

Stenographic Transcript
Before the

COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON UNITED STATES PACIFIC
COMMAND AND UNITED STATES FORCES KOREA

Thursday, April 27, 2017

Washington, D.C.

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

1 OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN McCAIN, U.S. SENATOR
2 FROM ARIZONA

3 Chairman McCain: Well, good morning.

4 The Senate Armed Services Committee meets this morning
5 to receive testimony on the posture of U.S. Pacific Command
6 and U.S. Forces in Korea.

7 Admiral Harris, I appreciate your appearance before the
8 committee during this tense period in your area of
9 responsibility. I want to express the appreciation of this
10 committee for the service of the men and women you lead who
11 defend our Nation every day.

12 America's interests in the Asia-Pacific region are deep
13 and enduring. That is why for the past 70 years we have
14 worked with our allies and partners to uphold a rules-based
15 order based on the principles of free peoples and free
16 markets, open seas and open skies, and the rule of law and
17 the peaceful resolution of disputes. These ideas have
18 produced unprecedented peace and prosperity in the Asia-
19 Pacific, but now the challenges to this rules-based order
20 are mounting and they threaten not just the nations of the
21 Asia-Pacific region but the United States as well.

22 The most immediate threat is the situation on the
23 Korean Peninsula. Kim Jung-Un's regime has thrown its full
24 weight behind its quest for nuclear weapons and the means to
25 deliver them. And unfortunately, the regime is making real

1 progress. A North Korean missile with a nuclear payload
2 capable of striking an American city is no longer a distant
3 hypothetical but an imminent danger, one that poses a real
4 and rising risk of conflict. Indeed, as Admiral Harris said
5 yesterday in testimony before the House, North Korea already
6 has the conventional capability to strike U.S. territory. I
7 look forward to hearing your assessment of North Korea's
8 nuclear and missile programs, the military options your
9 forces offer to our commander-in-chief and their readiness
10 to carry them out if called upon.

11 I welcome the news that the deployment of the THAAD
12 missile defense system to South Korea and other capabilities
13 in the region will soon be completed. It is shameful that
14 China has retaliated against South Korea with economic and
15 cyber means in response to its support for this deployment.
16 This committee understands that deploying this system is a
17 joint alliance decision that is necessary to defend our
18 ally, South Korea. Admiral Harris, we welcome your views on
19 whether further enhancements to U.S. missile defenses or our
20 conventional military posture are required in Northeast Asia
21 to counter the threat from North Korea.

22 For years, the United States has looked to China, North
23 Korea's longtime patron and sole strategic ally, to bring
24 the regime to the negotiating table and achieve progress
25 toward a denuclearized Korean Peninsula. We have done so

1 for the simple reason that China is the only country that
2 may have the influence to truly curb North Korea's
3 destabilizing behavior. But China has repeatedly refused to
4 exercise that influence.

5 I welcome the Trump administration's outreach to China
6 on the issue of North Korea. But as these discussions
7 continue, the United States should be clear that while we
8 earnestly seek China's cooperation on North Korea, we do not
9 seek such cooperation at the expense of our other vital
10 interests. We must not and will not bargain over our
11 alliances or over fundamental principles of the rules-based
12 order.

13 As its behavior toward South Korea indicates, over the
14 last several years, China has acted less and less like a
15 responsible stakeholder of the rules-based order in the
16 region and more like a bully. It has economically coerced
17 its neighbors, increased its provocations in the East China
18 Sea, and militarized the South China Sea. Meanwhile, with a
19 rebalance policy too heavy on rhetoric and too light on
20 action, years of senseless defense cuts, and now the
21 disastrous decision to withdraw from the Trans-Pacific
22 Partnership, U.S. policy has failed to adapt to the scale
23 and velocity of China's challenge to the rules-based order.
24 And that failure has called into question the credibility of
25 America's security commitments in the region.

1 This committee has grown increasingly concerned about
2 the erosion of America's conventional military overmatch as
3 states like China and North Korea develop advanced
4 capabilities to counter our ability to project military
5 power. While America's military remains the most powerful
6 on earth, we must adapt to the new realities we face. We
7 must think differently about forward basing and force
8 posture, logistics and mobilization, and take steps to
9 reshape the capabilities of our joint force for the renewed
10 reality of great power competition.

11 Specifically on the issue of munitions, this committee
12 has heard testimony each year about the qualitative and
13 quantitative shortfalls we have in our munitions, but we
14 have seen little action from the services to finally turn
15 the corner and address this issue with the seriousness it
16 requires. Admiral Harris, I am interested in your views on
17 munitions requirements and what it will take to meet them.

18 The new administration has an important opportunity to
19 chart a different and better course. At our hearing earlier
20 this week, our panel of expert witnesses agreed there was a
21 strong merit for a, quote, "Asia-Pacific Stability
22 Initiative." This initiative could enhance U.S. military
23 power through targeted funding to realign our force posture
24 in the region, improve operationally relevant
25 infrastructure, fund additional exercises, preposition

1 equipment, and build capacity with our allies and partners.
2 Admiral Harris, I am eager to hear your thoughts on this
3 kind of an initiative.

4 And, Admiral, I think there is some symbolism in your
5 appearance today and the information that the Chinese are
6 now building their own aircraft carrier. I am sure that as
7 an old naval aviator, that that has some interest for you.

8 Senator Reed?

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

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

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

4 And I want to thank you, Admiral Harris, for being here
5 today. We understand how difficult this time must be for
6 you and for General Brooks and all the men and women that
7 you lead. And we want you to express our great appreciation
8 for their efforts.

9 It is clear to me, especially after the thoughtful
10 discussion we had on Tuesday with our outside panel, that
11 there is no set of options that lead to quick and certain
12 strategy on North Korea. While I believe that we should
13 pursue and exhaust every diplomatic option to bring the
14 North Korean regime to the negotiating table, those options
15 are somewhat limited. China provides the lifeline for North
16 Korea, and China, for its own national security interests,
17 seems unwilling to exert the type of pressure that is needed
18 to convince the regime that denuclearization is the only
19 path forward. Even if China were willing to exert that type
20 of pressure, it seems that Kim Jung-un is so determined to
21 pursue his nuclear program that he is willing to risk
22 impoverishing and starving his own population to achieve his
23 dream of becoming a nuclear-capable state.

24 There are military options, but they are risky. A
25 comprehensive strike on nuclear facilities may precipitate a

1 catastrophic retaliation against the civilian population of
2 Seoul or against our bases and service members in South
3 Korea or Japan. A surgical strike, while less risky, may
4 not deter the North Korean regime and runs the risk of
5 emboldening Kim Jong-un. Complicating factors, of course,
6 are the stockpile of chemical and biological weapons at his
7 disposal and road-mobile missile launchers spread across the
8 countryside.

9 North Korea's nuclear and missile program is an
10 immediate and grave national security threat. Admiral
11 Harris, I ask that you tell us how you are preparing for
12 every contingency on the peninsula.

13 While North Korea poses an immediate national security
14 threat, we must not lose sight of the potential long-term
15 threat that China poses to the rules-based order in the
16 Asia-Pacific region. Whether it be economic coercion of its
17 smaller, more vulnerable neighbors or undermining the
18 freedom of navigation that we all depend upon, China has not
19 demonstrated a willingness to rise as a responsible global
20 leader. Therefore, I believe it is critical that we empower
21 and engage countries in Southeast Asia and South Asia to
22 protect their own waterways and provide them with economic
23 alternatives to main regional stability, preserve U.S.
24 standing in Asia, and allow the economic growth and
25 stability that has characterized the region for the last 50

1 years to continue.

2 Again, thank you, Admiral, for your service, and thank
3 you, Mr. Chairman.

4 Chairman McCain: Admiral?

5

6

7

8

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, Chairman McCain and Senator
4 Reed and distinguished members. It is an honor for me to
5 appear before this committee.

6 There are many things to talk about since my last
7 testimony 14 months ago, and I regret that I am not here
8 with my testimony battle buddy, General Vince Brooks, but I
9 think you would all agree that he is where he is needed most
10 right now on the Korean Peninsula.

11 Mr. Chairman, I request that my written posture
12 statement be submitted for the record.

13 Chairman McCain: Without objection.

14 Admiral Harris: As the PACOM Commander, I have the
15 extraordinary privilege of leading about 375,000 soldiers,
16 sailors, airmen, marines, coast guardsmen, and DOD civilians
17 serving our Nation over half the globe. These dedicated
18 patriots are doing an amazing job, and thanks to them,
19 America remains the security partner of choice in the
20 region.

21 That is important because I believe that America's
22 future and economic prosperity are inextricably linked to
23 the Indo-Asia-Pacific, a region that is poised at the
24 strategic nexus where opportunity meets the four
25 considerable challenges of North Korea, China, Russia, and

1 ISIS.

2 It is clear to me that ISIS is a threat that must be
3 destroyed now, but as we eliminate ISIS in the Middle East
4 and North Africa, some of the surviving fighters will likely
5 repatriate to their home countries in the Indo-Asia-Pacific.
6 So we must continue to work with likeminded nations to
7 eradicate ISIS before it grows in the PACOM area of
8 responsibility.

9 Then there is North Korea, which remains the most
10 immediate threat to the security of the United States and
11 our allies in Japan and Korea. North Korea has vigorously
12 pursued a strategic strike capability with nuclear tests and
13 ballistic missile launches which it claims are intended to
14 target the United States, South Korea, Japan, and just
15 earlier this week, Australia. Make no mistake. Kim Jong-un
16 is making progress on his quest for nuclear weapons and a
17 means to deliver them intercontinentally. All nations need
18 to take this threat seriously because North Korea's missiles
19 point in all directions. North Korea's capabilities are not
20 yet an existential threat to America, but if left unchecked,
21 it will eventually match the capability to hostile rhetoric.

22 I know that there is some debate about North Korea's
23 intent and the miniaturization advancements made by
24 Pyongyang, and I will not add to that speculation.
25 Regardless, my job is to provide military options to the

1 President, and because PACOM must be ready to fight tonight,
2 I must assume that Kim Jong-un's nuclear claims are true. I
3 know his aspirations certainly are.

4 That is why General Brooks and I are doing everything
5 possible to defend the American homeland and our allies and
6 the Republic of Korea and Japan. That is why the ROK-U.S.
7 Alliance decided last July to deploy THAAD, the terminal
8 high altitude area defense system, which would be
9 operational in the coming days and able to better defend
10 South Korea against the growing North Korean threat.

11 That is why the USS Carl Vinson carrier strike group is
12 back on patrol in Northeast Asia.

13 That is why we must continue to debuted America's
14 newest and best military platforms in the Indo-Asia-Pacific.

15 That is why we want to continue to emphasize trilateral
16 cooperation between the United States, South Korea, and
17 Japan, a partnership with a purpose if there ever was one.

18 And that is why we continue to call on China to exert
19 its considerable influence to stop Pyongyang's unprecedented
20 weapons testing. While recent actions by Beijing are
21 encouraging, the fact remains that China is as responsible
22 for where North Korea is as North Korea itself.

23 In confronting the reckless North Korean regime, it is
24 critical that we are guided by a strong sense of resolve
25 both privately and publicly, both diplomatically and

1 militarily. As President Trump and Secretary Mattis have
2 made clear, all options are on the table. We want to bring
3 Kim Jong-un to his senses and not to his knees.

4 We are also challenged in the Indo-Asia-Pacific by an
5 aggressive China and a revanchist Russia. China continues a
6 methodical strategy to control the South China Sea. I
7 testified last year that China was militarizing this
8 critical international waterway and the airspace above it by
9 building air and naval bases on seven Chinese manmade
10 islands in the disputed Spratlys. Despite subsequent
11 Chinese assurances at the highest levels that they would not
12 militarize these bases, today they have these facilities
13 that support long-range weapons emplacements, fighter
14 aircraft hangars, radar towers, and barracks for their
15 troops. China's militarization of the South China Sea is
16 real.

17 I am also not taking my eyes off of Russia, which just
18 last week flew bomber missions near Alaska on successive
19 days for the first time since 2014. Russia continues to
20 modernize its military and exercise its considerable
21 conventional and nuclear forces in the Pacific.

22 So despite the region's four significant challenges
23 since my last report to you, we have strengthened America's
24 network of alliances and partnerships. Working with
25 likeminded partners on shared security threats like North

1 Korea and ISIS is a key component of our regional strategy.
2 Our five bilateral defense treaty alliances, Australia,
3 Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, and Thailand,
4 anchor our joint force efforts in the Indo-Asia-Pacific.

5 We have also advanced important partnerships with India
6 and Indonesia, Malaysia and New Zealand, Singapore and Sri
7 Lanka, Vietnam and others, all with a view toward
8 reinforcing the rules-based security order that has helped
9 underwrite peace and stability and prosperity throughout the
10 region for decades.

11 But there is more work to do. We must be ready to
12 confront all challenges from a position of strength and with
13 credible combat power.

14 So I ask this committee to support continued investment
15 to improve military capabilities. I need weapon systems of
16 increased lethality, precision, speed, and range that are
17 networked and cost effective. And restricting ourselves
18 with funding uncertainties reduces warfighting readiness.
19 So I urge Congress to repeal sequestration and to approve
20 the proposed Defense Department budget.

21 Finally, I would like to thank Chairman McCain and this
22 committee for proposing and supporting the Asia-Pacific
23 Stability Initiative. This effort will reassure our
24 regional partners and send a strong signal to potential
25 adversaries of our persistent commitment to the region.

1 As always, I thank the Congress for your enduring
2 support to the men and women of PACOM and to our families
3 who care for us. Thank you very much, and I look forward to
4 your questions.

5 [The prepared statement of Admiral Harris follows:]

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Chairman McCain: Thank you, Admiral, and thank you for
2 the outstanding job and your outstanding leadership that you
3 are exhibiting in these very difficult and challenging
4 times.

5 Admiral, would you say that it is an accurate statement
6 to say that the crisis on the Korean Peninsula now is
7 reminiscent? It reminds one of a gradual Cuban Missile
8 Crisis.

9 Admiral Harris: Sir, I will just say that I think the
10 crisis on the Korean Peninsula is real. It is the worst I
11 have seen. I am not a student of the Cuban Missile Crisis,
12 but what I know of it, it seems that we are faced with a
13 threat and a leader who is intent on achieving his goal of a
14 nuclear capability against the United States.

15 Chairman McCain: And that leader does not always
16 behave in a rational fashion. Is that correct?

17 Admiral Harris: That is correct, sir. I believe to
18 ascribe terms like "rational" or "irrational" to Kim Jong-un
19 is probably not helpful because he is what he is and we have
20 to deal with the Kim Jong-un that is. And I believe that he
21 does have some kind of calculus that ends up in decisions.
22 So he takes the information and makes a decision, and those
23 decisions are often brutal and the decisions are there to
24 keep him and his family in power in North Korea.

25 Chairman McCain: And it is clear that his goal is a

1 nuclear weapon and the means to deliver it to the United
2 States of America. Is there any doubt in your mind?

3 Admiral Harris: There is no doubt in my mind,
4 Chairman.

5 Chairman McCain: And there is some question, given the
6 difficulty of getting real reliable intelligence as to how
7 close he is to reaching that goal?

8 Admiral Harris: There is some doubt or questions
9 within the intelligence community whether he has that
10 capability today or whether he will soon have that
11 capability. But I have to assume that he has it, as do my
12 fellow combatant commanders, Lori Robinson and John Hyten.
13 And we have to assume that the capability is real. We know
14 what his intentions are and he is moving toward them.

15 Chairman McCain: So it is not a matter of whether. It
16 is a matter of when.

17 Admiral Harris: It is clearly a matter of when.

18 As I said yesterday, KJU is not a leader who is afraid
19 to fail in public. So I talked about Thomas Edison. He
20 tried a thousand times before he got the light bulb to work.
21 KJU is going to continue to try until he gets his ICBMs to
22 work.

23 Chairman McCain: What does THAAD do for us in South
24 Korea?

25 Admiral Harris: I think the point that KJU's rhetoric

1 -- and he has threatened the United States and cities by
2 name, and just this week, he threatened Australia by name.
3 I think his rhetoric, if you were to project it on a graph,
4 is going in one direction. And then his capability is
5 approaching -- the line of his capability is approaching the
6 line of his rhetoric. And where those lines cross, I
7 believe we are then at an inflexion point and we wake up to
8 a new world.

9 Chairman McCain: What does THAAD do for us?

10 Admiral Harris: THAAD enables us and our South Korean
11 allies to defend South Korea or a big portion of South Korea
12 against the threat from North Korea. It is aimed at North
13 Korea -- the systems. And it poses no threat on China.

14 Chairman McCain: Is it not incredibly difficult to
15 counter the 4,000 artillery pieces that the North Koreans
16 have on the DMZ which could attack a city of 26 million
17 people?

18 Admiral Harris: It is, sir, and THAAD is not designed
19 to counter those kinds of basic weapons.

20 Chairman McCain: And what is designed to do that?
21 Anything?

22 Admiral Harris: We do not have those kinds of weapons
23 that can counter those rockets once they are launched.

24 Chairman McCain: And they can launch -- they have the
25 capability of a launch of those rockets.

1 Admiral Harris: At this very moment, they have that
2 capability, Senator.

3 Chairman McCain: What do you make of China's reaction
4 to our emplacement of THAAD, a purely defensive system?
5 Does that give you an idea of China's real intentions about
6 North Korea?

7 Admiral Harris: I have said before, Chairman, that I
8 believe it is preposterous that China would criticize South
9 Korea or the United States for emplacing a purely defensive
10 missile system against the North Korean threat when that
11 North Korean threat owes its survival, if you will, to
12 China. And I believe that China, rather than criticize the
13 United States or South Korea for defending ourselves, should
14 rather put that energy toward convincing Kim Jong-un to stop
15 his nuclear ambitions.

16 Chairman McCain: So we should be a bit skeptical about
17 our ability to persuade the Chinese to break Kim Jong-un's
18 quest for nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them.

19 Admiral Harris: I have been skeptical up to the recent
20 discussions between President Trump and President Xi. So I
21 think that we are seeing more activity, proactive, positive
22 activity, from China in this case than we have seen in a
23 long time. So I remain cautiously optimistic but certainly
24 hopeful.

25 Chairman McCain: But you would not rely on that.

1 Admiral Harris: It is too early to tell, sir. It has
2 only been a month or so, and it is too early to tell.

3 Chairman McCain: But I mean you would not rely on it
4 at this time.

5 Admiral Harris: I would not bet my farm on it.

6 Chairman McCain: We thank you, Admiral.

7 Senator Reed?

8 Senator Reed: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 And thank you, Admiral Harris.

10 Admiral Harris, I understand yesterday that you, in
11 response to the House questions, took responsibility for the
12 miscommunication regarding the Carl Vinson carrier group.
13 First of all, I commend you for standing up and being
14 accountable and responsible. That is what naval officers
15 do. But I think we better take significant steps to avoid
16 such confusion in the future. It was quite detrimental not
17 only here but, as you know, in South Korea particularly
18 where there was a great deal of concern. In some quarters,
19 they felt that they had been misled, indeed. So I would
20 urge you to ensure that such a miscoordination or
21 miscommunication does not happen in the future.

22 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir. Again, as I said yesterday,
23 I am accountable and responsible for the communications that
24 came out of that evolution. I am sorry that it happened,
25 and all I can say is I will do better in the future.

1 Senator Reed: Let me raise an issue that is linked to
2 our diplomacy. We are asking China to take a much more
3 assertive role in urging the North Koreans to de cease and
4 desist. But your view in terms of what concessions we
5 should make, if any, to the Chinese to get them to
6 cooperate. As both the chairman and I pointed out and as
7 you pointed out, they are posing significant challenges to
8 the rule of law in the Pacific, and we cannot ignore that.
9 So your comments on this issue.

10 Admiral Harris: Senator, I believe that great powers
11 can walk and chew gum at the same time, and by that, I mean
12 I think we can compliment and be grateful for China's
13 efforts in North Korea even as we criticize them, rightfully
14 so, and hold them accountable for actions that run counter
15 to the international rules and norms elsewhere, in this case
16 the South China Sea. I think we can do both, and we should
17 do both. And I do think China as a great power can handle
18 that criticism on the one hand while they are dealing with
19 this important critical international security issue on the
20 other.

21 Senator Reed: Thank you.

22 Obviously, we are trying to approach the North Korean
23 issue with a comprehensive strategy, diplomacy, military
24 action, military preparedness certainly. One aspect is
25 information warfare. My sense -- and I am not the expert

1 you are, but Kim Jong-un is paranoid about his own people
2 and what information they are getting. Do you think we are
3 making a sufficient effort to get information into North
4 Korea through various means so that we can begin to bypass
5 the Dear Leader and go to the people and that could create
6 pressures on him to forestall his nuclear ambitions?

7 Admiral Harris: I believe we are making an effort. I
8 am not witting of the totality of that effort. But I do
9 believe that the people in North Korea revere Kim Jong-un.
10 And I believe that the idea that somehow we could -- or
11 somehow that they could rise up against Kim Jong-un, if the
12 situation in North Korea became so dire, I think that might
13 be a hollow hope. I believe that they consider him a god
14 king, and they truly revere him as their leader. That is
15 just based on what I have read in the press and reports of
16 reporters who see the North Korean people start to cry and
17 all of this and get emotional when he comes out on stage,
18 and they seem to be real tears. So I think that he has a
19 hold on his people, that they are not going to rise up from
20 beneath and topple him.

21 Senator Reed: Again, I think your perception is much
22 closer to the situation on the ground, but anything we can
23 do to either raise questions -- I do not think they will
24 prompt an uprising immediately -- not only questions among
25 the population but questions among the Dear Leader, Kim

1 Jong-un, that his people are being sort of influenced or
2 there might be elements within the country that are thinking
3 and embracing other ideas could be some leverage. And I
4 think we have to pursue aggressively this information
5 operation. My sense is we are not.

6 Admiral Harris: And I must agree with you there.

7 Senator Reed: Just one other issue. China has refused
8 arbitration -- to acknowledge the decision of the
9 arbitration clause under the Law of the Sea with the
10 Philippines, et cetera. We do have a successful example of
11 Timor-Leste and Australia of working together, and that
12 might be a model maybe just rhetorically that we could use
13 with the Chinese and see if we could move them towards more
14 cooperative aspects with the Philippines.

15 Admiral Harris: I agree with you there.

16 Senator Reed: Thank you.

17 Admiral Harris: There are several good examples just
18 in the Indo-Asia-Pacific where arbitration has worked, both
19 parties have given a little and gotten a lot, and the
20 overall picture in the region has been one of increased
21 civility rather than decreased stability.

22 Senator Reed: Thank you very much, Admiral.

23 Chairman McCain: Senator Inhofe?

24 Senator Inhofe: Admiral, I think what has happened in
25 the last few days has served as a wakeup call to the

1 American people. Of course, we had our hearing on Tuesday.
2 Four pretty smart people came to the same conclusion. We
3 have you today, and of course, we have what happened
4 yesterday at the White House, as well as other places in the
5 House.

6 But we actually talked about this, and it has been
7 obvious to those of us at this table that over a period of
8 time, North Korea has, going all the way, arguably, back to
9 the Scud, the times of the middle 1970s, progressing up to
10 the Nodong and the Taepodong 1 and Taepodong 2, and then
11 ultimately coming up to the statement that he makes that
12 declares that North Korea -- this is Kim Jong-un declares
13 that, quote, it is in final stages and preparations to test
14 an intercontinental ballistic missile.

15 So I think people now realize that it is an imminent
16 threat. And they really have not. I know that you deal in
17 military circles and you are dealing with people who know
18 what threat is. But those of us around this table are
19 dealing with the general public, many of whom do not
20 understand that.

21 So we had the hearing on Tuesday. They agreed that
22 North Korea currently represents the single most imminent --
23 they use "imminent" -- threat. Victor Cha testified, and
24 this was his quote. He said the pace of North Korea's
25 development shows that it wants to be able not just to field

1 one missile that could reach the United States but a whole
2 slew of them. And the panel all agreed on that. So we are
3 getting to really talking about serious things here.

4 You just now in response to a question or a comment by
5 the chairman said that it is not a matter of if, but a
6 matter of when.

7 And I think it is our job, and it is incumbent upon the
8 military as well as us to let the American people know the
9 nature of the threat that is out there.

10 Now, last year, Senator Rounds and I led a group to
11 your area, and we talked about some of the things that were
12 taking place at that time. And we came back and we had that
13 hearing that you referred to. In the hearing, you were
14 asked the question as to what are your needs there in terms
15 of resourcing yourself adequately to meet the threats. Let
16 us keep in mind that was a year ago, and the threat has
17 totally been enhanced since that time. What would those
18 needs be today as opposed to what we thought they were a
19 year ago?

20 Admiral Harris: Sir, last year, I commented that I had
21 the forces to fight tonight, to respond tonight to any
22 threat from North Korea or anywhere else for that matter.
23 And I still believe that today. I have the forces in place
24 to fight tonight if necessary.

25 What I am concerned about are those follow-on forces,

1 the forces themselves, and also how those follow-on forces
2 would get to the region in terms of airlift and sealift. So
3 I am worried about that.

4 I am also worried about things like small diameter
5 bombs and other kinds of munitions, anti-air warfare weapons
6 for our fighter aircraft, adequate numbers of AIM-9D and
7 AIM-120 missiles. I worry about the shortage of anti-ship
8 missiles, whether it is long-range anti-surface missiles,
9 more Tomahawk, whatever, but a long-range anti-surface
10 missile.

11 I would like to see a fifth SSN in Guam, but more than
12 the fifth SSN in Guam, our Nation is facing a significant
13 shortage in terms of submarine numbers. So as the combatant
14 commander, for example, I only get 50 percent of the
15 submarines that I think I need, but that is based on a 52-
16 submarine force, and by the end of 2020, the Navy projects
17 that attack submarine force will go down to 42. So my
18 requirements will not go down, but the pool from which they
19 will be sourced is going to drop dramatically. So I worry
20 about that significantly as I look at the threat from North
21 Korea, potential threat from China and from Russia.

22 Senator Inhofe: Yes. And we are going to be depending
23 on you to advise us in not generalities but as you are
24 getting into right now, priorities and the needs that you
25 have. And we will depend on that.

1 I am also encouraged that our allies are more
2 dependable than what they have been in the past. And is it
3 your impression that they see this threat that is out there
4 as we do? Does this open the door for maybe even more
5 allies coming in our direction?

6 Admiral Harris: I believe it does. If we define
7 allies as partners like you are talking, you know, we only
8 have five defense treaty allies in the world, and they are
9 all in the Indo-Asia-Pacific. We have other countries that
10 are close to us, that are partners with us. Singapore comes
11 to mind, for example, Malaysia, Indonesia, India, Vietnam.
12 These are countries that I think seek the United States as a
13 security partner of choice.

14 Senator Inhofe: Yes. Well, I appreciate that very
15 much.

16 My time has expired, but I would like to just ask one
17 more question. You made the statement we should cease to be
18 cautious about the language we use to describe these
19 activities. Can you define that a little bit for us?

20 Admiral Harris: I am not sure in what context you are
21 referring to.

22 Senator Inhofe: Okay. That was a quote. And I will
23 do that for the record and give you the context because it
24 is something that a lot of us did not understand.

25 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.

1 Senator Inhofe: Thank you very much.

2 Chairman McCain: Senator Nelson?

3 Senator Nelson: Admiral, thank you for your service,
4 and you are certainly in the center of the action.

5 Let me just reiterate here what you have said. You
6 said that the Korean leader is intent on accomplishing his
7 goals as a nuclearized nation. His goal is a nuclear
8 warhead -- these are my words, but I think it is what you
9 meant -- married to an ICBM that would have the capability
10 of getting to the U.S. And you said it is, in your opinion,
11 not a matter of if, it is a matter of when. Is that a
12 correct interpretation of what you have said?

13 Admiral Harris: It is correct, sir.

14 Senator Nelson: Okay.

15 And you also offered your opinion that you would not
16 bet that China can basically deter the DPRK. Is that
17 correct?

18 Admiral Harris: To be clear, I have felt in the past
19 that China, though it has the capability to influence and
20 affect North Korean behavior, for a number of reasons it has
21 chosen not to exert the full range of its influence.

22 And I think we are in a different place now. I think
23 the jury is out. It is early days. We will have to see if
24 China has changed its view of its willingness to influence
25 KJU.

1 Senator Nelson: Based on their previous activity,
2 there is no indication that you think that that is going to
3 occur, although you are hopeful.

4 Admiral Harris: Right, sir. I mean, past performance
5 is no indicator of future productivity. So up to a month or
6 2 ago, I would agree with that statement completely. After
7 all, I made the statement. But from a month ago forward, we
8 are seeing some positive behavior from China, and I am
9 encouraged by that. So I think we should let this thing
10 play out a little bit and see where it goes.

11 Now, part of that, though, Kim Jong-un and the North
12 Korean regime -- you know, they can do something
13 precipitative in the intervening period to test us. So we
14 have to be careful and sensitive to that as well.

15 Senator Nelson: Precisely.

16 So up to this point, has China done anything that would
17 give you an indication that they are going to be helpful to
18 the U.S. in getting the Leader to back off of his intent to
19 nuclearize an ICBM?

20 Admiral Harris: Sir, I do not know for a fact what
21 China has done in the last month or so. I know that they
22 are active in working the problem set, but I do not know the
23 specifics of what they have done. All I see are the
24 activities that Kim Jong-un has done in the last month or
25 so.

1 Senator Nelson: And that is still on his march to a
2 nuclearized ICBM.

3 Admiral Harris: I think it is, though in the last
4 month, he has not tested a nuclear weapon. So he has tested
5 five this century and he has not tested a sixth. He has not
6 launched an ICBM in the last month or ever. So I do not
7 know if there is a cause and effect or whether it just did
8 not fit his schedule. Again, it is early days on this. So
9 I think we would be best served to see if this has a
10 positive outcome or not and let President Xi work this issue
11 as he and the President said they agreed they would.

12 Senator Nelson: Sure.

13 But if China does not deter him, there is only one
14 deterrence left, and that is the U.S. kinetic action. Is
15 that what it looks like?

16 Admiral Harris: I do not want to say that there is
17 only that option left. I think if China's efforts fail,
18 then we are back to where we were, status quo ante, if you
19 will, to try to throw some Latin in there. And at that
20 point then, as the President has said, all options are on
21 the table. And I think he means just that: all options are
22 on the table. So my job in that framework is to provide
23 military options, but there are other options I am sure.
24 And I would leave it to those experts to come up with those
25 options. But my options are hard power options.

1 Senator Nelson: In your hard power options, you need
2 additional materiel.

3 Admiral Harris: I need additional materiel in the long
4 run, but that is not to suggest that the hard power options
5 that the U.S. military can provide the President would not
6 be effective tonight, and they would be effective tonight if
7 called upon to execute them.

8 Senator Nelson: Final question. There was a report in
9 the "Washington Post" -- I think it was David Ignatius --
10 several weeks ago in essence saying that the failures of the
11 North Korean launches are directly attributable to the U.S.
12 Is that anything that you want to talk about here?

13 Admiral Harris: No, sir. It is not anything I want to
14 talk about here.

15 Senator Nelson: Okay.

16 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17 Chairman McCain: Senator Wicker?

18 Senator Wicker: Admiral Harris, thank you for being
19 here.

20 As PACOM Commander, did you participate in authoring
21 the 2016 Force Structure Assessment?

22 Admiral Harris: I participated in the run-up to that.

23 Senator Wicker: Okay.

24 Well, the Force Structure Assessment called for a 355-
25 ship Navy, and in that regard, I want to follow up on a line

1 of questioning from Senator Inhofe and drill down on that.

2 Actually what the FSA said is that in a perfect world
3 unconstrained by the budget, the requirement is 653 ships
4 fleet-wide, but by accepting risk and understanding the
5 financial restrictions that we have, the requirement is 355
6 ships.

7 Now, I want to help you get the ships you need. I want
8 to help the Navy get the ships they need. And so when I am
9 told 355 ships is the requirement, I believe that.

10 Now, you mentioned to Senator Inhofe that you do not
11 have enough submarines. You also mentioned some ammunition
12 there. But let us talk about ships. How many submarines do
13 you have now and how many do you need?

14 Admiral Harris: Sir, I would prefer to give you those
15 in a different setting on precise numbers.

16 But I will say that I only get half of what I need. So
17 I have a stated requirement that is based on steady state
18 things that we do with our submarines today, and then I have
19 a requirement that is based on warfighting. So in our war
20 plans, these war plans state a requirement for X number of
21 submarines in Y number of days. So those are two kinds of
22 metrics. So you got a number of submarines that you need to
23 fight the war if it happens, and then you have got a number
24 of submarines that I need today to do the day-to-day
25 operations in the region. And in today's numbers, I get

1 about half of what my formally stated requirement is.

2 Senator Wicker: You get half of 52.

3 Admiral Harris: No, sir. I get half of my
4 requirement. 52 is the total number of attack submarines
5 that the Navy has. So my number of requirements is
6 irrespective of the number of submarines the Navy has, but
7 the number of submarines that I get are based on the number
8 of submarines the Navy has. It is not just me. It is all
9 the combatant commanders have these requirements, Central
10 Command, EUCOM, and every other COM.

11 Senator Wicker: Let me just ask you. If the Navy gets
12 its 355 ships and you get your portion of it, what will you
13 be capable of doing that you cannot do now?

14 Admiral Harris: The first thing is my steady state
15 requirements in order to do the things that we do today in
16 the climate that we are in will be much better. My fight
17 tonight forces that I have to have ready to respond to a
18 North Korean aggression or Chinese coercion or something
19 like that -- those forces will be more robust. Most
20 importantly, the follow-on and surge forces will be
21 available on shorter timelines. So today those follow-on
22 forces are delayed by any number of reasons, and that delay
23 is felt in terms of increased risk, longer timelines, and
24 increased depths of Americans. And if I have the number of
25 ships that the Navy is asking for and the number of jets the

1 Air Force is asking for and on and on, then both my ready to
2 fight tonight forces will be richer, the timelines to get
3 follow-on forces will be shortened, and the density of those
4 follow-on forces will be thicker.

5 Senator Wicker: Well, let me just say I think at some
6 point it is going to be helpful to this committee if you are
7 a little more specific about those details.

8 Let me just follow up on something that Chairman McCain
9 asked about. The threats that we have from North Korea now
10 -- there is the intercontinental ballistic missile. There
11 is a better chance than not that we could shoot that down if
12 that happened. There are these 4,000 short-range missiles.
13 And your testimony is that there is essentially no defense
14 from the South for those short-range missiles.

15 Admiral Harris: Those are not missiles. Those are
16 mostly artillery.

17 Senator Wicker: Artillery, okay. There is no defense.

18 Admiral Harris: Right. I mean, you are trying to
19 shoot down an artillery round.

20 Senator Wicker: And then the chairman asked you -- and
21 I do not think I understood the answer -- what does THAAD
22 get us.

23 Admiral Harris: THAAD allows us an intercept
24 capability to shoot down at the high altitude level
25 ballistic missiles that go from North Korea to South Korea.

1 It is a terminal high altitude area defense system aimed at
2 ballistic missiles from North Korea against South Korea. So
3 that is a short distance across the earth, but the missiles
4 have a high atmospheric altitude. And so that is what THAAD
5 gives you.

6 So THAAD is part of a system that the South Koreans
7 have. They have Patriot and they have the like. So that is
8 what those systems are designed for, to give an umbrella, if
9 you will, to protect South Korea.

10 Senator Wicker: It seems to me the chairman's point is
11 the dramatic point, and that is that there is this short-
12 range artillery and we have no defense should North Korea
13 decide to unleash those.

14 Admiral Harris: And I think we should develop that
15 capability.

16 Senator Wicker: Thank you.

17 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.

18 Chairman McCain: Senator Shaheen?

19 Senator Shaheen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

20 And, Admiral Harris, thank you very much for your
21 service to the country and for your leadership at this
22 challenging time.

23 One of the things that we heard from a panel of private
24 sector but some former officials on North Korea on Tuesday
25 was that the only impetus to encourage China to engage with

1 North Korea in the way that we would like in order to help
2 us get them to back down on their nuclear program would be
3 if we initiated much more extensive sanctions on China with
4 respect to their financial system or if they believed that
5 there was imminent threat of war on the Korean Peninsula.
6 Do you think that is an accurate analysis based on your
7 experience with China in the region?

8 Admiral Harris: Senator, I think it is an accurate
9 analysis. I think there is some room in the sanctions
10 regime, but there is not a lot left in there but there are
11 some and we should apply all of those that we can before we
12 are left with only the other choice.

13 Senator Shaheen: Again, to be clear, they were
14 suggesting that the sanctions should be on China on their
15 financial system.

16 Admiral Harris: There are some areas in the sanctions
17 regime that we have not yet explored, and I think we should
18 explore those before we do the kinetics.

19 Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

20 And everyone has acknowledged, obviously, that North
21 Korea is working towards a nuclear weapon, and that is one
22 of the things that has changed in North Korea. Have we seen
23 an escalation of rhetoric from Kim Jong-un or are we seeing
24 very much the same kinds of rhetoric but we are paying more
25 attention to it today because of the nuclear threat?

1 Admiral Harris: I think we are seeing increased
2 rhetoric. I mean, just this week, he threatened Australia.
3 This week, he said he was going to shoot out -- sink the
4 Carl Vinson with a single shot, which is ridiculous, but he
5 said it. And so he is increasing his rhetoric. At the same
6 time, he is continuing his aggressive weapons development.
7 So I think they are both going hand in hand. He had that
8 parade last week which showed off all the weapon systems and
9 stuff like that. So I think all of that in combination lets
10 me know and should let us all know that he is intent on his
11 objective and he is moving toward that objective apace.

12 Senator Shaheen: And how much of a concern is it that
13 at a time when we are trying to get China to work with us on
14 North Korea, we are also very concerned about what they are
15 doing in the South China Sea, their increasing effort to
16 expand control of the seas in Southeast Asia? How much of a
17 difficulty does that present for us as we are trying to work
18 with them?

19 Admiral Harris: As I said earlier, I do not think that
20 it poses too much of a difficulty for a Nation like the
21 United States. We should be able to compliment and applaud
22 China's efforts on the one hand and then be willing to
23 criticize them for the bad things they do on the other. And
24 I think from China's perspective, they can receive that
25 criticism and continue to do the thing that benefits not

1 just us but benefits them. A nuclear North Korea or the
2 U.S. response to a nuclear North Korea, as you said, affects
3 China almost as much as it would affect North Korea. So I
4 think it is in their best interest to do this and listen to
5 what the international community, not just the United
6 States, but the international community is saying about
7 this.

8 Senator Shaheen: So I appreciate that you have taken
9 responsibility for the Carl Vinson, and I understand as the
10 Commander you would do that. But as we are thinking about
11 the messages that we send to North Korea, to China, to both
12 our allies and enemies, how concerned should we be about
13 that kind of a mixed message? Yesterday, one of the things
14 that obviously got a lot of attention was the briefing at
15 the White House of all of the Senators, which I assume North
16 Korea watched very closely, as did most people. So how
17 should we think about being consistent about the messages
18 that we are sending to the region?

19 Admiral Harris: I agree with you. I think we should
20 be consistent. The messaging was my fault not simply
21 because I am the combatant commander, but it was my fault.
22 And so I take the responsibility for it.

23 What I said at the time was that we were going to pull
24 the Carl Vinson out of Singapore. We were going to truncate
25 the follow-on exercise that it was going to have with

1 Australia, cancel the Australian port visit, and then send
2 it to Northeast Asia. I did not specify a time in there.
3 There was a lot of press reporting on that that implied that
4 it was now, now, now. And I could have stepped in and
5 corrected that, and I did not. And I feel responsible for
6 that and I am remiss for not doing that. But that is all on
7 me. The messaging on this comes out of Pacific Command. So
8 I regret that it happened. I will try to do better, but it
9 is on me.

10 Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 Chairman McCain: Senator Fischer?

13 Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 Thank you, Admiral Harris, for being here today.

15 Some believe that our nuclear forces exist only to
16 deter a nuclear attack on the homeland here in the United
17 States, but I think the recent events on the Korean
18 Peninsula demonstrate the value of our extended deterrence
19 commitments and the role that our nuclear forces play in
20 assuring our allies of our resolve as well.

21 Can you talk about the value that our allies place on
22 our nuclear umbrella and the importance of modernizing our
23 nuclear forces so that we can continue to deter our
24 adversaries and also to reassure our allies?

25 Admiral Harris: Ma'am, I think our allies are as

1 dependent on our nuclear umbrella as we are. And I think
2 the shows of force that we provide against our adversaries
3 are important. We have the USS Michigan, a guided missile
4 SSGN -- it is not a ballistic missile deterrent, but it is a
5 guided missile submarine -- is in Busan, South Korea right
6 now. And I think that sends a powerful signal of solidarity
7 with our South Korean ally, and at the same time it shows
8 the North Koreans that we are serious about our defense
9 commitment to our ally on the peninsula.

10 I think that the modernizing of our nuclear deterrent
11 is absolutely critical to our Nation for our survival, and
12 that means the follow-on Ohio class submarines. That means
13 the long-range strike bomber and upgraded ground-based
14 ICBMs. And I think the three together, the triad, is a
15 proven success story. We should not experiment with some
16 other formula. It has worked so far, and I think it will
17 work well into the future. But we must commit as a Nation
18 to modernizing that force.

19 Senator Fischer: Thank you, sir. If we are going to
20 have the message of deterrence and assurance, we need to
21 stick to that modernization plan then. Correct?

22 Admiral Harris: Yes, ma'am.

23 Senator Fischer: Last year, General Scaparrotti, who
24 was then the Commander of the United States Forces in Korea,
25 stated that the ISR was his top readiness challenge. And he

1 said, quote, the United States Forces Korea requires
2 increased multi-discipline, persistent ISR capabilities to
3 maintain situational awareness and provide adequate decision
4 space for the USFK, PACOM, and national senior leaders.

5 Can you discuss how the ISR enables your operations in
6 the PACOM region and also in relation to the Korean
7 Peninsula specifically?

8 Admiral Harris: Yes, ma'am. And I will try to stay on
9 the right side of the classification here without getting
10 into too many specifics.

11 But ISR, intelligence, surveillance, and
12 reconnaissance, is the term that we apply to our ability to
13 watch our adversaries, and we want to watch them all the
14 time. But there is not enough ISR to go around to meet all
15 of the requirements of all of the combatant commanders. So
16 I have stated my requirements. This is like the submarine
17 discussion. Central Command, who is fighting the fight
18 today in the Middle East, AFRICOM in North Africa, and so on
19 -- they have their requirements for ISR also. So it comes
20 out of a pool, and all the services contribute to the pool
21 in different ways.

22 So I do not have what I need. I do not have the
23 ability to persistently watch my adversaries all over the
24 Indo-Asia-Pacific, over half the globe, 24/7. And I need it
25 24/7. I need it whatever 60 times 24 hours is. I need that

1 minute by minute, and I do not have that. That is what
2 General Scaparrotti was getting at, was persistent ISR. And
3 I am convinced that today, even though he is the European
4 Command Commander, he would like more ISR as well.

5 Senator Fischer: Can you give us some kind of idea on
6 what percentage of those requirements you have fulfilled, if
7 you have half? Do you have two-thirds?

8 Admiral Harris: No. I probably have a tenth of my
9 requirements are fulfilled.

10 Senator Fischer: Thank you, sir.

11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 Chairman McCain: Senator Peters?

13 Senator Peters: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14 And thank you, Admiral Harris, for your testimony here
15 today.

16 Admiral Harris, you referenced in your written
17 testimony that 9 out of 10 mega-cities in the world are in
18 the Pacific Command's area of responsibility, and certainly
19 given our conversation here today, Seoul is in the front and
20 center of what we are talking about. It is my understanding
21 that the number of mega-cities in the world is expected to
22 expand in the coming years, and I expect that growth will
23 continue in the Indo-Asia-Pacific theater as well.

24 And I am concerned, as well as I know a number of other
25 folks, that our military is not adequately prepared for

1 operations in mega-cities, so whether it is to fight or it
2 is to assist in humanitarian assistance or disaster relief
3 missions.

4 So I would like your opinion, Admiral, on how we should
5 conduct training, and do you believe that additional
6 training, particularly with the Army and Marine Corps,
7 should focus on operations within mega-cities?

8 Admiral Harris: Thanks, Senator. And just to be
9 clear, that 9 of 10 -- I stole a city from Joe Votel. One
10 of those cities is Karachi, Pakistan, which is in his AOR
11 but right next to mine.

12 I believe the Army and the Marine Corps are getting
13 after this issue of fighting in heavily urban terrains. And
14 I believe that they need to continue to do that for the
15 reasons you have outlined, but also we are working with our
16 allies and friends in the region to improve their capability
17 at the same time we are working to improve our capability to
18 fight in those dense urban environments.

19 Senator Peters: Admiral Harris, as you know, China's
20 One Belt, One Road strategy seeks to secure China's control
21 over its continental and maritime interests but with the
22 hopes of dominating Eurasia and exploiting natural resources
23 for future economic gains. Such designs place the country
24 at odds with the United States but also nations like Japan
25 and India. And currently China's economy budget is four

1 times greater than those of India. I want to talk a little
2 bit about India and its importance to us.

3 However, India is an ambitious and growing country both
4 in population and its economy. China and India naturally
5 have competing interests at stake on the continent and
6 adjoining maritime domain. India has expressed concerns
7 over China's recent expansion into the South China Sea and
8 perceived strategic goals in the region, also given the fact
9 that India is a democracy, certainly shares many values with
10 us here in the United States.

11 I would be curious as to how you view India's role in
12 the future in the Indo-Pacific region and what we should be
13 doing to strengthen that relationship and if there anything
14 in particular that you would like to see expanded so that we
15 can work more closely with our friends in India.

16 Admiral Harris: Thank you, sir.

17 I have made India a formal line of effort at Pacific
18 Command because I believe it represents a tremendous
19 opportunity for the United States at large and for PACOM in
20 particular in the mil-to-mil space.

21 We share democratic values with India. We are the
22 world's two largest democracies. We share cultural values
23 with Indian Americans that live and work and lead in our
24 country. And I think in the mil-to-mil space, we are in a
25 very good place and getting better. India is purchasing a

1 lot of American equipment. The world's second largest C-17
2 fleet, for example, is Indian. The Indians have P-8
3 Poseidon aircraft, U.S. helicopters, Howitzers, and on and
4 on. So I think there is a lot of opportunity there, and I
5 think we should continue to work that.

6 We are heavily involved -- when I say "we," the Navy is
7 heavily involved in working with the Indians on the
8 development of their aircraft carrier, their indigenous
9 aircraft carrier. And that is an exciting program. And I
10 think that India's geostrategic interests align perfectly
11 with ours in terms of being concerned about China and in
12 terms of the intersection of China and India, including
13 along their long land border but especially in the Indian
14 Ocean, especially in the approaches to the Indian Ocean, the
15 Andaman Islands and the like.

16 So I welcome an improved relationship with India. They
17 have invited me twice in the last 2 years to speak at their
18 Raisina Dialogue, which I have accepted, and I want to
19 continue to improve and grow the relationship between our
20 two countries.

21 Senator Peters: Thank you, Admiral.

22 Chairman McCain: Senator Cotton?

23 Senator Cotton: Admiral, welcome back. Thanks to you
24 and all the men and women you lead in Pacific Command.

25 I want to talk today about the strength of missile

1 forces in the Indo-Pacific. Given the vast distances in
2 that theater, missiles are a critical component of any
3 country's security, including ours.

4 How many of China's land-based missile forces do you
5 estimate have a range of 500 to 5,500 kilometers?

6 Admiral Harris: In an unclassified venue, Senator,
7 over 90 percent fall in that range.

8 Senator Cotton: And how many missiles do you have that
9 fall into that range?

10 Admiral Harris: I have none, sir.

11 Senator Cotton: You have none.

12 Admiral Harris: Right.

13 Senator Cotton: Why do you have none?

14 Admiral Harris: Because that range, 500 to 5,500
15 kilometers, is defined in the INF Treaty, the Intermediate
16 Nuclear Force Treaty, which prohibits nuclear and cruise
17 missiles and ICBMs -- or nuclear and conventional cruise and
18 ICBMs or ballistic missiles in that range. And we adhere to
19 the INF Treaty religiously, as we should. It is a treaty
20 that we signed on for.

21 China is not a signatory to the treaty. So they are
22 not obliged to follow that treaty, and we cannot
23 legitimately, in my opinion, criticize China for developing
24 weapons that contravene the treaty because they did not sign
25 onto it.

1 Senator Cotton: The only two parties to the treaty are
2 Russia and the United States.

3 Admiral Harris: That is correct. And there are some
4 successor states from the Soviet Union that the treaty
5 applies, but it is really us and Russia are the signatories
6 to the treaty. General Selva just testified recently that
7 Russia has violated the treaty in the conventional sense
8 with a conventional cruise missile. And so at the end of
9 the day, what you have is you have a treaty that binds
10 theoretically two countries, one of which violates it
11 without being held to account. The other adheres to it
12 rigidly, as it should. And then all the other countries in
13 the world are not obliged to follow the treaty, and they do
14 not. And those countries that are of concern, of course,
15 are China in my region and Iran in General Votel's.

16 Senator Cotton: Since you mentioned General Selva's
17 testimony, I think this is what you are referring to. He
18 spoke to the House Armed Services Committee last month in
19 which he said the Russians have deployed a land-based cruise
20 missile that violates the spirit and intent of the
21 Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and they do not
22 intend to return to compliance. Is that what you were
23 referring to?

24 Admiral Harris: It was, sir.

25 Senator Cotton: And you agree with that assessment?

1 Admiral Harris: I do.

2 Senator Cotton: And the INF Treaty was originally
3 reached between the United States and the Soviet Union after
4 the buildup of, first, Soviet forces in the late 1970s and
5 then our own forces, along with NATO, in 1983. So it was
6 geared primarily towards the European theater. Is that
7 correct?

8 Admiral Harris: It was geared toward the Soviet Union,
9 Senator, in a bipolar world. This was at the height of the
10 Cold War, and now we are in a multi-polar world where we
11 have a lot of countries that are developing these weapons,
12 including China that I worry about. And I worry about their
13 DF-21 and DF-26 missile programs, their anti-carrier
14 ballistic missile programs, if you will.

15 INF does not address missiles launched from ships or
16 airplanes, but it focuses on those land-based systems.

17 I think there is goodness in the INF Treaty. Anything
18 you can do to limit nuclear weapons at large is a general
19 good probably. But the aspects of the INF Treaty that limit
20 our ability to counter Chinese and other countries' cruise
21 missiles, land-based missiles, I think is problematic.

22 Senator Cotton: And as you say, since the United
23 States and Russia are the only two parties to the treaty and
24 you and General Selva and several other U.S. Government
25 officials have said that Russia is violating the treaty,

1 that means the United States is the only country in the
2 world -- the only country in the world -- that unilaterally
3 refuses to build missiles that have a range of 500 to 5,500
4 kilometers.

5 Admiral Harris: That is correct.

6 Senator Cotton: Do you think that we should consider
7 renegotiating or withdrawing from the treaty or declaring
8 Russia in material breach?

9 Admiral Harris: I would never advocate unilateral
10 withdrawing from the treaty because of the nuclear
11 limitation part of it. But I do think we should look at
12 renegotiating the treaty. We should consider that because,
13 as you say, there are only two countries that signed onto
14 it, and one of them does not follow it. So that becomes a
15 unilateral limitation on us.

16 Senator Cotton: So one final question then. There are
17 three scenarios. One is Russia comes back into compliance.
18 The United States and Russia comply. Two is we somehow
19 withdraw from or abrogate or declare Russia in material
20 breach so we are no longer unilaterally controlled. Or we
21 continue the status quo where we unilaterally are the only
22 country that refuses to develop those missiles. Surely,
23 whatever you think between one and two, we cannot accept
24 three going forward. Can we?

25 Admiral Harris: Right.

1 Senator Cotton: Thank you.

2 Senator Reed [presiding]: Thank you.

3 On behalf of the chairman, Senator Warren, please.

4 Senator Warren: Thank you, and thank you for being
5 here, Admiral Harris.

6 In your posture statement last year, you described the
7 Asia-Pacific rebalance as, quote, a strategic whole-of-
8 government effort that guides and reinforces our military
9 efforts integrating with diplomatic, political, and economic
10 initiatives. Do you still agree with that statement,
11 Admiral?

12 Admiral Harris: I do, ma'am. But, you know, we
13 labeled it "the rebalance" in the previous administration,
14 and in the early days of the previous administration, we
15 labeled it "the pivot."

16 Senator Warren: Yes.

17 Admiral Harris: I think the labeling of whatever it is
18 we do is less important than the whatever it is we do.

19 Senator Warren: And that is actually the part I wanted
20 to focus on because I agree with you on this.

21 I just have a simple question right here and that is
22 whether or not funding cuts to agencies that conduct
23 diplomacy and development and perform other civilian
24 functions would make your job easier or more difficult.

25 Admiral Harris: I believe it would make it more

1 difficult. I am reminded of what a famous French foreign
2 minister Talleyrand said to the head of the French army,
3 Marshal Ney -- he said when my profession fails, yours must
4 come to the rescue. I think that we are not in a good place
5 if we are that bifurcated, but also I believe if the State
6 Department fails earlier because of funding, then we will
7 have to, quote/unquote, come to the rescue sooner. And I
8 would rather push that off to the right rather than bring it
9 to the left.

10 Senator Warren: Yes. That is a very powerful point.

11 I just want to note for the record that the Trump
12 administration in its budget blueprint calls for about a 29
13 percent cut to the State Department and significant cuts to
14 other agencies with international responsibilities.
15 Obviously, there is a strong military component to the Asia-
16 Pacific and keeping us safe there, but as you say, it takes
17 a lot more in this vital region to keep us safe.

18 So I want to shift, if I can, to North Korea. We are
19 dealing here with a real threat from a dangerous, unstable
20 nuclear-armed state. And despite tough sanctions, North
21 Korea continues to be provocative. I am concerned that this
22 is a brewing crisis that would escalate without warning.

23 We went over to the White House yesterday, and the
24 administration said again that the time for strategic
25 patience is over. Now, I think it is still not clear

1 precisely what their new strategy is. By all accounts,
2 North Korea is continuing its effort to develop a nuclear-
3 armed intercontinental ballistic missile system that could
4 reach the continental U.S. coastline. And in recent days,
5 administration officials have talked about shooting down a
6 North Korean ballistic missile test.

7 So, Admiral, could you talk a little bit about the
8 strategic considerations that we must take into account
9 before taking such an action? What are the up sides and
10 down sides to shooting down one of their test missiles here?

11 Admiral Harris: There is a capability issue. There is
12 a geometry issue of where that missile is going and all of
13 that. So if they are launching a test missile that we think
14 is going to land in Korea or Japan, then I think we are
15 obligated to do what we can.

16 Senator Warren: I understand that. But just shooting
17 down a test missile in general. You know, as I understand
18 it -- I have been trying to read about this -- experts on
19 North Korea's war plans say that Kim Jong-un would likely
20 respond to U.S. military action with massive escalation
21 against South Korea, Japan, perhaps even the United States
22 if we shot down a test missile. So I am just asking. Do
23 you agree with that assessment? And if so, how is it that
24 the administration should take this dynamic into account as
25 it formulates its North Korea policy?

1 Admiral Harris: A lot of what you are asking, Senator,
2 is being deliberated in the administration now. I am in a
3 difficult position when asked to comment on ongoing process
4 deliberations. So I am going to defer on that.

5 But I will say that if we do not maintain credible
6 combat power to confront Kim Jong-un's testing and his
7 development goals, then we are going to be in a position to
8 be blackmailed by KJU. And I think that is probably a worst
9 place to be. And I think that we will all agree that
10 everything that has been done up to this point has not
11 worked in deterring Kim Jong-un. So all of the military
12 capabilities that we have, all of our alliances, and all of
13 that, have not deterred Kim Jong-un's desires to achieve a
14 nuclear weapon that can reach the United States. So we must
15 stop that somehow. And so those options I think are on the
16 table. All of those options are on the table.

17 Senator Warren: The "somehow," though, is the
18 question. And I see that I am out of time. So I am going
19 to quit here and we can continue this conversation later.
20 But that is precisely the question we are trying to ask
21 about and why it is that I am asking the question about what
22 the up sides and down sides are if we take action directly
23 on one of these testing missiles, whether or not it
24 escalates and this gives him provocation to invade South
25 Korea, to bomb Japan otherwise.

1 Admiral Harris: I think he can manufacture whatever
2 provocation he wants to attack South Korea or Japan or us.
3 I think that the manufacture of provocations resides with
4 him.

5 Senator Warren: I appreciate that, but I have to say
6 on this one, Admiral, I think that we need the
7 administration to be clearer about what they have in mind
8 here. You rightly say this is under discussion, but what
9 that means to me at this point is that no one knows exactly
10 what it is that we plan to do here. And if no one knows
11 here in the United States, if the American people do not
12 know, if Kim Jong-un does not have some idea of what the
13 response will be if he continues this testing, I think it is
14 difficult for it to have any kind of deterrent effect.

15 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 Chairman McCain: On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator
17 Ernst, please.

18 Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19 Admiral, thank you very much for being here today. I
20 know the region is in a really precarious time and
21 situation. But we do appreciate you taking time out to be
22 with us.

23 In a February speech, you warned the audience of the
24 perils of linear thinking, saying instead that we need to
25 think exponentially in order to develop strategies and

1 technologies that give us an asymmetric advantage over
2 regional threats. And I absolutely 100 percent agree with
3 you.

4 As chair of the Emerging Threats and Capabilities
5 Subcommittee, I am very, very frustrated with the oftentimes
6 slow and very, very expensive nature of our defense
7 acquisitions. You have even said this. You said that Lady
8 Gaga was able to use over 300 drones during her Super Bowl
9 halftime show, and why is it that she has that technological
10 advantage and we cannot capitalize on that.

11 How important is it that we are able to rapidly develop
12 things like directed energy weapons and swarming micro-
13 drones and, more importantly, if we had these technologies
14 today, would we have more and better options in order to
15 manage threats that are posed by North Korea and China?

16 Admiral Harris: So I think, Senator, that innovation,
17 in general, is one of those asymmetric advantages that
18 America enjoys over every adversary. But we are in a place
19 now where our adversaries recognize that, and they are
20 trying to close that innovation gap.

21 And they do it in a number of ways. They send their
22 best and brightest students to American universities, and
23 then they get educated here and they go back home and they
24 carry that knowledge back to them. They also do it
25 illegally. They steal our secrets. They steal our

1 industrial processes, and they shorten their acquisition
2 timelines dramatically. So they can field things at a rate
3 faster than we can.

4 And we are often encumbered, rightly so, by law,
5 regulation, and policy, and I think that we should look at
6 trying to figure out how to shorten that process. The law
7 is important, obviously. Regulations are important. Policy
8 is important. But when the three in combination allow us to
9 be overtaken in technological development by those countries
10 that would do us harm, I think we should step back and look
11 at that and ask ourselves is this the right way forward.

12 I am pleased with things like the DIUx effort that has
13 been undertaken by the Department, the SCO effort, the
14 Special Capabilities Office that resides in OSD to try to go
15 flash to bang quicker, and things like that.

16 Senator Ernst: Thank you. And I do agree. I think it
17 is important that we are able to move rapidly. And you are
18 absolutely correct about the regulations and the laws.
19 Great. They were there for a purpose, but we do have to go
20 back and I think scrutinize some of those regulations to
21 make sure that we are able to move as rapidly as some of our
22 near-peer competitors or even those that are not near-peer
23 competitors with off-the-shelf technology.

24 You mentioned ISIS in some of your comments, and in
25 your testimony, of course, active engagement between the

1 United States and our partner countries is very critical to
2 maintaining the stability in that region, not just with
3 those state actors like North Korea but also with partners,
4 engaging those partners in the fight against ISIS.

5 If you could, can you speak to the importance of
6 engaging some of those partners and how we are moving
7 forward in that fight against ISIS?

8 Admiral Harris: Sure. So in the Indo-Asia-Pacific,
9 the countries that we work closest with in the ISIS fight
10 are Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Bangladesh.
11 And that is us, Australia, and New Zealand that are involved
12 in this effort to work with those countries to help them
13 fight that threat themselves. And the entity that does that
14 for me is SOCPAC, Special Operations Command Pacific, and
15 Major General Bryan Fenton and his team are actively engaged
16 in providing advice and assistance to those countries, most
17 principally right now in the southern Philippines. So I am
18 encouraged by the work they are doing. I think it is God's
19 work and I am pleased with where we are in that fight in the
20 Indo-Asia-Pacific.

21 Senator Ernst: Thank you very much. Thank you,
22 Admiral.

23 Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24 Senator Reed: Senator Sullivan has to go to the floor
25 to preside. Senator Hirono has graciously yielded to

1 Senator Sullivan.

2 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and my
3 colleague, Senator Hirono, from Hawaii, I very much
4 appreciate letting me jump ahead.

5 In Alaska and Hawaii, we have a lot invested in this,
6 as you know, Admiral, given that our citizens are going to
7 be impacted sooner than anyone else with regard to the
8 intercontinental ballistic missile threat.

9 I just want to begin by thanking you again for your
10 service, Admiral.

11 Would you agree that we are clearly in a more direct
12 threat phase with regard to the North Korean challenge to
13 our citizens?

14 Admiral Harris: I agree, Senator.

15 Senator Sullivan: And we were all over at the White
16 House describing a strategy, integrated strategy, that the
17 administration is putting together with regard to very
18 focused initially on enhanced diplomacy. But do you also
19 believe that the threat of military force or at least
20 keeping it on the table actually enhances our diplomatic
21 efforts?

22 Admiral Harris: It does. I believe that the best
23 enhancement to diplomacy is a strong military capability.

24 Senator Sullivan: You mentioned the unprecedented
25 weapons testing. I have a chart that I want you to take a

1 look at and also not if but when North Korea will have a
2 capacity to range the continental United States. Again,
3 Alaska and Hawaii would be ranged earlier with the ICBM.
4 The chart shows that Kim Jong-un has actually conducted more
5 tests than his father and grandfather combined. Do you see
6 that abating at all?

7 Admiral Harris: I do not see it abating at all if the
8 trajectory remains as you have depicted it on the graphic.

9 Senator Sullivan: And he is learning even when he
10 fails.

11 Admiral Harris: Right, and he is not afraid to fail in
12 public.

13 Senator Sullivan: So one thing just for my colleagues
14 here, we are going to be working on a bipartisan enhanced
15 homeland missile defense bill, and I certainly think that is
16 in order and hopefully we will be able to get a number of
17 members on this committee to be cosponsors of that.

18 Admiral, I next want to turn to the South China Sea and
19 the issue of freedom of navigation operations. Earlier you
20 had mentioned at high level assurances that the Chinese were
21 not doing that. Standing next to the President in the rose
22 garden, President Xi stated, quote, China does not intend to
23 pursue the militarization of these islands. So what do you
24 make of that statement by the President of China?

25 Admiral Harris: I wanted to believe him.

1 Senator Sullivan: Since he made that I think it was a
2 year and a half ago, what has happened?

3 Admiral Harris: They have militarized the South China
4 Sea, sir.

5 Senator Sullivan: So despite the fact that the
6 president was standing next to our President, that was not
7 an accurate statement.

8 Admiral Harris: The reality is that China has
9 militarized the South China Sea.

10 Maybe it is the other graphic, but if you look at a
11 graphic of Fiery Cross Reef, you will see a 10,000-foot
12 runway, weapons emplacements, fighter aircraft hangars, and
13 barracks for troops. Clearly that facility which is 700
14 acres, a military facility -- all that capability does not
15 exist to rescue the odd fisherman that gets lost out there.

16 Senator Sullivan: This committee, as you know, has
17 been very interested in our policies and execution with
18 regard to freedom of navigation operations in the South
19 China Sea. The Trump administration is developing its own
20 policies. I was supportive of Secretary Carter's
21 pronouncements of flying, sailing, and operating anywhere
22 international law allows, but the execution of that was done
23 rather meekly.

24 Could you give us a sense as the new administration is
25 developing these policies, what principles they should be

1 looking at, the important role of whether we are doing it
2 under innocent passage or not? And also when you look at
3 this last graph, this last chart, you see that the
4 Scarborough Shoal has not been militarized yet, but it is
5 very strategic. And what would happen if that became
6 militarized by China? And what should we do to stop that
7 militarization? Should we draw a red line at that important
8 geographic point in the South China Sea? Just give us a
9 sense on those issues, innocent passage, allies, Scarborough
10 Shoal, what we should be looking at, what the new Trump
11 administration should be looking at in terms of their FONOPS
12 policy in the South China Sea.

13 Admiral Harris: So, Senator, I have made it clear to
14 this committee and other testimonies in other committees
15 that I am a supporter of freedom of navigation operations.
16 And I think we should do them not to send a signal about
17 territoriality or sovereignty or anything like that. We
18 should send a signal that we do, in fact, fly, sail, and
19 operate wherever international allows. And the freedom of
20 navigation operations exist just for that reason, to
21 exercise our freedom of navigation and the freedom of
22 navigation that is exercised or could be exercised by all
23 countries in the world.

24 So one of the beneficiaries of our freedom of
25 navigation operations in the South China Sea would be China,

1 for example, in other waters. And that is the right of all
2 nations to operate in accordance with international law. So
3 I believe we should continue to do those.

4 There is a whole range of them, whether you challenge
5 what is considered an illegal baseline claim, whether you do
6 innocent passage and do not notify a country who maintains
7 that you must notify them before you do an innocent passage,
8 or you can go within a 12-mile territorial limit of an
9 island or feature or whatever that does not deserve one
10 under international law. So there is any number of ways to
11 conduct freedom of navigation operations, and we should not
12 limit ourselves to any of those.

13 With regard to Scarborough Shoal, I think it is an
14 important part of this region for the reasons depicted on
15 that chart. It would give China a, quote/unquote, trifecta
16 of bases in the South China Sea with Woody Island, the
17 Paracels to the northwest, the Spratlys and their seven
18 bases there to the south, and then Scarborough Shoal would
19 give them a key base in the northeast. They have not done
20 that yet.

21 I hesitate to draw red lines. I think red lines are
22 problematic for a number of reasons, but we should
23 communicate clearly with China that we do not want them to
24 reclaim and then militarize Scarborough Shoal.

25 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Admiral.

1 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 Senator Reed: On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator
3 Hirono, please.

4 Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 Aloha, Admiral Harris. Always good to see you. Thank
6 you for your service.

7 There is a lot of focus, of course, on the ongoing and
8 the heightened threat from North Korea, and in light of
9 that, of course, I want to ensure that Hawaii is adequately
10 protected.

11 PMRF is a national treasure that cannot be replicated
12 anywhere else with its undersea and missile testing ranges.
13 There has been discussion about operationalizing Aegis
14 Ashore located at PMRF. Is Hawaii adequately protected at
15 this time given intelligence assessments of North Korea's
16 current capability and the missile defense systems we have
17 in place? And going forward, as North Korea's capabilities
18 advance, what will be needed to defend the U.S. and in
19 particular Hawaii from North Korean advancements?

20 Admiral Harris: Thanks, Senator. I agree with you
21 that Pacific Missile Range Facility on Kauai is a national
22 treasure. I have gone on record as supporting the idea that
23 we should develop and acquire a defensive Hawaii radar that
24 gives Hawaii the ability to see the space, if you will, in
25 the face of potential ballistic missile attacks. We have

1 the SBX. That is the X-band radar that sits on a self-
2 propelled oil platform that has to be sustained and
3 refurbished and all of that. And I think a land-based
4 permanent facility to do that -- a defensive Hawaii radar --
5 is necessary.

6 I believe today General Robinson will tell you that
7 Hawaii is adequately defended. I think in the future as
8 North Korea continues its weapons development program, that
9 we need to look at all ways to improve the defense of
10 Hawaii, including ground-based interceptors. I think we
11 should study putting ground-based interceptors in Hawaii. I
12 am not smart enough to know if we should or not, but I think
13 we should study it and I think that would be the complement
14 to a defensive Hawaii radar.

15 Senator Hirono: Do you have any sense as to the time
16 frame for moving from the radar capability that you say we
17 need to develop right now and going with the ground-based?

18 Admiral Harris: No, ma'am. I do not have an idea.

19 Senator Hirono: Thank you.

20 Congress has called for headquarters reductions in
21 recent years, and while I agree with reducing redundancy
22 where it makes sense and eliminating waste, I am not a fan
23 of salami sliced percentage cuts across headquarters
24 entities. So I am a strong advocate of taking a look at
25 each headquarters operations, the personnel mix, the

1 evolving threats and challenges that face us, as well as
2 previous growth of a particular headquarters before
3 recommending any cuts.

4 So as you mentioned in your testimony, PACOM has been
5 in its AOR for four of the five challenges which drive U.S.
6 defense planning and budgeting. So that is in your AOR.
7 Can you talk about PACOM headquarters in terms of staffing
8 levels over the last 20 years or so, reductions you have
9 taken or are about to be applied in light of the challenges
10 you face, including a hostile North Korea, a rising China,
11 Russia, and ISIS in your AOR? And how will actual and
12 proposed staffing reductions impact PACOM's ability to
13 succeed with all of the challenges you face?

14 Admiral Harris: Yes, ma'am. So over the past 40
15 years, PACOM has averaged less than 800 personnel, and that
16 is officers, enlisted personnel, and DOD civilians. We have
17 been pretty consistent over 40 years at that level, and
18 PACOM is the largest geographic combatant command with one
19 of the smallest staffs.

20 That said, I think we all should seek efficiencies
21 where we can, but I am not supportive of the idea of salami
22 slicing either. So across that 40 years of staff manning
23 levels at PACOM, the threat has increased because in that
24 intervening 40 years, we do not have a bipolar world
25 anymore. We have the threats I talked about in my

1 testimony, China, Russia, North Korea, and ISIS. So I
2 continue to -- and my staff -- we continue to work closely
3 with OSD, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint
4 Staff on our manning levels.

5 Senator Hirono: And I would like for us to be very
6 cognizant of the kind of impacts the across-the-board types
7 of cuts will have.

8 You have already mentioned -- if you do not mind, Mr.
9 Chairman, I would like to get to one more question. You
10 have already mentioned the support that you have for AFSEA.
11 In your written testimony, you state that you have concerns
12 about some of the changes made to security cooperation
13 authorities in the 2017 NDAA. And I just wanted to give you
14 an opportunity to tell us how these changes could impact the
15 DOD counternarcotic interests, national crime programs in
16 the PACOM AOR.

17 Admiral Harris: It could potentially, depending on how
18 the cuts are actually effected, it could dramatically affect
19 Joint Interagency Task Force West, which goes after
20 counternarcotics programs.

21 I am also concerned about programs like IMET,
22 International Military Education and Training, which I think
23 is one of the best foreign assistance programs out there
24 because that is where we bring foreign bright, up and coming
25 mid-grade officers to the United States for senior military

1 education for a year at a time with their families, and they
2 get immersed in American culture, ideas and living in an
3 environment where we practice daily civilian control of the
4 military. So I think it is important that we fund these
5 programs, and I am concerned if those programs were to be
6 cut.

7 Senator Hirono: Thank you for that.

8 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 Senator Reed: On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator
10 Rounds, please.

11 Senator Rounds: Thank you, sir.

12 Admiral, first of all, thank you for your service to
13 our country. I think the first time that we met was in
14 Hawaii. I was on Senator Inhofe's CODEL with him. And your
15 briefing to our CODEL that day was alarming, to say the
16 least, and an eye-opening with regard to the breadth, the
17 scope, the size of the area in which your team was
18 responsible for the security not just of our forces but in
19 conjunction with our allies as well.

20 One item that caught our attention at that time was
21 simply the time frame in which to respond to adversarial
22 activity. I would like to talk about some of the newer
23 technologies that are being employed or that may be very
24 well employed in the near future. In particular, when we
25 talk about the unique problem set that you have got there,

1 the trifecta of few land-based areas from which to operate
2 extreme distances, some of the most challenging and
3 contested environments to operate in, I believe the
4 deterrence value of long-range strike to hold targets at
5 risk, targets that are quickly becoming harder and harder to
6 access, what are your thoughts on the possibility of a
7 conventional warhead variant of the proposed long-range
8 stand-off weapon?

9 Admiral Harris: So, Senator, I think that we are going
10 to have to look at that in terms of INF because currently
11 that is the law, that is the treaty that we follow if you
12 are talking a land-based capability. We are not limited in
13 air and surface launch.

14 Senator Rounds: Thinking about air-launched --

15 Admiral Harris: I think we should explore all of that
16 because more capability against the threats we face is what
17 is needed in the Pacific Command.

18 Senator Rounds: What about with regard to hypersonics?
19 Right now I think in open source documents, there is some
20 pretty clear evidence that both Russia and China have been
21 looking at hypersonics, the ability to deliver weapons at
22 mach 5.0.

23 Admiral Harris: So I have to be careful when I talk
24 hypersonics in an open hearing. But I am concerned about
25 Chinese and Russian hypersonic weapons development, and I

1 have expressed those concerns in the right places.

2 Senator Rounds: Is this an area where perhaps our own
3 technology development needs to be reviewed in terms of our
4 ability to respond to those possible threats?

5 Admiral Harris: I think that we must improve our
6 ability to defend against and conduct -- defend against
7 hypersonic weapons and develop our own hypersonic weapons.
8 But, again, in the development of hypersonic weapons,
9 offensive hypersonic weapons, we are going to run up against
10 treaty restrictions.

11 Senator Rounds: We have been talking now about some
12 unique types of new weapon developments, both ours and
13 theirs. At the same time when we talk about readiness, it
14 seems that we get caught up and we assume that we are simply
15 being able to maintain the readiness that is necessary.

16 I would like to give you an opportunity to talk a
17 little bit about perhaps our lack of readiness in some
18 areas. In particular, I am thinking right now, as an
19 example, every time we get together with a team of experts
20 such as yourself, we hear some perhaps horror stories about
21 the inability to even take care of some of our existing
22 assets. In particular, I am going to draw attention to the
23 fact that we have got the USS Boise sitting at port, not in
24 depot but at port. Here is a nuclear-powered submarine,
25 which is not operational at this time, and I understand that

1 there are two other boats in the same category.

2 Can you give us any anecdotal or additional information
3 on other areas in which you have seen or have been
4 frustrated by our inability to maintain the readiness
5 necessary for you to do your mission?

6 Admiral Harris: So that is one of the issues that fall
7 into the service chiefs bailiwicks, if you will. Their
8 responsibility is to man, train, and equip the force for use
9 by the combatant commanders and meeting the national command
10 authority's responsibilities. So I too share your concerns
11 when I look across the enterprise, not just at the Navy but
12 across the enterprise, at shortfalls in follow-on force and
13 surge force readiness.

14 Senator Rounds: Are you prepared to give us any
15 examples?

16 Admiral Harris: No, sir, not in this hearing.

17 Senator Rounds: All right. Thank you, sir.

18 Admiral Harris: Thank you, sir.

19 Senator Rounds: Once again, thank you for your
20 service, sir.

21 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.

22 Senator Reed: Thank you.

23 On behalf of the chairman, let me recognize Senator
24 Donnelly.

25 Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 And, Admiral, thank you so much for your service to the
2 country.

3 When we were home here in the Senate working in our
4 States was when this developed with the aircraft carrier.
5 And so based on the words of the President and Secretary
6 Mattis, I spent that time in meeting after meeting with
7 people in Indiana telling them how serious we take this
8 North Korea situation and telling them we take it so serious
9 that we have our aircraft carrier, the Carl Vinson, heading
10 to North Korea right now. It turned out that was wrong. I
11 felt misled and I think my constituents were misled as well.

12 And what I do not understand is that when those
13 comments were made, how nobody said anything that, hey, this
14 is wrong. This is not correct. And so my question is how
15 do we make sure this does not happen again. And I know
16 other members asked about this as well. But I do not want
17 to be in a position of having the people in my State think
18 one thing and the reality is something else when we all take
19 a pledge that we will speak truth to power, that if we see
20 something that is not correct, we will tell people. We will
21 let them know. You know, I have a great concern about that.

22 Admiral Harris: Sir, I cannot say I am sorry enough,
23 but I will try --

24 Senator Donnelly: No. I am not asking you to say you
25 are sorry.

1 Admiral Harris: I am accountable for and responsible
2 for the messaging that came out of that Carl Vinson issue.
3 But at the end of the day, what we said was the Carl Vinson
4 was leaving Singapore, truncating its exercise, canceling
5 its port visit, and heading to Northeast Asia. And that is
6 where it is today. It is within striking range of North
7 Korea if the President were to call on it.

8 Now, that messaging was not done well, and that
9 messaging is on me.

10 Senator Donnelly: Actually it was -- we heard the
11 President and Secretary Mattis say exercises are being
12 canceled. It is heading to North Korea right now. Some day
13 I am going to the cemetery. I hope it is not next week. I
14 hope it is not next year. But at some point I am going to
15 the cemetery. So I would say I am going to the cemetery.
16 That is technically correct. But I just want to make sure
17 that the information I give to the people in my State is
18 accurate, and if you can make sure, if you see something
19 that you look at and you go, look, this really seems
20 sideways, that it be communicated right away so that the
21 people of this country actually know what is going on and
22 our allies know what is going on.

23 Have you seen any sanctions against North Korea that
24 have worked or that have slowed down Kim Jong-un's efforts?

25 Admiral Harris: None.

1 Senator Donnelly: None.

2 Have you seen in the last month or the last couple of
3 months Kim Jong-un slow down his efforts to achieve his
4 goals of mating up the nuclear warhead with missiles?

5 Admiral Harris: I have not seen anything in the last
6 -- since I have been at Pacific Command. In the last month,
7 though, since President Trump and President Xi got together
8 and President Xi and China seemed to be more willing to
9 exercise their influence on North Korea, North Korea has not
10 done any of the testing that Senator Sullivan showed on his
11 graph, the bad testing, the nuclear test or ICBM testing.
12 And I think it is early days yet to draw a direct
13 correlation. I think we are going to have to wait and see
14 and give President Xi and China a chance, assuming that in
15 that interim period, Kim Jong-un does not do a nuclear test
16 or an ICBM test or something like that.

17 Senator Donnelly: What is your understanding -- and by
18 that I mean PACOM's understanding -- of China's biggest
19 influence point pushing back against North Korea where North
20 Korea will pay attention?

21 Admiral Harris: Where China's?

22 Senator Donnelly: Where China's biggest strength to
23 slow down North Korea and their efforts is.

24 Admiral Harris: I think their biggest strength in
25 doing that is economic. 80 percent of North Korea's economy

1 is China-based. 80 percent. So I think China has a
2 powerful lever to apply on North Korea. And from China's
3 perspective, you know, they are concerned about two things.
4 They are concerned about a unified Korean Peninsula that is
5 aligned with the United States, and they are worried about
6 refugees, should North Korea collapse precipitously.

7 Senator Donnelly: The time went by so fast. I have a
8 million more questions for you, but I will only ask one more
9 and that is the rules of engagement for our ships. Are any
10 of our ships sailing solo right now near North Korean
11 waters? And if so, do we have a plan that if they are
12 intercepted or engaged, that we have air cover for them
13 immediately, that we have fellow ships coming by immediately
14 so that they are protected and we do not have another Pueblo
15 type situation?

16 Admiral Harris: That is a great question. And all of
17 our ships that are operating in the Sea of Japan east sea
18 area operate under standing rules of engagement. And they
19 have what they need in my opinion and belief to defend
20 themselves.

21 Senator Donnelly: Thank you.

22 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23 Senator Reed: On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator
24 Perdue, please.

25 Senator Perdue: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1 Admiral, thank you and thank you for all the men and
2 women in your theater.

3 You know, since the Barbary pirates and our first spy
4 frigates, the United States has always dealt with our
5 foreign policy and our national interest from a position of
6 strength. I am very concerned, as we sit here today, that
7 we are in the middle of a paradigm shift relative to the
8 other super powers.

9 In your mind since 2000, China has spent or is spending
10 today approximately six times more on their military. And
11 these are constant dollars, 2016 dollars. Is that
12 directionally correct in your mind, about six times compared
13 to just 15 years ago?

14 Admiral Harris: Probably, sir, but I do not have the
15 data. But I have sent the curve, and the curve is dramatic
16 in the amount of defense spending that they are doing based
17 on just what they tell us and they are probably spending
18 higher.

19 Senator Perdue: Well, that is what I want to get to.
20 The Stockholm International Peace Research Institute -- and
21 I believe that China is spending more than even these
22 numbers reveal. That is an 11 percent compound annual
23 growth rate just since 2000.

24 Here is the real problem. In 2017, they are going to
25 spend about \$240 billion, but adjusting for purchase power

1 parity, in real terms, apples to apples to the United
2 States, that is \$826 billion compared to our \$630 billion.
3 Directionally would you think that is reasonable to look at
4 it that way?

5 Admiral Harris: I think it would be. We have looked
6 at purchasing power parity in a general sense with regard to
7 China, and they reached that purchasing power parity point
8 already in comparison with the United States.

9 Senator Perdue: I lived over there. I have
10 manufactured over there. I have sold over there. And when
11 you adjust the currency and the ability that they have to
12 buy their weapons and their systems cheaper than we are and
13 I look at the developments just this year -- you know, you
14 educated me a year or so ago about their DF-26, the carrier
15 killer, the first aircraft was coming online this year, the
16 fact that 95 percent of their missiles violate the INF
17 Treaty, and that they far outrange our capabilities today.
18 Would you say today, sir, that China is on parity with the
19 United States military capability in the Pacific region?

20 Admiral Harris: I would not in terms of our asymmetric
21 advantages and the quality of our equipment and our people.
22 That said, quantity has a quality all its own, and they are
23 swiftly moving to exceed the United States in terms of
24 numbers of ships and submarines and aircraft and the like.
25 So we have to continue to work and resource those asymmetric

1 advantages that we have. And certainly China is trying to
2 close that gap in every regime.

3 Senator Perdue: So within the next 5 years, if you
4 continue that trajectory, there is every reason to believe
5 on a purchasing power parity basis that they will actually
6 double the amount of investment that we have in the
7 military. That is just a projection.

8 But what I am concerned about is this. Independent of
9 the money, I believe we have a supply chain war. You have
10 talked about it today. It takes us much longer. It is much
11 more expensive. We have many more regulations to go
12 through. Tell us what we can do to help you as a combatant
13 commander compete in the supply chain war that you have to
14 deal with as well. Your quote here today is I do not have
15 what I need today against the current threats. And we know
16 that their threats are only going to increase geometrically
17 over the next 5 to 10 years. I believe they have got a 2025
18 strategy, and I am very concerned. You have talked about
19 that as well. Tell us what we can do to help you, sir.

20 Admiral Harris: Senator, I think that the best thing
21 that the Congress can do to help me today is end
22 sequestration and give us a budget.

23 Senator Perdue: When you look at the China strategy in
24 the Southeast Asia region, particularly in the South China
25 Sea, it is pretty easy. You have said they militarized it.

1 I agree with that. What are there intentions for that outer
2 ring of islands? It looks like the next level of national
3 interest -- I am talking about Marianas and Guam, all the
4 way to Palau in that area. Have you see any indications now
5 that they have sights on those as well?

6 Admiral Harris: Not indications like what we are
7 seeing in the South China Sea where they are doing land
8 reclamation activities and that kind of stuff, island
9 building. But they are working to influence countries in
10 that region, small island nations, economically to bring
11 them in line with their world view.

12 Senator Perdue: Two last questions real quick. Are
13 you concerned about the PLA's recent reorganization? And
14 then also the Russia-China cooperation is at a higher level
15 now than it has been in 30 years. Are you concerned about
16 those two developments?

17 Admiral Harris: I am concerned about the former, which
18 is the PLA's reorganization into joint theater commands. So
19 we went through a period of joint integration, if you will,
20 as a result of the Goldwater-Nichols Act in the late 1980s
21 -- mid 1980s. And since then I think we have become a much
22 more effective joint fighting force across our military.
23 And I think China is learning from that. They watch it,
24 they study. And they are going to this theater joint
25 combined command structure. And I think that will make them

1 better. It certainly made us better. And I worry about
2 that.

3 And then your second question?

4 Senator Perdue: The Russia-China cooperation, their
5 military cooperation.

6 Admiral Harris: I think that is more temporary because
7 they need each other right now more than anything else. And
8 I would not be concerned about a long-term alliance with
9 Russia and China if history is a guide.

10 Senator Perdue: Thank you, sir.

11 Admiral Harris: Thank you.

12 Senator Reed: On behalf of the chairman, Senator
13 Blumenthal, please.

14 Senator Blumenthal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15 And thank you, sir, for being with us again, and thank
16 you to you and the men and women under your command for
17 their extraordinary service to our Nation.

18 When you were here last year, you told me that you were
19 concerned about Russian and Chinese undersea warfare
20 capabilities, specifically their modernized submarines. And
21 you noted, number one, the Russians took no break from
22 developing submarine capability following the Cold War and
23 they have ballistic missile submarines now in their force
24 fleet in the Pacific. Number two, the Chinese are building
25 a new class of such submarines that may have the capability

1 to threaten us. And you also told us that your submarine
2 requirement in PACOM still has not been met.

3 In your testimony this year, you mentioned a second
4 ballistic missile submarine in the Pacific and the Russians
5 plan to build and send six new attack submarines to the
6 Pacific by 2021. And you state -- I am quoting -- potential
7 adversary submarine activity has tripled from 2008 levels --
8 tripled -- requiring a corresponding increase of U.S.
9 activity to maintain undersea superiority. End quote.

10 You, I think, support the Navy's 2016 force structure
11 assessment which calls for an increase from 48 to 66 attack
12 submarines as part of a larger 355-ship Navy. In February,
13 Acting Secretary of the Navy Sean Stackley submitted to
14 Secretary Mattis an accelerated fleet plan which supports
15 three additional Virginia submarines, one more in fiscal
16 year 2021, fiscal year 2022, and fiscal year 2023,
17 respectively. Are you supportive of this accelerated plan,
18 and do you believe that it will give you, give our Nation
19 the necessary capability to address these looming and
20 increasing threats from both Russia and China in the
21 Pacific?

22 Admiral Harris: Sure, sir. I am completely supportive
23 of the plan, and I am completely supportive of the effort to
24 move to the left construction of these Virginia class
25 submarines. They will clearly increase our Nation's

1 capability and, if assigned to PACOM, PACOM's capability.
2 But three or four are inadequate in the grand scheme based
3 simply on my requirements, which have to be adjudicated with
4 the requirements of all the other combatant commands who
5 have legitimate needs for submarines in their regions as
6 well.

7 Senator Blumenthal: Can you give us an assessment of
8 our adversaries' anti-submarine warfare capability?

9 Admiral Harris: So today the U.S. reigns supreme in
10 the undersea realm and in anti-submarine warfare. But our
11 adversaries, particularly China and Russia, are closing that
12 gap because they understand that the gap exists and they are
13 working to reduce our asymmetric advantage. I think that we
14 have to continue to keep that advantage. I do not want it
15 to be a fair fight if we have to go into a fight with these
16 folks. That means that we have to continue to resource the
17 development and to continue development of our undersea
18 capability and our anti-submarine warfare capabilities.

19 Senator Blumenthal: Does North Korea have significant
20 anti-submarine warfare capability?

21 Admiral Harris: They do not.

22 Senator Blumenthal: And are they developing that
23 capability?

24 Admiral Harris: They are working on it. They are
25 trying. They have submarines. They have a lot of them, a

1 lot smaller submarines. They are diesels. And they have an
2 SSB which is a ballistic missile capable diesel submarine.
3 And so they recognize the advantages and what the submarine
4 gives them in terms of warfighting, but they are a long way
5 from developing a submarine force that is comparable to any
6 other country that we talk about in the region.

7 Senator Blumenthal: On the F-35, in your testimony you
8 note, quote, the forward stationing and deployment of the
9 fifth generation airframes to the region continues to be a
10 priority for your command. Do you continue to believe that
11 the F-35 is necessary in that part of the world for the
12 defense of our allies? Japan is going to be acquiring them
13 and others.

14 Admiral Harris: Senator, I believe that the F-35 is
15 critical most in PACOM than any other region of the world
16 because of the threat that we face and what the F-35 brings
17 to the fight. And the F-22's also from Hawaii and Alaska.
18 And so those fifth generation fighters will allow us to get
19 inside the A2/AD, area denial/area defense, capabilities of
20 our adversaries, particularly China and the region. We are
21 going to need fifth generation fighters to get in there, and
22 they provide that.

23 Senator Blumenthal: Thank you very much, Admiral.
24 Thanks for your great work at PACOM and throughout your
25 career. Thank you.

1 Senator Reed: On behalf of the chairman, Senator
2 Graham, please.

3 Senator Graham: Thank you.

4 Admiral, I want to echo that, to thank you for your
5 service and all those who are with you here today and in
6 your command.

7 Is China's activity in the South China Sea, in terms of
8 militarizing the region, getting better or worse or about
9 the same?

10 Admiral Harris: I am not sure what better means, but
11 they are militarizing more now than they were last year.

12 Senator Graham: I would say that is worse.

13 Admiral Harris: From our perspective, that is worse.

14 Senator Graham: Did they understand that we are
15 serious about that is a bad thing?

16 Admiral Harris: I believe they are.

17 Senator Graham: And they apparently do not care.

18 Admiral Harris: To date.

19 Senator Graham: So how do we make them care?

20 Admiral Harris: I think we have to demonstrate
21 credible combat power on the one hand and powerful diplomacy
22 on the other.

23 Senator Graham: Is it fair to say that unless
24 something changes, North Korea is likely to have an ICBM
25 with a nuclear warhead that can reach America by 2020?

1 Admiral Harris: I do not want to put a timeline on
2 that, sir, in this hearing. But it is safe to say that they
3 will have one soon. They will match rhetoric to
4 capabilities.

5 Senator Graham: Okay, great.

6 Why do they want that missile?

7 Admiral Harris: I beg your pardon?

8 Senator Graham: What is the purpose of having that
9 missile?

10 Admiral Harris: One, they want to be recognized as a
11 nuclear power, and two, they want to ensure their survival.

12 Senator Graham: In their mind, it is an insurance
13 policy?

14 Admiral Harris: Partly.

15 Senator Graham: From an American point of view, what
16 kind of threat does that present to us?

17 Admiral Harris: It presents today, even though I do
18 not believe they have the full capability today, they
19 threaten the 28,000 American troops in South Korea plus
20 their families, 55,000 American troops plus their families
21 in Japan, our South Korean and Japanese allies and --

22 Senator Graham: What about the homeland? If they get
23 an ICBM with a nuclear weapon attached, what kind of threat
24 do you see at the homeland?

25 Admiral Harris: Depending on the nuclear weapon,

1 depending on the missile, it could reach the eastern
2 seaboard. They could reach us right here in this building.

3 Senator Graham: Is it fair to say that is what they
4 want to do in the western part of the United States?
5 California is probably an easier target initially.

6 Admiral Harris: I believe they want to be able to
7 threaten the United States.

8 Senator Graham: Well, what kind of threat would that
9 be to us? That would be a bad thing. Right?

10 Admiral Harris: That would be a terrible thing, sir.

11 Senator Graham: So do you believe it should be the
12 policy of the United States never to let that happen?

13 Admiral Harris: I beg your pardon?

14 Senator Graham: It should be the policy of the United
15 States to never allow North Korea to develop an ICBM with a
16 warhead that could hit America.

17 Admiral Harris: I believe that is correct.

18 Senator Graham: Do you believe that the only way they
19 will change that policy -- their desire -- is if they
20 believe that the regime could be taken down by us if they
21 continue to develop an ICBM? Without credible military
22 threat in the mind of North Koreans, they are going to plow
23 ahead.

24 Admiral Harris: I believe that generally, but I
25 believe that China might be able to exert its influence.

1 Senator Graham: Do you believe China could change
2 North Korea's behavior absent a belief by North Korea that
3 we would use military force to stop their ICBM program?

4 Admiral Harris: I do not.

5 Senator Graham: Do you believe that China would act
6 stronger and more bold if they believed credible military
7 force was on the table to stop North Korea?

8 Admiral Harris: I do.

9 Senator Graham: So it seems to me that the policy of
10 the United States, given the Admiral's advice -- and you are
11 really good at what you do -- that we should all agree that
12 it is not good for America for North Korea to have an ICBM
13 with a warhead attached, and it is really not good for
14 China. Is it?

15 Admiral Harris: I believe it is not good for China.

16 Senator Graham: Why do they not believe that?

17 Admiral Harris: Because they have their own calculus,
18 their own --

19 Senator Graham: Do you think they are beginning to
20 reshape their calculus in light of our reaction to North
21 Korea?

22 Admiral Harris: I hope so, but it is early days.

23 Senator Graham: In terms of China -- leverage on North
24 Korea, you said it was substantial.

25 Admiral Harris: Their leverage is potentially

1 substantial.

2 Senator Graham: The best way to avoid a military
3 conflict with North Korea over their missile program is for
4 China to wake up North Korea to the reality of what threat
5 that presents to North Korea and China. Is that fair to
6 say?

7 Admiral Harris: That is fair to say.

8 Senator Graham: Is it also fair to say that we do not
9 have any intentions of invading North Korea at all? Nobody
10 has told you get ready to invade North Korea.

11 Admiral Harris: That is not fair to say, sir. I
12 believe the President has said that all options are on the
13 table.

14 Senator Graham: Yes, but I mean we are not going to
15 just go in and take North Korea down.

16 Admiral Harris: Sir, I do not want to get into what we
17 could or could not do.

18 Senator Graham: Well, North Korea thinks we are going
19 to invade at any moment. Do you think that is part of our
20 national security strategy is without provocation to attack
21 North Korea?

22 Admiral Harris: I think North Korea has provided
23 provocation already in terms of --

24 Senator Graham: But without provocation, it is not our
25 policy to attack North Korea.

1 Admiral Harris: They have provoked us already, sir.

2 Senator Graham: I said but if they stopped it, they do
3 not have anything to worry about.

4 Admiral Harris: Then we will have to look at it.

5 Senator Graham: That is all I am saying.

6 Admiral Harris: That is a decision that --

7 Senator Graham: If North Korea is listening, none of
8 us want to invade your country.

9 Senator McCaskill: They are.

10 Senator Graham: Okay, well, good.

11 So here is the point. All of this military force going
12 that way is to deter them from being able to hit us and
13 protect our allies. Right?

14 Admiral Harris: Right.

15 Senator Graham: We are trying to deter them from
16 hurting us. We are not sending a bunch of people over there
17 to invade their country without provocation. Is that fair
18 to say?

19 Admiral Harris: Right.

20 Senator Graham: Good. I hope they understand that and
21 I hope China understands that.

22 Thank you.

23 Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.

24 Senator Reed: On behalf of the chairman, Senator
25 McCaskill, please.

1 Senator McCaskill: Thank you.

2 Last year, Admiral, General Scaparrotti testified at
3 this hearing that North Korea has one of the largest
4 chemical and biological weapons stockpiles and research
5 programs in the world. Do you agree with that assessment?

6 Admiral Harris: I do.

7 Senator McCaskill: And do you believe that the facts
8 that we know about the death of the half brother to Kim
9 Jong-un was likely assassinated with VX nerve agent?

10 Admiral Harris: I do, Senator. That is just based on
11 open source reporting.

12 Senator McCaskill: Right.

13 So we have not confirmed that it was used.

14 Admiral Harris: I beg your pardon?

15 Senator McCaskill: We have not independently confirmed
16 that it was used.

17 Admiral Harris: I have not seen reporting to reflect
18 that.

19 Senator McCaskill: So do you know enough about their
20 delivery capabilities of chemical and biological weapons at
21 this point to adequately be prepared to defend our allies
22 and our American soldiers and families in the surrounding
23 vicinities?

24 Admiral Harris: I do not know enough about all of
25 their capabilities, including those that we saw or probably

1 saw in Malaysia. So I think that is part of the readiness
2 calculus that we have to go through when we consider the
3 threat from North Korea.

4 Senator McCaskill: Do you have the appropriate CBRN,
5 which is an acronym for the record that is our defense,
6 equipment necessary for chemical and biological attacks?

7 Admiral Harris: I believe that General Brooks does
8 have that for the forces that are in Korea now.

9 Senator McCaskill: Okay. What about in Japan?

10 Admiral Harris: I cannot speak to that.

11 Senator McCaskill: I would love a follow-up on that.

12 Admiral Harris: Yes, ma'am.

13 Senator McCaskill: You know, we do chem stuff at Fort
14 Leonard Wood in Missouri. It is our biological defense
15 center, and I am concerned if they are using nerve agents to
16 kill family members, they certainly are not going to
17 hesitate to use nerve agents to kill American soldiers and
18 our South Korean allies and innocent citizens. So I would
19 like to follow up on that.

20 [The information follows:]

21 [COMMITTEE INSERT]

22

23

24

25

1 Admiral Harris: You bet.

2 Senator McCaskill: Do you think we should deploy THAAD
3 to Japan?

4 Admiral Harris: I believe that is a decision that
5 Japan is going to have to make. I think that Japan should
6 have some kind of a system like that, but whether it is
7 THAAD or Aegis Ashore or both or some other system, they are
8 going to have to make that decision.

9 Senator McCaskill: As you know, I had the opportunity
10 to take an exhausting tour of all of our anti-ballistic
11 missile systems last year, and you kindly hosted us when we
12 were at PACOM, but had a chance to be in both South Korea to
13 see Patriot systems, understand that THAAD was going in and
14 also, obviously, in Guam to observe the THAAD. I just want
15 to make sure we know what the needs are in terms of THAAD in
16 light of what North Korea is up to.

17 Admiral Harris: So we work with Japan and describe the
18 capability that THAAD would provide that would give them
19 also Aegis Ashore and potentially other systems. So that
20 will be a Japanese decision. It could be --

21 Senator McCaskill: We indicated to them that we would
22 be cooperative in trying to deploy THAAD to Japan.

23 Admiral Harris: Right.

24 Senator McCaskill: Okay.

25 Admiral Harris: To be clear on that, I have not

1 reached an agreement with Japan on deploying THAAD.

2 Senator McCaskill: Right.

3 Admiral Harris: But that is a different issue than
4 your initial question, which was should Japan buy THAAD.

5 Senator McCaskill: Right.

6 Admiral Harris: So if they buy it, then it is theirs
7 and it relieves me of the burden of having to deploy it and
8 the joint force.

9 Senator McCaskill: Right.

10 Admiral Harris: So I think that whole decision,
11 whether they buy THAAD or Aegis Ashore or asks us to support
12 them or whatever, that is a decision yet to be made.

13 Senator McCaskill: It seems to me that the discussion
14 that we are trying to have about pressure on China to do the
15 right thing, especially in light of what I learned from you
16 in terms of China's activities, the militarization in the
17 South China Sea, that the more talk we have publicly about
18 THAAD more places, I think the more it behooves what I think
19 is our policy right now as it relates to North Korea.

20 Very quickly. I do not think anybody has touched on
21 what I have been really confused by and worried by in light
22 of how important the Philippines is to the United States
23 military. Could you assess the current situation of the
24 U.S.-Philippines relations? Because I know what strategic
25 importance those islands have to your capability of

1 defending United States of America.

2 Admiral Harris: So, ma'am, I believe that we are in a
3 reasonably good place in the mil-to-mil space with our
4 forces in the Philippines, AFP, if you will. So we have a
5 range of activities that we continue to do with the AFP,
6 including Balikatan, which is the big exercise that kicks
7 off next month in May.

8 Our EDCA, that is Enhanced Defense Cooperation
9 Agreement -- that is the five Philippine bases that we have
10 agreed with the Government of the Philippines to improve in
11 some cases for us to use. That is proceeding apace.

12 Most importantly, our Special Operations Command folks
13 are active in the southern Philippines to combat terrorism
14 in conjunction with and in support of the armed forces of
15 the Philippines. So our guys are doing the advising and
16 assisting but not the direct action. That is the
17 responsibility of the armed forces of the Philippines there,
18 and I think that is working.

19 Senator McCaskill: So Duterte is not having a negative
20 impact on the mil-to-mil relationship is what you are
21 telling me.

22 Admiral Harris: Yes, ma'am.

23 Senator McCaskill: Well, that is reassuring because he
24 kind of goes in the category with Kim Jong-un in terms of
25 what the hell. Right?

1 Admiral Harris: We are in a good place in the mil-to-
2 mil space with the Philippines.

3 Senator McCaskill: Right. Thank you.

4 Chairman McCain [presiding]: Senator King?

5 Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 First, sort of parenthetically your exchange with
7 Senator Ernst about the importance of innovation, the center
8 of innovation in this country is, of course, Silicon Valley
9 and those innovative industries that are located in other
10 parts of the country. We had testimony a couple months ago
11 that Silicon Valley essentially will not deal with the
12 Defense Department because of the, I would call it,
13 Byzantine -- but that would be an insult to the Byzantine
14 Empire -- the cumbersome and slow process in our
15 procurement. That is an urgent national priority in my
16 opinion. And I just wanted to echo that conversation.

17 The second point I think that is important, all the
18 discussion we have had in the last few days about North
19 Korea and the last few weeks and months have focused on the
20 ICBM and the threat to the homeland via a missile.

21 The other problem that I think deserves attention is
22 that North Korea is a serial proliferator of nuclear
23 technology, and I think as serious a threat as an ICBM is a
24 nuclear weapon, a nuclear warhead in the hold of a tramp
25 steamer sponsored by ISIS headed into Miami or the Port of

1 Baltimore. So that to me is an imminent threat that is
2 almost as dangerous as the ICBM threat. So that has got to
3 be part of this calculation.

4 Here is my question. Historically the regimes in North
5 Korea have gone through these cycles of provocation and
6 rising tension and then there has been some negotiation and
7 concessions. If this is part of that pattern, what does Kim
8 Jong-un want?

9 Admiral Harris: So, Senator, I do not think it is any
10 longer a part of the pattern of his grandfather and his
11 father. So as you correctly stated, in the past, they have
12 gone into this provocation cycle. I have talked about it a
13 lot in Hawaii where there is a provocation, there is a
14 negotiation, and there is a concession. It is peaceful for
15 a while, and then the cycle starts again. I think Kim Jong-
16 un has elevated that to a cycle of provocation, provocation,
17 provocation. What he is seeking his own independent nuclear
18 deterrent in order to threaten the United States and to
19 ensure the continuance of his regime.

20 Senator King: To follow up on Senator Graham's
21 questions, if you go back to history, this situation that we
22 are in now has often been analogized recently to the Cuban
23 Missile Crisis. And part of the settlement in that case was
24 we had a military force and the threat of military force.
25 We had the blockade, but ultimately there was an agreement

1 not to invade Cuba. And that was part of the agreement that
2 ended up with the missiles coming out.

3 Is this a moment -- if regime preservation is his goal,
4 is there a moment where we could enter into those kinds of
5 negotiations?

6 Admiral Harris: Sir, I do not want to limit the
7 President's options as he decides which course of action to
8 take. I will simply say that in the Cuban Missile Crisis,
9 the key to that was credible combat power that allowed
10 diplomacy to act.

11 Senator King: I completely agree.

12 Admiral Harris: And I believe that my part of this
13 problem set is to provide that credible combat power in the
14 face of North Korean provocation.

15 Senator King: I totally accept that. I understand
16 that the Vinson has to be there and all the other
17 capabilities that we have, and that is part of this process.
18 But I am talking about how do we eventually get out of this,
19 and that involves some discussion of what is it that is
20 necessary to end this.

21 China is a little puzzling to me because we have always
22 talked about economic pressure. China has, I agree, total
23 pressure ability with regard to North Korea. There is no
24 law that says that the missiles that he is developing and
25 the nuclear weapons only can go south and east. He is as

1 close to Beijing as he is Tokyo. And if I were China, I
2 would not want a nuclear-armed guy right on my border who
3 could threaten me. And it seems to me that China really has
4 to start to think about the threat that -- if he achieves
5 this, suddenly he can threaten anybody within 1,000 miles.

6 Admiral Harris: I agree with you there.

7 Senator King: Finally, we talked about the
8 vulnerability of Seoul. As I talk to people in Maine, they
9 are surprised to learn that Seoul is about 30 miles from the
10 North Korean border from the DMZ and the enormous threat
11 from just artillery. And we talked about that we do not
12 have any defense for that now.

13 Do the technologies that have been developed in
14 conjunction with the Israelis, David's Sling and Iron Dome,
15 have any relevance in this case?

16 Admiral Harris: Sir, I do not know. I am not smart
17 enough on that. I will have to get back to you on that.

18 Senator King: I would appreciate that because that is
19 a technology that has been effective in defending Israel
20 from short-range rockets, and perhaps it would be something
21 that would change the military calculus.

22 [The information follows:]

23 [COMMITTEE INSERT]

24

25

1 Admiral Harris: And I will get back to you, sir.

2 Senator King: Thank you, Admiral.

3 Chairman McCain: Well, thank you, Admiral. I think
4 that what we are talking about that the North Koreans have
5 is rockets, which would not lend itself to Iron Dome
6 defenses.

7 These are very difficult and challenging times, and it
8 is very fortuitous that you are here before this committee
9 particularly after the briefing that we had yesterday at the
10 White House. You have been able to give us some of the
11 details that only a military commander can provide us with
12 and will help us to make judgments.

13 I do not think any of us are predicting conflict, and I
14 think it would be wrong for us to do that. But I also
15 believe that we should make every preparation. Although
16 military activity would be a last resort, it is something
17 that we cannot completely rule out. But I emphasize it
18 would be absolutely, I know, this President's last resort.

19 But you are the tip of the spear, Admiral, and so the
20 fact that you will have men and women ready, if called upon,
21 in the testimony you have given today is reassuring to this
22 member and I believe to the other members of the committee.
23 And I know how much you look forward to coming back and
24 testifying before this committee. I know it is one of the
25 highlights of your time as Commander in the Pacific, but

1 this testimony today was extremely important and I thank you
2 for taking the time and speaking in a very informative and
3 articulate fashion.

4 Senator Reed?

5 Senator Reed: Mr. Chairman, I concur.

6 Once again, Admiral, thank you and make sure you thank
7 the men and women under your command.

8 Chairman McCain: This hearing is adjourned.

9 [Whereupon, at 11:48 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25