFK) Commanders, with partners in the wider U.S. Government, and with counterparts in the Republic of Korea and Japan, to ensure our forces have what they need to defeat such sites.

**Do you believe the President has the authority, under Article II of the Constitution, to conduct a military strike on North Korea, either conventional or nuclear, to protect against an imminent threat against the United States without prior Congressional authorization? If yes, what would constitute an imminent threat to the United States that would trigger the President's authority under Article II?**

North Korea's many threats directly against the U.S. homeland must be taken seriously. I believe the President has a responsibility to the American people to act in the defense of the country to repel an imminent attack by North Korea. I believe this extends to any immediate threat to the U.S. homeland, territories, interests, or treaty allies. If confirmed, it will be my



advice that the Department of Defense closely consult and coordinate with Congress throughout the process to ensure that the United States has the appropriate authorizations and authority to defeat the threat decisively.

**What is your assessment of the threat that North Korea poses as a possible source of proliferation of missile, nuclear, or other military technology?**

North Korea has shown itself to be a rogue regime that defies international law and norms, including in the area of proliferation. As the United States and the international community continues to apply pressure to the North Korean regime, I believe it will be more critical than ever to monitor closely its proliferation activities as a means of acquiring funds to continue to advance its illicit nuclear and missile programs.

**How important are cooperation and collaboration with South Korea and Japan in addressing the threat from North Korea? Is it possible to initiate a war with North Korea without the express consent of South Korea and Japan?**

I understand that we have an “ironclad” commitment to the defense of both South Korea and Japan, represented most visibly by strong bilateral security treaty relationships with these two allies. Although the United States is powerful – our military is the most capable fighting force the world has ever seen – cooperation and collaboration with South Korea and Japan is essential. The U.S. military presence in East Asia is largely dependent upon access to South Korean and Japanese basing and infrastructure. Also, I understand that our military approach to defeating North Korea is predicated on close cooperation with our allies—to maximize resources and save lives we must fully leverage the robust capabilities of South Korea and Japan. Although I do think it would be theoretically possible to initiate a conflict with North Korea without the express consent of South Korea and Japan, this approach would be flawed and dangerous. It would be impossible to sustain U.S. military action without the support of the governments of South Korea and Japan, access to our bases there, and coordination with their militaries. Ultimately, we must remain unified in our response to the North Korean threat.

**What role do you believe China would be willing to play in convincing North Korea to negotiate a freeze of its nuclear and missile programs?**

I understand that while China has increased its pressure on North Korea, there are still many more levers that it has at its disposal, including in fully implementing existing sanctions. China remains North Korea’s single largest economic and trading partner and, as such, wields more individual influence with the North Korea regime. I believe that the United States must continue to insist that China do more.

**China**

**If confirmed, what policies would you recommend to deter aggression by China, maintain free passage through the global commons, and assure our Indo-Asia-Pacific allies and friends?**

I believe that the greatest U.S. strength in the Indo-Pacific region is our network of allies and partners, and although the United States and our allies maintain a decisive military edge over China, it is important that we continue to invest in innovative technologies and capabilities to deter Chinese aggression. It is also important that China's sees and experiences consequences for bad behavior. If confirmed, I will recommend policies that will advance our capabilities, maintain free passage through the global commons, and uphold our security commitments to regional allies and partners.

**In your view, what effect are China's expanding economy and growing military having on the region-at-large and how does that growth influence the U.S. security posture in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region?**

I agree with Secretary Mattis that China's growing economic power lends it a position of influence in the Indo-Pacific region. We must insist that China use its influence for common good. We will not accept Chinese actions that undermine the rules-based order. If confirmed, I will assess the effects of China's growing influence in the region, including on U.S. security posture, to ensure we are able to maintain the presence and posture that have underpinned U.S. security guarantees, and in turn, regional peace and prosperity for decades.

**What policies would you recommend the United States put in place, both unilaterally and in coordination with allies and partners, to counter the increasing challenge posed by China in the East and South China Seas?**

China's aggressive and destabilizing behavior has caused countries in the Indo-Pacific region to look for continued U.S. leadership. If confirmed, I will assess the full complement of policies, ranging from unilateral, bilateral, and multilateral options, to address the challenge that China poses in the East and South China Seas. In coordination with the Department of State, I will work to reassure our allies and partners that the United States will continue to uphold its alliance commitments and steadfastly protect free passage through the global commons.

**What U.S. national interests do U.S. forces postured in or near the South China Sea protect? What do you expect U.S. allies to do to assist in countering Chinese provocations in the South China Sea?**

Upholding freedom of navigation and overflight globally is essential to the economic and national security interests of the United States and all nations in the international community. If confirmed, I will work with the Department of State to engage our allies and partners to protect the rights and freedoms of the international community to fly, sail, and operate wherever international law allows.

**Given that China's land reclamation in the South China Sea demonstrates a disregard for international rules and norms, would you recommend the Department of Defense support the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea? Do you believe the United States should ratify the convention?**

It is essential to our nation's economic and security interests to maintain free passage through the global commons, as reflected in customary international law and the Law of the Sea Convention. If confirmed, I will work with the Department of State to support policy options that uphold an international rules-based order, including measures intended to preserve and protect the global mobility of U.S. forces, our allies, and our partners.

**China's defense budget seems to be increasing at an alarming rate year after year. However, China's plans and strategies do not seem aimed at military domination outside of its immediate neighborhood.**

**How would you explain this discrepancy and why China is engaged in such a massive military build-up?**

China's military modernization and lack of transparency raise concerns about China's long-term strategic intentions. As China's global interests grow, its military is increasingly going to be called upon to safeguard China's interests ranging from trade, investments, and citizens abroad. The United States seeks to manage competition with China constructively and ensure U.S. allies and partners have the ability to avoid coercion and Chinese actions that impinge on the interests of the international community or undermine the rules-based order.

**There have been reports in recent years of increasing attempts, originating in China, to steal confidential business information and proprietary technologies using tools in cyberspace. This could undercut U.S. activity in the private sector, as well as pose a threat to technological superiority in certain critical areas.**

**What is your understanding of China's efforts to develop and deploy cyber warfare capabilities against U.S government and private sector targets?**

I understand that China has developed advanced cyber capabilities and strategies and invested significantly in cyber. China's cyber capabilities provides it with a viable, plausibly deniable capability to target the U.S. homeland and damage U.S. interests. China is using its cyber capabilities to support intelligence collection against the U.S. diplomatic, economic, and defense industrial base sectors that support U.S. national defense programs. The information targeted could potentially be used to benefit China's defense industry and high technology industries. I believe the theft of intellectual property through cyber means is a clear threat to the economic prosperity from which in large measure the nation derives its national security. Any State that engages in the theft of our intellectual property through cyber means jeopardizes both our national security and economic prosperity.

**What is your understanding of the role of the Department of Defense in deterring or preventing these attacks?**

I understand that since 2015, DoD has supported the commitment between the United States and China that neither country's government will conduct or knowingly support cyber-enabled theft of intellectual property with the intent of providing competitive advantage to companies or commercial sectors, and the Trump Administration reaffirmed this commitment at the U.S.-

China Law Enforcement and Cybersecurity Dialogue on October 4, 2017. Also, I believe the elevation of U.S. Cyber Command from its previous status as a sub-unified command under U.S. Strategic Command will better enable the Department to deter and prevent future attacks and reflects the growing centrality of cyberspace to U.S. national security. I understand that the Department is committed to strengthening its cyber defenses and capabilities – as well as those of our allies and partners – to address threats in cyberspace. If confirmed, I will support these efforts.

## **Taiwan**

### **What is your view of the United States' responsibilities under the Taiwan Relations Act?**

The U.S. government strongly supports Taiwan's acquisition of defensive weapons through Foreign Military Sales and Direct Commercial Sales channels consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act. The U.S. is also required to maintain the capacity to resist force in the Taiwan Strait. Defense engagements with Taiwan center on transforming Taiwan's military to ensure that the island remains secure, confident, and free from coercion.

### **What policy recommendations do you have for improving U.S. support to Taiwan?**

Consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act, I believe the U.S. Government should improve the predictability of arms sales to Taiwan by encouraging Taiwan to submit formal requests for defense articles and services, then responding to those formal requests in a timely fashion.

### **What opportunities do you see to strengthen our defense relationship with Taiwan?**

I believe the United States can strengthen its defense relationship with Taiwan by providing more training and assistance, as well as raise the level of consistent engagement between our two defense establishments. Taiwan indigenously manufactures excellent asymmetric systems including sea mines and small, mobile anti-ship cruise missile platforms. Although the United States does not currently produce or sell similar systems, it has significant expertise on the development of tactics and doctrine that could benefit Taiwan's warfighters if we increased cooperation in this area.

### **What is your view regarding the longstanding U.S. policy of selling defense articles and services to Taiwan despite objections and criticism from China?**

China is developing the capacity to coerce Taiwan and if directed, to compel unification by force. There are no indications that China is preparing to renounce the use of force, now or in the future. I believe it is, therefore, incumbent upon Taiwan to invest in the capabilities to deter aggression and to mount an effective defense should deterrence fail. The United States strongly supports Taiwan in these efforts. Consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act, I understand that the U.S. Government remains steadfastly committed to supporting Taiwan, including by making available to it the defense articles and services necessary to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.

**Do you support U.S. Navy ships making port calls in Taiwan? Do you support Taiwan navy ships making port calls in U.S. territories? If yes to either question, please explain how port calls would comport with the United States' long standing One China policy? Also, please explain what tangible benefit the United States or Taiwan would receive if port calls were instituted.**

I have been on the record in published articles supporting both U.S. Navy Ship visits to Taiwan, as well as Taiwan navy ship visits to the United States. Such port calls would be entirely consistent with our One China Policy as we define it. We already have occasional U.S. military flights land in Taiwan, and have had Taiwan military aircraft land in the United States. We have active duty members of the U.S. military permanently assigned to Taiwan. Since we reserve for ourselves the right to define our own One China Policy, commencing U.S. ship visits to Taiwan and vice versa can be included. The benefits of U.S. port calls to Taiwan would fall into the traditional justification for port calls to any other friendly country in the world – rest and relaxation for the sailors (which aids in recruitment and retention); minor repair and maintenance; port familiarization to assist in planning for a known contingency; and to support our political goals of supporting Taiwan and deterring China. If there are alternate views in the Department of Defense, I look forward to learning more about the counter arguments.

## **Japan**

**Congress and this Committee strongly support the growing relationship between the United States and Japan and the increasing integration of our military forces at the operational and tactical level.**

**What is your view on the state of the U.S.-Japan security relationship?**

I understand that the U.S.-Japan Alliance is the cornerstone of peace and security in the Indo-Pacific. I believe our security relationship with Japan is strong and is improving, thanks to the 2015 Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation and the passing of Japan's Peace and Security Legislation. Prime Minister Abe continues to institute defense reforms designed to increase Japan Self-Defense Force (JSDF) capabilities that strengthen the alliance. Japan is investing in advanced military capabilities, including F-35, Global Hawk, MV-22, and Aegis BMD-capable ships. Also, in addition to enhancing its role in the defense of Japan, the JSDF is playing an increasingly vital role in regional security affairs, including efforts to build the capacity of partners in Southeast Asia. Japan is our premiere missile defense ally and an active contributor to maritime security. If confirmed, I would encourage continued close cooperation with Japan and further efforts to modernize the Alliance.

**What policies would you recommend to continue to improve this relationship and improve U.S.-Japanese interoperability?**

If confirmed, I would support the full and expeditious implementation of policies consistent with the 2015 Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation, which serve as a forward-looking document for strengthening the Alliance. The new Guidelines describe how the United States

and Japan will cooperate to ensure regional peace and security. Although the core of the Guidelines is the U.S. commitment to the defense of Japan, the Guidelines also recognize that Japan is ready to do more, both regionally and globally. Through operationalization of the Guidelines, we will strengthen our ability to cooperate together across a range of critical areas to include: peacekeeping operations; humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HA/DR); maritime security; partner capacity building; noncombat evacuation operations; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, (ISR); ballistic missile defense (BMD); and, logistics support.

## **Southeast Asia**

### **How important is Southeast Asia in the U.S. defense posture in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region?**

I understand that Southeast Asian nations play a critical role in supporting a defense posture that enables the Department of Defense to maintain a free and open Indo-Pacific region. The continuing Marine Corps rotations in Australia and the Littoral Combat Ship rotations in Singapore are examples of posture initiatives that advance our strategic interests in the region.

### **How can the United States increase cooperation with countries in Southeast Asia?**

I understand that DoD has long had a significant level of cooperation with allies (Philippines, Thailand, and Australia) and partners in Southeast Asia to help promote and preserve the stability and prosperity that has benefitted the United States and the region for more than 70 years. We are also investing in potential new security partners such as Vietnam. If confirmed, I will look for ways that DoD can increase cooperation with Southeast Asian countries -- while supporting a rules-based regional architecture -- in key areas of mutual interest, particularly maritime security and counter-terrorism.

## **India**

### **How would you describe the current state of the U.S.-India security relationship?**

I understand that the U.S.-India security relationship is at its strongest point in our history. During the last decade our overall relationship has strengthened significantly, particularly with regard to security and defense issues. I am encouraged by our increasing level of defense collaboration with India. The designation of India as a Major Defense Partner in 2016 reflects the progress we are making to build a long-term and broad-based strategic partnership, and if confirmed, I will look to build on this progress.

### **What recommendations would you make to bolster the overall defense relationship between our two countries?**

If confirmed, I will look for opportunities to further strengthen our defense cooperation to advance the U.S.-India defense relationship. I believe that it is particularly important that we

expand our cooperation on regional and global security issues, including supporting our South Asia strategy and contributing in Afghanistan; expand our defense trade under the Defense Technology and Trade Initiative; and advance the interoperability of our militaries to enable strong cooperation.

**What recommendations do you have for accelerating U.S. foreign military sales to India?**

I understand that we have made significant progress during the past decade to expand our defense trade and reduce obstacles in our respective bureaucracies to enable closer cooperation, including Foreign Military Sales. Given the importance of defense trade in establishing a strong partnership, if confirmed, I am committed to looking at what more the Department of Defense can do to strengthen this component of our relationship.

**Afghanistan**

**President Trump announced on August 21, 2017 that the U.S. strategy in Afghanistan would no longer be guided by timelines for withdrawal, but instead by a “conditions-based” approach. In addition, the President stated that an Afghan-led peace process that culminates in a political settlement is the desired end-state in Afghanistan.**

**What are the key U.S. national security interests in Afghanistan and how would you describe the strategy to secure them?**

As I understand it, the primary U.S. national security interest in Afghanistan is to prevent Afghanistan from being used as a safe haven for terrorists to plan and launch attacks against the U.S. homeland, U.S. citizens, U.S. interests, and our allies and partners. Secretary Mattis recently characterized the U.S. government’s approach to Afghanistan as “R4+S” (i.e., regionalize, realign, reinforce and reconcile, and sustain).

I understand the strategy involves increasing the warfighting capabilities of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) so they can secure and protect Afghanistan and its citizens on their own. I also understand that the Secretary made adjustments to the military mission by providing more advisors, combat enablers, fire support, and tactical-level training, advising, and assisting (TAA) to the Afghans – all with an eye toward Afghanistan becoming more fiscally, militarily, and politically sustainable over time.

I further understand that the new South Asia Strategy calls for a whole-of-government approach to build a broad diplomatic consensus for a stable Afghanistan, emphasizing regional integration and cooperation, stressing cooperation toward an Afghan-led peace process and political settlement, and holding countries accountable for the use of proxies or other asymmetric means which undermine stability and regional confidence.

If confirmed, I will support the Secretary in further developing and executing the President’s strategy for South Asia.

**What conditions (security, political, etc.) does the new U.S. strategy seek to create? What metrics of success or failure will be applied to assess progress toward those conditions?**

As I understand it, our goals for Afghanistan are to prevent terrorist groups from exploiting sanctuaries to plan and stage attacks against the U.S. homeland, U.S. citizens, or our allies and partners overseas; enhance the ability of the ANDSF to secure the Afghan population and territory; secure regional support for stabilizing Afghanistan; and achieve a political settlement with the Taliban. We expect the Afghan government to work towards these goals with us.

In order to ensure the South Asia strategy is successfully implemented, I understand the Department is developing a framework for assessing the strategy. This assessment framework will be informed by past efforts (e.g., a failure analysis of our past efforts, lessons learned from our experience in Afghanistan as well as Iraq and Syria, and various reports from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR), DoD Inspector General, and the Government Accountability Office).

**Do you believe it is in U.S. national security interests to maintain a long-term U.S. military presence in Afghanistan?**

We cannot allow Afghanistan again to become a safe haven from where terrorists can plan and execute attacks against the United States and our interests. The United States must engage actively in Afghanistan to ensure the safety of our homeland and U.S. citizens and our allies and partners abroad.

**What is the role of U.S. and coalition military operations in promoting reconciliation with the Afghan Taliban and other insurgent groups and an eventual political settlement?**

The goal of U.S. and coalition military operations is to support our Afghan partners so they can eliminate the Taliban's will to fight and set the conditions for political settlement. The elimination of arbitrary withdrawal timelines for international military forces means the Taliban cannot wait out the United States. The NATO Resolute Support Mission is working to train, advise, and assist the Afghan forces so that the Taliban will never again be able to control Afghanistan.

**Do you believe that the increase in U.S. forces and additional authorities outlined in the new strategy will produce battlefield results that will significantly alter the Taliban's calculus and create the conditions for political reconciliation—especially when the United States failed to achieve this goal with far more troops on the ground in the past? If so, why?**

The increase in U.S. forces, an adjusted approach to providing advisors to the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) below the corps level, and expanded authorities are



foundational facets that should improve circumstances on the ground by better enabling the ANDSF to move towards reaching the goal of securing their own country.

I believe that these recent changes may potentially alter the Taliban's calculus and, in turn, help create conditions for a political settlement. Previously, when U.S. and international troops were in the lead, and working off a publicly set time-based strategy, the Taliban knew we would eventually leave and they could wait us out. The Taliban cannot wait out the ANDSF. The ANDSF is getting stronger every day, and we believe that their continued success against the Taliban, combined with additional U.S. authorities that allow our forces to take the fight to the enemy and to provide better support to the ANDSF, will help set the conditions for a political settlement.

**What is your understanding of how the President's new strategy will translate to military progress on the battlefield to political progress towards a settlement?**

I understand that by eliminating the time-based approach for withdrawal from Afghanistan, the President demonstrated our resolve and dedication and sent a clear signal to the Taliban that they cannot wait us out. The Department's continued training of the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF), and their increasing battlefield success, and permanence, reinforce the message to the Taliban that they cannot win militarily.

**Do you believe the United States can achieve its national security objectives in Afghanistan if Pakistan continues to provide sanctuary and support for militant and terrorist groups, including the Taliban, the Haqqani Network, and Lashkar-e-Tayyiba?**

Sanctuary for the Taliban and other terrorist networks inside Pakistani territory continues to have a negative impact on the security conditions and stability in Afghanistan. If confirmed, I will support the Secretary and work with our Combatant Commanders to find ways to deny extremist forces sanctuary in Pakistan.

**What is your assessment of the roles Russia and Iran are playing in Afghanistan, including support for the Taliban and other militant groups?**

It is my understanding that Russia and Iran both support the Taliban in some way, either as a hedge against a failed Afghan government, as a counter to a perceived threat from the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria – Khorasan (ISIS-K), or to act as a spoiler to U.S. presence in the region. The Secretary has made it clear that the United States will not tolerate external support of the Taliban or insurgent groups, and the President's new strategy makes it clear that all regional countries can and should join the Afghan-led peace process.

**Pakistan**

**President Trump stated on August 21, 2017 that Pakistan "often gives safe haven to agents of chaos, violence, and terror." He further noted that Pakistan has been a "valued**

**partner” and has “much to gain from partnering with our efforts in Afghanistan.” The President also suggested that the United States would no longer tolerate Pakistan’s harboring of terrorist organizations that have been attacking U.S. and Afghan forces for 16 years.**

**What is your view of the current state of the U.S.-Pakistan security relationship?**

I understand that the United States seeks a constructive relationship with Pakistan that advances mutual interests, such as defeating ISIS and al Qaida, but we also have serious concerns about Pakistan’s expanding its nuclear program and providing safe-haven for militant groups in its territory.

**Do you believe U.S. security assistance to Pakistan is effective and supports U.S. national security objectives?**

Security assistance is a tool that can be used to further the United States’ national security interests. If confirmed, I will work with interagency partners to assess the effectiveness of security assistance for Pakistan in this regard.

**What steps would you recommend the United States take to convince or compel Pakistan to do more to cut off support and sanctuary for militant and terrorist groups?**

If confirmed, I will review what steps the United States, particularly the Department of Defense, could take to convince Pakistan to cut off support and sanctuary for militant and terrorist groups.

**Are there additional conditions on security assistance to Pakistan that you believe should be considered if Pakistan declines to cut off support and sanctuary for militant and terrorist groups? If so, what are they?**

If confirmed, I would assess what changes should be considered for security assistance to Pakistan.

## **Terrorism**

**What is your assessment of the threat to U.S. interests posed by al-Qaeda, ISIS, and affiliated terrorist organizations operating in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region?**

Al-Qa’ida and ISIS present the greatest threat to the United States and remain the primary focus of U.S. counterterrorism efforts in the region.

In South Asia, groups like the Haqqani Network, Lashkar-e-Tayyiba, and Jaish-e-Mohammed all present threats to U.S. persons, allies, partners, and interests in the region. In Southeast Asia, I understand that unresolved legacy insurgencies coupled with weak rule of law, returning foreign fighters from the Middle East, online radicalization, and the influence of ISIS compound the threat posed by local extremist groups and their off-shoots, which comprise the primary threat.

In all, these regional terrorist groups are taking advantage of disenfranchised segments of the population, porous borders between countries, and weak governance to perpetrate attacks, conduct kidnap-for-ransom operations, and radicalize local populations in an effort to destabilize the region.

**What is your understanding of the U.S. counterterrorism strategy in the region?**

I understand that the United States has prioritized stopping threats to the U.S. homeland and preventing attacks against our interests or our allies and partners. This will require a continued U.S. commitment to addressing terrorist threats emanating from the region, in particular those stemming from ungoverned spaces that are vulnerable to extremism in South and Southeast Asia. I believe the foundation for success is our enduring counterterrorism cooperation with allies and partners to mitigate direct threats, while helping build the resident capability and capacity to confront the threats in the region themselves.

**What changes, if any, would you recommend to that strategy?**

If confirmed, I will evaluate our current counterterrorism strategy in depth and recommend updates.

**What should be the strategic objectives of U.S. counterterrorism activities in the region?**

I believe the United States should continue to prioritize stopping threats on the U.S. homeland and on U.S. persons, partners, and interests in the region.

**Personnel**

**Based on your assessment of the threats facing the United States from the Indo-Asia-Pacific region now and in the future, what knowledge, skills, and abilities will be required by future military personnel to succeed against our adversaries?**

I believe a central principle of the National Defense Strategy should be to ensure that the All-Volunteer Force remains the world's most qualified and best trained, and that they and their families receive the finest quality care and support. In the evolving international security environment, we should re-double our efforts to improve training and preparation for the high-end, near-peer, war fight, which in recent years has generally not been prioritized due to the counter-insurgency nature of the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan.

**Do you believe personnel policy and manpower considerations play an adequate role in the development of national security strategies and priorities for the region?**

Yes. As Secretary Mattis, General Dunford, and other DoD leaders have consistently stated both in testimony and in other public statements, our strength lies in our unmatched training, compensation, and skills of our military personnel. If confirmed, I will work to ensure the

National Defense Strategy takes into account this core strength of our military personnel as compared to friends and foe alike as very much a net plus to our aggregate advantage over others.

**Do you believe that the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act and the Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act need to be updated to better reflect the national security challenges in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region?**

In regards to whether the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act and the Reserve Officer Personnel Management Act needs to be updated, I would defer to the Under Secretary for Personnel and Readiness.

### **Defense Security Cooperation**

**What is the appropriate role of the Department of Defense in the conduct of security sector assistance in the region?**

In many cases, working by, with, and through allies and partners is central to addressing regional and global security challenges. Building the capacity of allies and partners helps develop and maintain operationally-viable defense partnerships either to avoid the need to commit U.S. forces or to ensure interoperability with U.S. forces in coalition operations. I believe this is especially salient in the Indo-Pacific region, where I understand we have worked to foster interoperability with a number of our close allies and partners. I understand that the Department executes Title 10 and Title 22 security assistance programs as a subset of broader DoD security cooperation efforts.

**What should be the strategic objectives of the Department's efforts to build the capabilities of a partner nation's security forces, as it relates to the Indo-Asia-Pacific region?**

I understand our strategic objective is to help our partners develop effective militaries and legitimate security institutions that are capable of providing for their countries' security and contributing to wider efforts to address shared regional and global security challenges. Such efforts reduce the burden on U.S. forces and promotes interoperability between our forces.

**In your view, is the Defense Department appropriately organized and resourced to effectively conduct such activities? If not, what changes would you recommend?**

The NDAA for FY 2017 included significant changes to DoD's security cooperation enterprise to allow the Department to organize and resource security cooperation more effectively. Fully implementing these important reforms will take time, but they should enhance the coherence of the Department's security cooperation activities, deliver more impactful results, and inform further course corrections, as necessary. I look forward to working with Congress on these issues.

## Congressional Oversight

**In order to exercise its legislative and oversight responsibilities, it is important that this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress are able to receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of information.**

**Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee and other appropriate committees of Congress?**

Yes.

**Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear before this Committee, or designated members of this Committee, and provide information, subject to appropriate and necessary security protection, with respect to your responsibilities as the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs?**

Yes.

**Do you agree to ensure that testimony, briefings, and other communications of information are provided to this Committee and its staff and other appropriate committees in a timely manner?**

Yes.

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

Yes.

**Do you agree to answer letters and requests for information from individual Senators who are members of this Committee?**

Yes.

**If confirmed, do you agree to provide to this Committee relevant information within the jurisdictional oversight of the Committee when requested by the Committee, even in the absence of the formality of a letter from the Chairman?**

Yes.