OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN MCCAIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM ARIZONA

Chairman McCain: Well, good morning.

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

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

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

The most immediate threat is the situation on the Korean Peninsula. Kim Jung-Un’s regime has thrown its full weight behind its quest for nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them. And unfortunately, the regime is making real
progress. A North Korean missile with a nuclear payload capable of striking an American city is no longer a distant hypothetical but an imminent danger, one that poses a real and rising risk of conflict. Indeed, as Admiral Harris said yesterday in testimony before the House, North Korea already has the conventional capability to strike U.S. territory. I look forward to hearing your assessment of North Korea’s nuclear and missile programs, the military options your forces offer to our commander-in-chief and their readiness to carry them out if called upon.

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

For years, the United States has looked to China, North Korea’s longtime patron and sole strategic ally, to bring the regime to the negotiating table and achieve progress toward a denuclearized Korean Peninsula. We have done so
for the simple reason that China is the only country that
may have the influence to truly curb North Korea’s
destabilizing behavior. But China has repeatedly refused to
exercise that influence.

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

As its behavior toward South Korea indicates, over the
last several years, China has acted less and less like a
responsible stakeholder of the rules-based order in the
region and more like a bully. It has economically coerced
its neighbors, increased its provocations in the East China
Sea, and militarized the South China Sea. Meanwhile, with a
rebalance policy too heavy on rhetoric and too light on
action, years of senseless defense cuts, and now the
disastrous decision to withdraw from the Trans-Pacific
Partnership, U.S. policy has failed to adapt to the scale
and velocity of China’s challenge to the rules-based order.
And that failure has called into question the credibility of
America’s security commitments in the region.
This committee has grown increasingly concerned about the erosion of America’s conventional military overmatch as states like China and North Korea develop advanced capabilities to counter our ability to project military power. While America’s military remains the most powerful on earth, we must adapt to the new realities we face. We must think differently about forward basing and force posture, logistics and mobilization, and take steps to reshape the capabilities of our joint force for the renewed reality of great power competition.

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

The new administration has an important opportunity to chart a different and better course. At our hearing earlier this week, our panel of expert witnesses agreed there was a strong merit for a, quote, “Asia-Pacific Stability Initiative.” This initiative could enhance U.S. military power through targeted funding to realign our force posture in the region, improve operationally relevant infrastructure, fund additional exercises, preposition
equipment, and build capacity with our allies and partners. Admiral Harris, I am eager to hear your thoughts on this kind of an initiative.

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

Senator Reed?
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Senator Reed: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank you, Admiral Harris, for being here today. We understand how difficult this time must be for you and for General Brooks and all the men and women that you lead. And we want you to express our great appreciation for their efforts.

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

There are military options, but they are risky. A comprehensive strike on nuclear facilities may precipitate a
catastrophic retaliation against the civilian population of Seoul or against our bases and service members in South Korea or Japan. A surgical strike, while less risky, may not deter the North Korean regime and runs the risk of emboldening Kim Jong-un. Complicating factors, of course, are the stockpile of chemical and biological weapons at his disposal and road-mobile missile launchers spread across the countryside.

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

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

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

   Chairman McCain: Admiral?
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Admiral Harris: Thank you, Chairman McCain and Senator Reed and distinguished members. It is an honor for me to appear before this committee.

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

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

Chairman McCain: Without objection.

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

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

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

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

I know that there is some debate about North Korea’s intent and the miniaturization advancements made by Pyongyang, and I will not add to that speculation. Regardless, my job is to provide military options to the
President, and because PACOM must be ready to fight tonight, I must assume that Kim Jong-un’s nuclear claims are true. I know his aspirations certainly are.

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

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

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

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

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

In confronting the reckless North Korean regime, it is critical that we are guided by a strong sense of resolve both privately and publicly, both diplomatically and
militarily. As President Trump and Secretary Mattis have made clear, all options are on the table. We want to bring Kim Jong-un to his senses and not to his knees.

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

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

So despite the region’s four significant challenges since my last report to you, we have strengthened America’s network of alliances and partnerships. Working with likeminded partners on shared security threats like North
Korea and ISIS is a key component of our regional strategy. Our five bilateral defense treaty alliances, Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, and Thailand, anchor our joint force efforts in the Indo-Asia-Pacific.

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

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

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

Finally, I would like to thank Chairman McCain and this committee for proposing and supporting the Asia-Pacific Stability Initiative. This effort will reassure our regional partners and send a strong signal to potential adversaries of our persistent commitment to the region.
As always, I thank the Congress for your enduring support to the men and women of PACOM and to our families who care for us. Thank you very much, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Harris follows:]
Chairman McCain: Thank you, Admiral, and thank you for
the outstanding job and your outstanding leadership that you
are exhibiting in these very difficult and challenging
times.

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

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

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

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

Chairman McCain: And it is clear that his goal is a
nuclear weapon and the means to deliver it to the United States of America. Is there any doubt in your mind?

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

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: It is clearly a matter of when.

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

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

Admiral Harris: I think the point that KJU’s rhetoric
and he has threatened the United States and cities by name, and just this week, he threatened Australia by name. I think his rhetoric, if you were to project it on a graph, is going in one direction. And then his capability is approaching -- the line of his capability is approaching the line of his rhetoric. And where those lines cross, I believe we are then at an inflexion point and we wake up to a new world.

Chairman McCain: What does THAAD do for us?

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

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

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

Chairman McCain: And what is designed to do that?

Anything?

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

Chairman McCain: And they can launch -- they have the capability of a launch of those rockets.
Admiral Harris: At this very moment, they have that capability, Senator.

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

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

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

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

Chairman McCain: But you would not rely on that.
Admiral Harris: It is too early to tell, sir. It has only been a month or so, and it is too early to tell.

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

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

Chairman McCain: We thank you, Admiral.

Senator Reed?

Senator Reed: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Admiral Harris.

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

Admiral Harris: Yes, sir. Again, as I said yesterday, I am accountable and responsible for the communications that came out of that evolution. I am sorry that it happened, and all I can say is I will do better in the future.
Senator Reed: Let me raise an issue that is linked to our diplomacy. We are asking China to take a much more assertive role in urging the North Koreans to decease and desist. But your view in terms of what concessions we should make, if any, to the Chinese to get them to cooperate. As both the chairman and I pointed out and as you pointed out, they are posing significant challenges to the rule of law in the Pacific, and we cannot ignore that. So your comments on this issue.

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

Senator Reed: Thank you.

Obviously, we are trying to approach the North Korean issue with a comprehensive strategy, diplomacy, military action, military preparedness certainly. One aspect is information warfare. My sense -- and I am not the expert
you are, but Kim Jong-un is paranoid about his own people and what information they are getting. Do you think we are making a sufficient effort to get information into North Korea through various means so that we can begin to bypass the Dear Leader and go to the people and that could create pressures on him to forestall his nuclear ambitions?

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

Senator Reed: Again, I think your perception is much closer to the situation on the ground, but anything we can do to either raise questions -- I do not think they will prompt an uprising immediately -- not only questions among the population but questions among the Dear Leader, Kim
Jong-un, that his people are being sort of influenced or there might be elements within the country that are thinking and embracing other ideas could be some leverage. And I think we have to pursue aggressively this information operation. My sense is we are not.

Admiral Harris: And I must agree with you there.

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

Admiral Harris: I agree with you there.

Senator Reed: Thank you.

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

Senator Reed: Thank you very much, Admiral.

Chairman McCain: Senator Inhofe?

Senator Inhofe: Admiral, I think what has happened in the last few days has served as a wakeup call to the
American people. Of course, we had our hearing on Tuesday.

Four pretty smart people came to the same conclusion. We have you today, and of course, we have what happened yesterday at the White House, as well as other places in the House.

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

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

So we had the hearing on Tuesday. They agreed that North Korea currently represents the single most imminent -- they use "imminent" -- threat. Victor Cha testified, and this was his quote. He said the pace of North Korea’s development shows that it wants to be able not just to field
one missile that could reach the United States but a whole
slew of them. And the panel all agreed on that. So we are
getting to really talking about serious things here.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Inhofe: Yes. And we are going to be depending
on you to advise us in not generalities but as you are
getting into right now, priorities and the needs that you
have. And we will depend on that.
I am also encouraged that our allies are more dependable than what they have been in the past. And is it your impression that they see this threat that is out there as we do? Does this open the door for maybe even more allies coming in our direction?

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

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

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.
Senator Inhofe: Thank you very much.

Chairman McCain: Senator Nelson?

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

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

Admiral Harris: It is correct, sir.

Senator Nelson: Okay.

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

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

And I think we are in a different place now. I think the jury is out. It is early days. We will have to see if China has changed its view of its willingness to influence KJU.
Senator Nelson: Based on their previous activity, there is no indication that you think that that is going to occur, although you are hopeful.

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

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

Senator Nelson: Precisely.

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

Admiral Harris: Sir, I do not know for a fact what China has done in the last month or so. I know that they are active in working the problem set, but I do not know the specifics of what they have done. All I see are the activities that Kim Jong-un has done in the last month or so.
Senator Nelson: And that is still on his march to a nuclearized ICBM.

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

Senator Nelson: Sure.

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

Admiral Harris: I do not want to say that there is only that option left. I think if China’s efforts fail, then we are back to where we were, status quo ante, if you will, to try to throw some Latin in there. And at that point then, as the President has said, all options are on the table. And I think he means just that: all options are on the table. So my job in that framework is to provide military options, but there are other options I am sure. And I would leave it to those experts to come up with those options. But my options are hard power options.
Senator Nelson: In your hard power options, you need additional materiel.

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

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

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

Senator Nelson: Okay.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Wicker?

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

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

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

Senator Wicker: Okay.

Well, the Force Structure Assessment called for a 355-ship Navy, and in that regard, I want to follow up on a line
of questioning from Senator Inhofe and drill down on that.

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Wicker: You get half of 52.

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

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

Admiral Harris: The first thing is my steady state 
requirements in order to do the things that we do today in 
the climate that we are in will be much better. My fight 
tonight forces that I have to have ready to respond to a 
North Korean aggression or Chinese coercion or something 
like that -- those forces will be more robust. Most 
importantly, the follow-on and surge forces will be 
available on shorter timelines. So today those follow-on 
forces are delayed by any number of reasons, and that delay 

is felt in terms of increased risk, longer timelines, and 
increased depths of Americans. And if I have the number of 
ships that the Navy is asking for and the number of jets the
Air Force is asking for and on and on, then both my ready to fight tonight forces will be richer, the timelines to get follow-on forces will be shortened, and the density of those follow-on forces will be thicker.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: THAAD allows us an intercept capability to shoot down at the high altitude level ballistic missiles that go from North Korea to South Korea.
It is a terminal high altitude area defense system aimed at ballistic missiles from North Korea against South Korea. So that is a short distance across the earth, but the missiles have a high atmospheric altitude. And so that is what THAAD gives you.

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

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

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

Senator Wicker: Thank you.

Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.

Chairman McCain: Senator Shaheen?

Senator Shaheen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

One of the things that we heard from a panel of private sector but some former officials on North Korea on Tuesday was that the only impetus to encourage China to engage with
North Korea in the way that we would like in order to help us get them to back down on their nuclear program would be if we initiated much more extensive sanctions on China with respect to their financial system or if they believed that there was imminent threat of war on the Korean Peninsula. Do you think that is an accurate analysis based on your experience with China in the region?

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

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

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

Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

And everyone has acknowledged, obviously, that North Korea is working towards a nuclear weapon, and that is one of the things that has changed in North Korea. Have we seen an escalation of rhetoric from Kim Jong-un or are we seeing very much the same kinds of rhetoric but we are paying more attention to it today because of the nuclear threat?
Admiral Harris: I think we are seeing increased rhetoric. I mean, just this week, he threatened Australia. This week, he said he was going to shoot out -- sink the Carl Vinson with a single shot, which is ridiculous, but he said it. And so he is increasing his rhetoric. At the same time, he is continuing his aggressive weapons development. So I think they are both going hand in hand. He had that parade last week which showed off all the weapon systems and stuff like that. So I think all of that in combination lets me know and should let us all know that he is intent on his objective and he is moving toward that objective apace.

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

Admiral Harris: As I said earlier, I do not think that it poses too much of a difficulty for a Nation like the United States. We should be able to compliment and applaud China’s efforts on the one hand and then be willing to criticize them for the bad things they do on the other. And I think from China’s perspective, they can receive that criticism and continue to do the thing that benefits not
just us but benefits them. A nuclear North Korea or the U.S. response to a nuclear North Korea, as you said, affects China almost as much as it would affect North Korea. So I think it is in their best interest to do this and listen to what the international community, not just the United States, but the international community is saying about this.

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

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

What I said at the time was that we were going to pull the Carl Vinson out of Singapore. We were going to truncate the follow-on exercise that it was going to have with
Australia, cancel the Australian port visit, and then send
it to Northeast Asia. I did not specify a time in there.
There was a lot of press reporting on that that implied that
it was now, now, now. And I could have stepped in and
corrected that, and I did not. And I feel responsible for
that and I am remiss for not doing that. But that is all on
me. The messaging on this comes out of Pacific Command. So
I regret that it happened. I will try to do better, but it
is on me.

Senator Shaheen: Thank you.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Fischer?

Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you, Admiral Harris, for being here today.

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

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

Admiral Harris: Ma’am, I think our allies are as
dependent on our nuclear umbrella as we are. And I think
the shows of force that we provide against our adversaries
are important. We have the USS Michigan, a guided missile
SSGN -- it is not a ballistic missile deterrent, but it is a
guided missile submarine -- is in Busan, South Korea right
now. And I think that sends a powerful signal of solidarity
with our South Korean ally, and at the same time it shows
the North Koreans that we are serious about our defense
commitment to our ally on the peninsula.

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

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

Admiral Harris: Yes, ma’am.

Senator Fischer: Last year, General Scaparrotti, who
was then the Commander of the United States Forces in Korea,
stated that the ISR was his top readiness challenge. And he
said, quote, the United States Forces Korea requires increased multi-discipline, persistent ISR capabilities to maintain situational awareness and provide adequate decision space for the USFK, PACOM, and national senior leaders.

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

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

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

So I do not have what I need. I do not have the ability to persistently watch my adversaries all over the Indo-Asia-Pacific, over half the globe, 24/7. And I need it 24/7. I need it whatever 60 times 24 hours is. I need that
minute by minute, and I do not have that. That is what
General Scaparrotti was getting at, was persistent ISR. And
I am convinced that today, even though he is the European
Command Commander, he would like more ISR as well.

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

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

Senator Fischer: Thank you, sir.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Peters?

Senator Peters: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
And thank you, Admiral Harris, for your testimony here
today.

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

And I am concerned, as well as I know a number of other
folks, that our military is not adequately prepared for
operations in mega-cities, so whether it is to fight or it is to assist in humanitarian assistance or disaster relief missions.

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

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

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

Senator Peters: Admiral Harris, as you know, China’s One Belt, One Road strategy seeks to secure China’s control over its continental and maritime interests but with the hopes of dominating Eurasia and exploiting natural resources for future economic gains. Such designs place the country at odds with the United States but also nations like Japan and India. And currently China’s economy budget is four
times greater than those of India. I want to talk a little bit about India and its importance to us.

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

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

Admiral Harris: Thank you, sir.

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

We share democratic values with India. We are the world’s two largest democracies. We share cultural values with Indian Americans that live and work and lead in our country. And I think in the mil-to-mil space, we are in a very good place and getting better. India is purchasing a
lot of American equipment. The world’s second largest C-17 fleet, for example, is Indian. The Indians have P-8 Poseidon aircraft, U.S. helicopters, Howitzers, and on and on. So I think there is a lot of opportunity there, and I think we should continue to work that.

We are heavily involved -- when I say “we,” the Navy is heavily involved in working with the Indians on the development of their aircraft carrier, their indigenous aircraft carrier. And that is an exciting program. And I think that India’s geostrategic interests align perfectly with ours in terms of being concerned about China and in terms of the intersection of China and India, including along their long land border but especially in the Indian Ocean, especially in the approaches to the Indian Ocean, the Andaman Islands and the like.

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

Senator Peters: Thank you, Admiral.

Chairman McCain: Senator Cotton?

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

I want to talk today about the strength of missile
forces in the Indo-Pacific. Given the vast distances in that theater, missiles are a critical component of any country’s security, including ours.

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: I have none, sir.

Senator Cotton: You have none.

Admiral Harris: Right.

Senator Cotton: Why do you have none?

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

China is not a signatory to the treaty. So they are not obliged to follow that treaty, and we cannot legitimately, in my opinion, criticize China for developing weapons that contravene the treaty because they did not sign onto it.
Senator Cotton: The only two parties to the treaty are Russia and the United States.

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

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

Admiral Harris: It was, sir.

Senator Cotton: And you agree with that assessment?
Admiral Harris: I do.

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

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

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

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

Senator Cotton: And as you say, since the United States and Russia are the only two parties to the treaty and you and General Selva and several other U.S. Government officials have said that Russia is violating the treaty,
that means the United States is the only country in the
world -- the only country in the world -- that unilaterally
refuses to build missiles that have a range of 500 to 5,500
kilometers.

Admiral Harris: That is correct.

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: Right.
Senator Cotton: Thank you.

Senator Reed [presiding]: Thank you.

On behalf of the chairman, Senator Warren, please.

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

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

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

Senator Warren: Yes.

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

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

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

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

Senator Warren: Yes. That is a very powerful point. I just want to note for the record that the Trump administration in its budget blueprint calls for about a 29 percent cut to the State Department and significant cuts to other agencies with international responsibilities. Obviously, there is a strong military component to the Asia-Pacific and keeping us safe there, but as you say, it takes a lot more in this vital region to keep us safe.

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

We went over to the White House yesterday, and the administration said again that the time for strategic patience is over. Now, I think it is still not clear
precisely what their new strategy is. By all accounts,
North Korea is continuing its effort to develop a nuclear-
armed intercontinental ballistic missile system that could
reach the continental U.S. coastline. And in recent days,
administration officials have talked about shooting down a
North Korean ballistic missile test.

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

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

Senator Warren: I understand that. But just shooting
down a test missile in general. You know, as I understand
it -- I have been trying to read about this -- experts on
North Korea’s war plans say that Kim Jong-un would likely
respond to U.S. military action with massive escalation
against South Korea, Japan, perhaps even the United States
if we shot down a test missile. So I am just asking. Do
you agree with that assessment? And if so, how is it that
the administration should take this dynamic into account as
it formulates its North Korea policy?
Admiral Harris: A lot of what you are asking, Senator, is being deliberated in the administration now. I am in a difficult position when asked to comment on ongoing process deliberations. So I am going to defer on that.

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

Senator Warren: The “somehow,” though, is the question. And I see that I am out of time. So I am going to quit here and we can continue this conversation later. But that is precisely the question we are trying to ask about and why it is that I am asking the question about what the up sides and down sides are if we take action directly on one of these testing missiles, whether or not it escalates and this gives him provocation to invade South Korea, to bomb Japan otherwise.
Admiral Harris: I think he can manufacture whatever
provocation he wants to attack South Korea or Japan or us.
I think that the manufacture of provocations resides with
him.

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

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

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

54
Alderson Court Reporting
1-800-FOR-DEPO www.aldersonreporting.com
technologies that give us an asymmetric advantage over regional threats. And I absolutely 100 percent agree with you.

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

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

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

And they do it in a number of ways. They send their best and brightest students to American universities, and then they get educated here and they go back home and they carry that knowledge back to them. They also do it illegally. They steal our secrets. They steal our
industrial processes, and they shorten their acquisition
timelines dramatically. So they can field things at a rate
faster than we can.

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

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

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

You mentioned ISIS in some of your comments, and in
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
6 If you could, can you speak to the importance of
7 engaging some of those partners and how we are moving
8 forward in that fight against ISIS?
9
10 Admiral Harris: Sure. So in the Indo-Asia-Pacific,
11 the countries that we work closest with in the ISIS fight
12 are Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia, and Bangladesh.
13 And that is us, Australia, and New Zealand that are involved
14 in this effort to work with those countries to help them
15 fight that threat themselves. And the entity that does that
16 for me is SOCPAC, Special Operations Command Pacific, and
17 Major General Bryan Fenton and his team are actively engaged
18 in providing advice and assistance to those countries, most
19 principally right now in the southern Philippines. So I am
20 encouraged by the work they are doing. I think it is God’s
21 work and I am pleased with where we are in that fight in the
22 Indo-Asia-Pacific.
23
24 Senator Ernst: Thank you very much. Thank you,
25 Admiral.
26
27 Thank you, Mr. Chair.
28
29 Senator Reed: Senator Sullivan has to go to the floor
30 to preside. Senator Hirono has graciously yielded to
Senator Sullivan.

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

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: I agree, Senator.

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

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

Senator Sullivan: You mentioned the unprecedented weapons testing. I have a chart that I want you to take a
look at and also not if but when North Korea will have a
capacity to range the continental United States. Again,
Alaska and Hawaii would be ranged earlier with the ICBM.
The chart shows that Kim Jong-un has actually conducted more
tests than his father and grandfather combined. Do you see
that abating at all?

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

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

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: I wanted to believe him.
Senator Sullivan: Since he made that I think it was a year and a half ago, what has happened?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So one of the beneficiaries of our freedom of navigation operations in the South China Sea would be China,
for example, in other waters. And that is the right of all
nations to operate in accordance with international law. So
I believe we should continue to do those.

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

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

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

Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Admiral.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: Thanks, Senator. I agree with you that Pacific Missile Range Facility on Kauai is a national treasure. I have gone on record as supporting the idea that we should develop and acquire a defensive Hawaii radar that gives Hawaii the ability to see the space, if you will, in the face of potential ballistic missile attacks. We have
the SBX. That is the X-band radar that sits on a self-
propelled oil platform that has to be sustained and
refurbished and all of that. And I think a land-based
permanent facility to do that -- a defensive Hawaii radar --
is necessary.

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

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

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

Senator Hirono: Thank you.

Congress has called for headquarters reductions in
recent years, and while I agree with reducing redundancy
where it makes sense and eliminating waste, I am not a fan
of salami sliced percentage cuts across headquarters
entities. So I am a strong advocate of taking a look at
each headquarters operations, the personnel mix, the
evolving threats and challenges that face us, as well as previous growth of a particular headquarters before recommending any cuts.

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

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

That said, I think we all should seek efficiencies where we can, but I am not supportive of the idea of salami slicing either. So across that 40 years of staff manning levels at PACOM, the threat has increased because in that intervening 40 years, we do not have a bipolar world anymore. We have the threats I talked about in my
testimony, China, Russia, North Korea, and ISIS. So I continue to -- and my staff -- we continue to work closely with OSD, Office of the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Staff on our manning levels.

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

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

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

I am also concerned about programs like IMET, International Military Education and Training, which I think is one of the best foreign assistance programs out there because that is where we bring foreign bright, up and coming mid-grade officers to the United States for senior military
education for a year at a time with their families, and they
get immersed in American culture, ideas and living in an
environment where we practice daily civilian control of the
military. So I think it is important that we fund these
programs, and I am concerned if those programs were to be
cut.

Senator Hirono: Thank you for that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Reed: On behalf of Chairman McCain, Senator

Rounds, please.

Senator Rounds: Thank you, sir.

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

One item that caught our attention at that time was
simply the time frame in which to respond to adversarial
activity. I would like to talk about some of the newer
technologies that are being employed or that may be very
well employed in the near future. In particular, when we
talk about the unique problem set that you have got there,
the trifecta of few land-based areas from which to operate extreme distances, some of the most challenging and contested environments to operate in, I believe the deterrence value of long-range strike to hold targets at risk, targets that are quickly becoming harder and harder to access, what are your thoughts on the possibility of a conventional warhead variant of the proposed long-range stand-off weapon?

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

Senator Rounds: Thinking about air-launched --

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

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

Admiral Harris: So I have to be careful when I talk hypersonics in an open hearing. But I am concerned about Chinese and Russian hypersonic weapons development, and I
have expressed those concerns in the right places.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Rounds: All right. Thank you, sir.

Admiral Harris: Thank you, sir.

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

Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.

Senator Reed: Thank you.

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

Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
And, Admiral, thank you so much for your service to the country.

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

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

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

Senator Donnelly: No. I am not asking you to say you are sorry.
Admiral Harris: I am accountable for and responsible for the messaging that came out of that Carl Vinson issue. But at the end of the day, what we said was the Carl Vinson was leaving Singapore, truncating its exercise, canceling its port visit, and heading to Northeast Asia. And that is where it is today. It is within striking range of North Korea if the President were to call on it.

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: None.
Senator Donnelly: None.

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: Where China's?

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

Admiral Harris: I think their biggest strength in doing that is economic. 80 percent of North Korea's economy
is China-based. 80 percent. So I think China has a powerful lever to apply on North Korea. And from China’s perspective, you know, they are concerned about two things. They are concerned about a unified Korean Peninsula that is aligned with the United States, and they are worried about refugees, should North Korea collapse precipitously.

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

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

Senator Donnelly: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

Senator Perdue: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Admiral, thank you and thank you for all the men and women in your theater.

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

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

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

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

Here is the real problem. In 2017, they are going to spend about $240 billion, but adjusting for purchase power
parity, in real terms, apples to apples to the United States, that is $826 billion compared to our $630 billion.
Directionally would you think that is reasonable to look at it that way?

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

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

Admiral Harris: I would not in terms of our asymmetric advantages and the quality of our equipment and our people. That said, quantity has a quality all its own, and they are swiftly moving to exceed the United States in terms of numbers of ships and submarines and aircraft and the like.
So we have to continue to work and resource those asymmetric
advantages that we have. And certainly China is trying to close that gap in every regime.

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

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

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

Senator Perdue: When you look at the China strategy in the Southeast Asia region, particularly in the South China Sea, it is pretty easy. You have said they militarized it.
I agree with that. What are there intentions for that outer ring of islands? It looks like the next level of national interest -- I am talking about Marianas and Guam, all the way to Palau in that area. Have you see any indications now that they have sights on those as well?

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

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

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

And then your second question?

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

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

Senator Perdue: Thank you, sir.

Admiral Harris: Thank you.

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

Senator Blumenthal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

When you were here last year, you told me that you were concerned about Russian and Chinese undersea warfare capabilities, specifically their modernized submarines. And you noted, number one, the Russians took no break from developing submarine capability following the Cold War and they have ballistic missile submarines now in their force fleet in the Pacific. Number two, the Chinese are building a new class of such submarines that may have the capability
to threaten us. And you also told us that your submarine
requirement in PACOM still has not been met.

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

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

Admiral Harris: Sure, sir. I am completely supportive
of the plan, and I am completely supportive of the effort to
move to the left construction of these Virginia class
submarines. They will clearly increase our Nation’s
capability and, if assigned to PACOM, PACOM's capability. But three or four are inadequate in the grand scheme based simply on my requirements, which have to be adjudicated with the requirements of all the other combatant commands who have legitimate needs for submarines in their regions as well.

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: They do not.

Senator Blumenthal: And are they developing that capability?

Admiral Harris: They are working on it. They are trying. They have submarines. They have a lot of them, a
lot smaller submarines. They are diesels. And they have an
SSB which is a ballistic missile capable diesel submarine.
And so they recognize the advantages and what the submarine
gives them in terms of warfighting, but they are a long way
from developing a submarine force that is comparable to any
other country that we talk about in the region.

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

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

Senator Blumenthal: Thank you very much, Admiral.
Thanks for your great work at PACOM and throughout your
career. Thank you.
Senator Reed: On behalf of the chairman, Senator Graham, please.

Senator Graham: Thank you.

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

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

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

Senator Graham: I would say that is worse.

Admiral Harris: From our perspective, that is worse.

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

Admiral Harris: I believe they are.

Senator Graham: And they apparently do not care.

Admiral Harris: To date.

Senator Graham: So how do we make them care?

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

Senator Graham: Is it fair to say that unless something changes, North Korea is likely to have an ICBM with a nuclear warhead that can reach America by 2020?
Admiral Harris: I do not want to put a timeline on that, sir, in this hearing. But it is safe to say that they will have one soon. They will match rhetoric to capabilities.

Senator Graham: Okay, great.

Why do they want that missile?

Admiral Harris: I beg your pardon?

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: Partly.

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: Depending on the nuclear weapon,
depending on the missile, it could reach the eastern
seaboard. They could reach us right here in this building.

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

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

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: I beg your pardon?

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

Admiral Harris: I believe that is correct.

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

Admiral Harris: I believe that generally, but I
believe that China might be able to exert its influence.
Senator Graham: Do you believe China could change North Korea’s behavior absent a belief by North Korea that we would use military force to stop their ICBM program?

Admiral Harris: I do not.

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

Admiral Harris: I do.

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

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

Senator Graham: Why do they not believe that?

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

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: Their leverage is potentially
substantial.

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

Admiral Harris: That is fair to say.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Senator Graham: But without provocation, it is not our policy to attack North Korea.
Admiral Harris: They have provoked us already, sir.
Senator Graham: I said but if they stopped it, they do not have anything to worry about.
Admiral Harris: Then we will have to look at it.
Senator Graham: That is all I am saying.
Admiral Harris: That is a decision that --
Senator Graham: If North Korea is listening, none of us want to invade your country.
Senator McCaskill: They are.
Senator Graham: Okay, well, good.
So here is the point. All of this military force going that way is to deter them from being able to hit us and protect our allies. Right?
Admiral Harris: Right.
Senator Graham: We are trying to deter them from hurting us. We are not sending a bunch of people over there to invade their country without provocation. Is that fair to say?
Admiral Harris: Right.
Senator Graham: Good. I hope they understand that and I hope China understands that.
Thank you.
Admiral Harris: Yes, sir.
Senator Reed: On behalf of the chairman, Senator McCaskill, please.
Senator McCaskill: Thank you.

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

Admiral Harris: I do.

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

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

Senator McCaskill: Right.

So we have not confirmed that it was used.

Admiral Harris: I beg your pardon?

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: I do not know enough about all of their capabilities, including those that we saw or probably
saw in Malaysia. So I think that is part of the readiness calculus that we have to go through when we consider the threat from North Korea.

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

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

Senator McCaskill: Okay. What about in Japan?

Admiral Harris: I cannot speak to that.

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

Admiral Harris: Yes, ma’am.

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

[The information follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]
Admiral Harris: You bet.

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

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

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: Right.

Senator McCaskill: Okay.

Admiral Harris: To be clear on that, I have not
reached an agreement with Japan on deploying THAAD.

Senator McCaskill: Right.

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

Senator McCaskill: Right.

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

Senator McCaskill: Right.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Admiral Harris: Yes, ma’am.

Senator McCaskill: Well, that is reassuring because he kind of goes in the category with Kim Jong-un in terms of what the hell. Right?
Admiral Harris: We are in a good place in the mil-to-
mil space with the Philippines.

Senator McCaskill: Right. Thank you.

Chairman McCain [presiding]: Senator King?

Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First, sort of parenthetically your exchange with

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

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

The other problem that I think deserves attention is
that North Korea is a serial proliferator of nuclear
technology, and I think as serious a threat as an ICBM is a
nuclear weapon, a nuclear warhead in the hold of a tramp
steamer sponsored by ISIS headed into Miami or the Port of
Baltimore. So that to me is an imminent threat that is almost as dangerous as the ICBM threat. So that has got to be part of this calculation.

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

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

Senator King: To follow up on Senator Graham’s questions, if you go back to history, this situation that we are in now has often been analogized recently to the Cuban Missile Crisis. And part of the settlement in that case was we had a military force and the threat of military force. We had the blockade, but ultimately there was an agreement
not to invade Cuba. And that was part of the agreement that ended up with the missiles coming out.

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

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

Senator King: I completely agree.

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

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

China is a little puzzling to me because we have always talked about economic pressure. China has, I agree, total pressure ability with regard to North Korea. There is no law that says that the missiles that he is developing and the nuclear weapons only can go south and east. He is as
close to Beijing as he is Tokyo. And if I were China, I would not want a nuclear-armed guy right on my border who could threaten me. And it seems to me that China really has to start to think about the threat that -- if he achieves this, suddenly he can threaten anybody within 1,000 miles.

Admiral Harris: I agree with you there.

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

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

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

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

[The information follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]
Admiral Harris: And I will get back to you, sir.

Senator King: Thank you, Admiral.

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

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

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

But you are the tip of the spear, Admiral, and so the fact that you will have men and women ready, if called upon, in the testimony you have given today is reassuring to this member and I believe to the other members of the committee. And I know how much you look forward to coming back and testifying before this committee. I know it is one of the highlights of your time as Commander in the Pacific, but
this testimony today was extremely important and I thank you for taking the time and speaking in a very informative and articulate fashion.

Senator Reed?

Senator Reed: Mr. Chairman, I concur.

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

Chairman McCain: This hearing is adjourned.

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