

DEFENDING AMERICA FROM THE
CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY'S
POLITICAL WARFARE, PART III

HEARING
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTEENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

SEPTEMBER 24, 2024

Serial No. 118–131

Printed for the use of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability



Available on: *govinfo.gov*,
oversight.house.gov or
docs.house.gov

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

56–887 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2024

COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

JAMES COMER, Kentucky, Chairman

JIM JORDAN, Ohio	JAMIE RASKIN, Maryland, <i>Ranking Minority Member</i>
MIKE TURNER, Ohio	ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON, District of Columbia
PAUL GOSAR, Arizona	STEPHEN F. LYNCH, Massachusetts
VIRGINIA FOXX, North Carolina	GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
GLENN GROTHMAN, Wisconsin	RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY, Illinois
MICHAEL CLOUD, Texas	RO KHANNA, California
GARY PALMER, Alabama	KWEISI MFUME, Maryland
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana	ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ, New York
PETE SESSIONS, Texas	KATIE PORTER, California
ANDY BIGGS, Arizona	CORI BUSH, Missouri
NANCY MACE, South Carolina	SHONTEL BROWN, Ohio
JAKE LATURNER, Kansas	MELANIE STANSBURY, New Mexico
PAT FALLON, Texas	ROBERT GARCIA, California
BYRON DONALDS, Florida	MAXWELL FROST, Florida
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania	SUMMER LEE, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM TIMMONS, South Carolina	GREG CASAR, Texas
TIM BURCHETT, Tennessee	JASMINE CROCKETT, Texas
MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE, Georgia	DAN GOLDMAN, New York
LISA McCLAIN, Michigan	JARED MOSKOWITZ, Florida
LAUREN BOEBERT, Colorado	RASHIDA TLAIB, Michigan
RUSSELL FRY, South Carolina	AYANNA PRESSLEY, Massachusetts
ANNA PAULINA LUNA, Florida	
NICK LANGWORTHY, New York	
ERIC BURLISON, Missouri	
MIKE WALTZ, Florida	

MARK MARIN, Staff Director
JESSICA DONLON, Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel
MARGARET HARKER, Deputy Chief Counsel
KELSEY DONOHUE, Counsel
ABBY SALTER, Counsel
ALEXANDER CRANER, Professional Staff Member
MALLORY COGAR, Deputy Director of Operations and Chief Clerk

CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5074

JULIE TAGEN, Minority Staff Director
CONTACT NUMBER: 202-225-5051

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on September 24, 2024	1

WITNESSES

Dr. Bradley A. Thayer, Founding Member, Committee on the Present Danger: China Oral Statement	6
Dr. Robert D. Atkinson, President, Information Technology and Innovation Foundation Oral Statement	8
The Honorable Joseph Cella, Former U.S. Ambassador to Fiji, Kiribati, Nauru, Tonga and Tuvalu; Principal, Pontifex Group Oral Statement	10
Mr. Jacob Stokes (Minority Witness), Senior Fellow for the Indo-Pacific Secu- rity Program, Center for a New American Security Oral Statement	12

*Opening statements and the prepared statements for the witnesses are avail-
able in the U.S. House of Representatives Repository at: docs.house.gov.*

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Article, House Select Committee on the Chinese Communist Party, “CCP on the Quad: How American Taxpayers and Universities Fund the CCP’s Advanced Military and Technological Research”; submitted by Rep. Higgins.
- * Statement for the Record; submitted by Rep. Connolly.
- * Article, *Daily Caller*, “Alleged Chinese Spy Spent Years Rubbing Elbows with Dem Congresswoman”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Article, *BBC.com*, “Biden Has Called Japan and India Xenophobic”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS

- * Article, *Breitbart*, “Bombshell Indictment Top NY Dem Aide Worked as Agent of China”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Article, *Daily Caller*, “DoJ Charges Alleged Chinese Agent with Spying in U.S.”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Article, *The Federalist*, “Firebrand Leftist Raskin Said Congress Must Disqualify Trump”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Article, *The Federalist*, “Indictment of Gov. Hochul’s Aide Shows Red China is No. 1 Threat”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Article, *Politico*, “Trump Calls China’s Leader a Killer”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Biggs, *Breitbart*, “FBI Finds Chinese State Hacker Malware on U.S. Infrastructure-Related Routers”; submitted by Rep. Biggs.
- * Article, *New York Times*, “A Global Web of Chinese Propaganda Leads to U.S. Tech Mogul”; submitted by Reps. Biggs and Burlison.
- * Article, *Fox Business*, “Biden Calls Xi a Smart, Smart Guy”; submitted by Rep. Mace.
- * Article, *Fox Business*, “Biden Praises Xi Holds Accountable”; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Article, *Salon*, “In Resurfaced Speech Trump Endorses Project 2025”; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Article, *Associated Press*, “NY Gov Aide FBI Efforts”; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Article, *CNN*, “Trump Does Not Know Who Is Behind Project 2025”; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Article, *Washington Post*, “Walz’s decades of China experience are an asset, not a liability”; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Article, *Washington Post*, “Walz has a long history with China. But he’s not ‘pro-China’”; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Biden-Harris Admin October 2022 National Security Strategy; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Letter, September 9, 2024, from the White House to Chairman Comer; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Statement, from group of 741 national security leaders for Harris; submitted by Rep. Raskin.
- * Questions for the Record: to Dr. Atkinson; submitted by Rep. Foxx.

The documents listed are available at: docs.house.gov.

**DEFENDING AMERICA FROM
THE CHINESE COMMUNIST PARTY'S
POLITICAL WARFARE, PART III**

Tuesday, September 24, 2024

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:05 a.m., in room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. James Comer [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Comer, Gosar, Foxx, Grothman, Cloud, Palmer, Higgins, Sessions, Biggs, Mace, Fallon, Perry, Timmons, Burchett, McClain, Langworthy, Burlison, Raskin, Norton, Connolly, Krishnamoorthi, Khanna, Brown, Stansbury, Garcia, Lee, Crockett, Goldman, and Moskowitz.

Chairman COMER. The hearing of the Committee on Oversight and Accountability will come to order. I want to welcome everyone here today.

Without objection, the Chair may declare a recess at any time.

I now recognize myself for the purpose of making an opening statement.

This hearing is the third in the Oversight Committee's investigation into the Federal Government's response to the Chinese Communist Party's use of a strategy known as political warfare. The CCP employs a strategy to infiltrate and influence communities and critical sectors across the Nation. The CCP's ultimate goal is to weaken and destroy its main enemy, which the party has identified as America. The Committee has conducted oversight of 25 sectors of the Federal Government to understand if a whole-of-government approach to the CCP threat is sufficient or even in existence. Consulting with experts from the U.S. Government, military, and private sector, and holding briefings with 23 Federal agencies, the Committee has found that the CCP is waging a war without weapons against America, and the Biden-Harris Administration has no governmentwide strategy to combat CCP warfare.

By any reasonable analysis, the United States faces a new cold war, but right now, only its opponent, the CCP, is committed to winning it. Unlike the first cold war, the adversary is already within, having entrenched itself within U.S. borders, institutions, businesses, universities, and culture centers by capturing the elites in influential circles. Without a cohesive government strategy, the

agencies the Committee has surveyed have been left to formulate their own solutions, which are diverse and largely ineffective. Simply put, too many Federal agencies have failed to understand, acknowledge, and combat CCP's political warfare. Sometimes this is because the agencies themselves have succumbed to CCP influence operations seeking to reshape U.S. decision-making to the Party's benefit.

It is essential that Federal agencies understand what the CCP is: a totalitarian force that enslaves its own people, surveils and harasses critics of the Party and people of Chinese descent around the world, and poisons tens of thousands of Americans every year with fentanyl. Under General Xi Jinping, this regime is waging unrestricted warfare against our country. Congress alerted Federal agencies of this threat 25 years ago. Yet in 2024, the CCP's tactics still pose extraordinary danger to the American way of life, while the U.S. Government and its agencies, departments, and commissions have not engaged the CCP threat with urgency.

In the Committee's previous hearings in this investigation, it is notable that both Republican and Democrat witnesses who have testified have recognized CCP political warfare as a serious threat to American society. Today, our witnesses will testify about what Federal agencies should be doing to change course and secure America from the CCP and its destructive global ambitions. The stakes are high and Federal officials must start listening to the message the witnesses here today have to deliver.

The Federal Government has great responsibilities to confront Communist China. First, Federal leaders must be willing to talk about the CCP and the warfare it is waging against America. Transparent communication is critical to an effective deterrence strategy. Next, the strategy must be governmentwide. The CCP is targeting every corner of this country, and all Federal agencies have duties to fight back against it. Federal officials should reject mixed messaging and appeasement. That means Federal agencies must put an end to so-called country-neutral approaches doomed to fail the American people. Instead, officials should employ targeted strategies to identify, counter, and deter the CCP's unique methods and strategies, such as the United Front and elite capture.

Additionally, the intelligence community should not hide behind the classification system. This investigation has made clear that there is plenty of open-source information available demonstrating CCP infiltration operations. It is inexcusable for Federal officials to neglect their responsibilities to openly communicate about threats to the public. Also, Federal leaders must resist influence within their own ranks. The CCP actively wages psychological warfare to influence decision-making and how officials carry out their responsibilities. For example, Federal agencies should reject the lie that it is racist to criticize the CCP. America's adversary is the Chinese Communist Party, not the Chinese people, who are victims themselves of this regime.

Finally, in the face of the cold war the CCP is waging, Federal agencies should fulfill their responsibilities to the American people. Federal officials should use their platforms and authorities to equip America to strengthen their communities and create the new technologies that will secure a strong future for the Nation. Today,

Federal agencies are ill prepared to face the CCP threat. A governmentwide strategy is decades overdue. The American people deserve better from their government, and I hope that Federal officials will listen to the constructive recommendations offered today.

I thank the witnesses for being here today, and I look forward to their testimony. I now yield to Ranking Member Raskin for his opening remarks.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. All the dictators and despots of the world have something in common in 2024. They are united in trying to subvert democracy in America, and they are engaged indeed in political warfare against us, as the title of this hearing has it. The vicious autocrats of Russia, the police-state theocrats of Iran, the totalitarian communist billionaire bureaucrats of China and North Korea, and all their corrupt oligarchs and plutocrats seek to destroy the very idea of human rights and political freedom that are the defining ideals of America and still the hope of a world struggling against their oppression. The tyrants have something else in common: Donald Trump. He loves them all and they love him back. He loves them because he envies their total control over their societies, and they love him because they know they can manipulate and control him. He praises all of them: Putin, Orban, Xi, Kim Jong Un. Trump exults in their friendship and emulates their control over what he calls “their people.”

When he was President, Trump said that he and Xi, the President of China and Chairman of the Communist Party, “love each other,” and Trump called Xi a brilliant man. He openly envied and marveled over Xi’s total control over his people, saying, “He controls 1.4 billion people with an iron fist.” And when people asked questions about Xi and the CCP’s role at the beginning of the COVID–19 crisis, Trump repeatedly defended Xi and praised his excellent leadership, calling him a “brilliant man,” “smart,” “brilliant,” “everything perfect,” “we love each other,” “President Xi, who is a friend of mine, who is very smart,” “a very good man,” “nobody like that,” “the look, the brain, the whole thing,” “My feeling toward you is an incredibly warm one,” he said.

Trump has repeatedly praised Russia’s lawless and bloody invasion of Ukraine as smart. At a Mar-a-Lago fundraiser in 2022, he gushed that Putin was taking over a country, a vast, vast location, a great piece of land with a lot of people, and just walking right in. At the Presidential debate earlier this month, he refused to say that he wanted Ukraine to win the war but said he would end the war in 24 hours, meaning he would, per usual, cave in to Putin’s propaganda and outrageous demands and cede large parts of Ukraine to the Russian strongman who imprisons, poisons, and murders his political opponents. Trump’s Chief of Staff, John Kelly, described his own boss as “a person who admires autocrats and murderous dictators, a person that has nothing but contempt for our democratic institutions, our constitution, and the rule of law.” And to quote Trump’s chilling 2018 comments to Fox News about Kim Jong Un, Trump said, “He is the head of a country, and I mean he is the strong head. Don’t let anyone think anything different. He speaks and his people sit up at attention. I want my people to do the same.”

Trump openly catered to Putin, defended the former KGB chief, and aggressively took his side against the NSA, the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the FBI, and more than a dozen other U.S. intelligence agencies which found that Putin was engaged in active political espionage, sabotage, and interference in the 2016 American Presidential election, a form of shocking appeasement that just invited further Russian aggression against us in 2020 and now again in the 2024 campaign. H.R. McMaster, Trump's former national security advisor, recounted a meeting between Chinese President Xi and Donald Trump. According to McMaster, Xi "ate our lunch" because Trump madly ingratiated himself to Xi and completely failed to stand up for U.S. foreign policy interests. McMaster writes that Trump frequently revealed his affinity for strongmen and belief that he alone could form a good relationship with Putin. As President, according to his own national security advisor, John Bolton, Trump encouraged Xi's building and use of concentration camps to hold Uyghurs in Xinjiang province.

In the 2024 campaign, Trump has promised to follow the lead of these dictators in the global axis of autocrats. A convicted felon and an adjudicated sexual assailant, Trump repeatedly says he would suspend the rule of law in our country, override the Constitution as dictator on day one, launch the biggest mass detention and internment of immigrants in American history, and replace tens of thousands of professional civil servants with political loyalists and the personal sycophants he craves. He has pledged to use the Department of Justice as a weapon to investigate and prosecute his political enemies.

And he is not kidding. He packed and stacked the Supreme Court to destroy a fundamental constitutional freedom women enjoyed for more than a half century in America. He personally ordered the weaponization of the Department of Justice and the IRS against Hillary Clinton; his own FBI Director, James Comey; his own Deputy FBI Director, Andrew McCabe; his private lawyer for years, Michael Cohen, who was put in solitary confinement for 2 weeks when he refused to promise he would not write a book about Donald Trump, and was released by a United States Federal District judge who was shocked by the blatantly vindictive and unconstitutional persecution of an American citizen for exercising his First Amendment rights.

Putin, Xi, Trump, and Hungary's tyrant, Viktor Orban, who had a slumber party at Mar-a-Lago when he was in town promoting illiberal democracy, which means mob rule without freedom, these are the new axis of autocrats attacking American democracy and freedom and human rights all over the world. This is the real political warfare taking place against America. After repeatedly caving in to China and cheerleading its destruction of human rights, after making sure his own daughter received more than 40 trademarks from China and the CCP, after praising Xi's great performance on COVID-19, Trump decided it might be to his political advantage to attack China with some juvenile racist slurs and nicknames. Scandalously, he has lumped Chinese Americans and immigrants in with the atrocities of the CCP when it is the Chinese diaspora in the U.S. that is actually most at risk for transnational repression and brutalization by the CCP.

Trump's laughable decision to pose as a critic of Chinese Government oppression now resembles nothing so much as Orwell's depiction in "1984" of a friendly shifting competition between authoritarian powers—Oceania, East Asia, and Eurasia—who pretend to be rivals but actually form an axis of oppression against their own peoples, who they seek to dominate.

Now, contrary to this craven submission to foreign dictators and make-believe, the Biden-Harris Administration and Democrats in Congress have taken a strong stand for democracy and against all the autocrats and totalitarians, including the CCP, responding aggressively to the economic, security, and ideological challenges posed by China, including by investing in our competitiveness, our innovation, and our democracy. Under President Biden, the U.S. has aligned its efforts with those of our allies and partners around the globe, bringing together the democracies of the world. President Biden strengthened military partnerships with allies across the Indo-Pacific and established the Australia, United Kingdom, United States, or AUKUS, security pact to help defend peace, democracy, and stability in the region.

Today, the Democrats will explain how the Biden-Harris Administration has guaranteed that America can compete with and indeed outcompete China economically as well as geopolitically while we stand up for the ideals of human rights and democracy for all. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Ranking Member yields back. I am pleased to introduce our witnesses today. All witnesses are testifying in their personal capacities.

First, we have Dr. Bradley Thayer. He is a founding member of the Committee on the Present Danger: China. Formerly, he was a special governmental employee in the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, where he contributed to the January 2021 report, "DHS Strategic Action Plan to Combat the Threat Posed by the People's Republic of China." Dr. Thayer's research focuses on the existential threat the Chinese Communist Party poses to the United States. Dr. Thayer is testifying in his personal capacity. Next, we have Robert Atkinson. He is the founder and President of the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation. A policy expert, Mr. Atkinson has been appointed by Republicans and Democrats to serve on various commissions and advise on issues, including competitiveness, innovation, infrastructure, artificial intelligence, and competition with China.

Next, the Honorable Joseph Cella is the founder and Principal of the Pontifex Group, a consulting firm. Previously, Ambassador Cella served as the U.S. Ambassador to Fiji from 2019 to 2021. He is the co-founder and director of the citizen-led Michigan China Economic Security and Review Group, which monitors and counters threats of subnational incursions from the CCP to protect the security of the state of Michigan. Ambassador Cella is testifying in his personal capacity. And finally, Jacob Stokes is a senior fellow for the Indo-Pacific Security Program at The Center for a New American Strategy [sic], focusing on U.S.-China relations, Chinese foreign and military policy, East Asian security affairs, and great power competition. Previously, Mr. Stokes served as a Senior Advisor to the National Security Advisor, as well as Acting Special Ad-

visor for Asia Policy for then Vice President Biden. He also worked as a professional staff member for the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

Pursuant to Committee Rule 9(g), the witnesses will please stand and raise their right hand.

Do you solemnly swear or affirm that the testimony that you are about to give is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

[A chorus of ayes.]

Chairman COMER. Let the record show that the witnesses answered in the affirmative. Thank you all, and you may take a seat. We certainly appreciate you being here today and look very forward to your testimony on this very important subject.

Let me remind the witnesses that we have read your written statement, and it will appear in full in the hearing record. Please limit your oral statement to 5 minutes. As a reminder, please press the button on the microphone in front of you so that it is on and the Members can hear you. When you begin to speak, the light in front of you will turn green. After 4 minutes, the light will turn yellow. When the red light comes on, your 5 minutes is expired, and we please ask that you wrap it up as quick as you can.

I now recognize Dr. Thayer for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF DR. BRADLEY THAYER
FOUNDING MEMBER
COMMITTEE ON THE PRESENT DANGER: CHINA**

Dr. THAYER. Chair Comer, Ranking Member Raskin, and distinguished Members of this Committee, good morning, and thank you for the honor and privilege of permitting me to testify today in my personal capacity.

The current cold war with the Chinese Communist Party is multifaceted and fought thus far, short of kinetic war, but in all other domains, including the economic, diplomatic, and political. Given the focus of this Committee and topic of this hearing, it is important to understand the similarities between this cold war and the one fought with the Soviet Union. The most salient is that the motivation for aggression remains the same—communist ideology of the Soviet Union in the past and of the CCP today.

The impact of the ideology of communism and its role in driving the PRC's aggression is essential for this Committee to comprehend. Communism is a Western ideology imported into China and is not part of Chinese civilization, political culture, or political history, but its effect on China has been profound and created a swath of destruction through that country. It has intentionally destroyed the pillars of Chinese culture, society, and civilization, and killed scores of millions of Chinese.

Understanding the CCP's ideology provides Congress and Federal departments and agencies three major insights into the PRC's behavior. First, it allows them to comprehend why the PRC is inherently aggressive. Communism seeks to force societies like China's into an ideological procrustean bed defined by Marxism/Leninism. In addition, communism requires aggression, including unrestricted warfare against non-communist states. The effect on U.S. national security interests could not be more significant as this ex-

plains the CCP's aggression against the U.S. In the CCP's worldview, the U.S. is the fundamental enemy to be destroyed. The second insight is, the CCP is a product of Soviet imperialism. The Soviets and the Communist International played a dominant role in organizing, instructing, and, in almost every sense that matters, de facto leading the CCP. The role of Soviet communist thought is essential for comprehending the actions of the CCP, and it provided the foundation for what is known as Maoism, or more recently, Xi Jinping thought on socialism with Chinese characteristics for a new era.

The third insight is that the CCP is illegitimate. It is so for three reasons, first, precisely because they were formed and nurtured by the Communist International, and the CCP seizure of power in 1949 was made possible by Stalin and the Red Army. Second, they seek to sustain the tyranny of the failed ideology of communism on the Chinese people, when this ideology should be thought of for what it is: an illegitimate polity for China and the last surviving form of Western colonialism. The CCP cannot hide the fact that it is a product of Soviet imperialism. Third, the CCP is illegitimate because of its abhorrent leadership, which has accelerated under the misrule of General Secretary Xi Jinping. Seventy years of the CCP's tyranny have led to the recognition by the Chinese people that the odious, corrupt, and illegitimate regime rules for itself, not for the Chinese people.

I offer in my written testimony eight detailed recommendations for Congress. Here, I only mention their unifying theme, that is, given their august past, the Chinese people naturally possess a profound sense of pride in their civilization and its great accomplishments. They rightfully perceive themselves to occupy a unique place in the world that has excelled in every aspect, including literature, philosophy, art, religion, and technology. Accordingly, the Chinese people have their own ideas about how to govern China based on their glorious past and exalted history. Being ruled by a Soviet knockoff ideology is not part of the plan, nor should it be, and this insight introduces tremendous vulnerability for the Chinese Communist Party as their ideology is anchored and remains dependent upon that Western ideology of Marxism/Leninism. Thus, to move to a better future for the Chinese people begins by recognizing that the CCP is illegitimate and has no right to rule them.

In conclusion, the U.S. is now in a new cold war. The Sino-American security competition is the great struggle of the 21st century and promises to resolve the century's dispositive question: whether the world will be free and protected by the United States and its allies or fall into a totalitarian abyss as sought by the CCP. The 20th century encountered the same question, and freedom defeated communism. Today, the answer to this question, will freedom or tyranny define the 21st century, will be answered by Congress, the Administration, U.S. allies and partners, and, ultimately, the American people. The leadership and focus of this Committee will contribute to ensuring that the answer will be the same in the 21st century as it was in the last: freedom will triumph over the CCP's tyranny.

Thank you very much, indeed, for the great honor and opportunity to address this testimony. I look forward to addressing your questions.

Chairman COMER. Thank you very much. Mr. Atkinson?

**STATEMENT OF ROBERT D. ATKINSON
FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND INNOVATION
FOUNDATION (ITIF)**

Dr. ATKINSON. Thank you, Chairman Comer and Ranking Member Raskin and Members of the Committee. In the late 50s—I do not remember what year it was—but there was the famous kitchen debate with Vice President Nixon and Khrushchev, and Khrushchev said, “We will bury you,” and what he meant by that was our socialist, communist economy is going to be so much stronger than your weak capitalist economy, and eventually we will win. Now, that was a joke. I mean, he was not making a joke, but it was a joke. There was simply no way the Russians could do that, just because their system was so inept and so bureaucratic and so controlled.

The Chinese Government learned from that, and so what they have learned is, essentially, you have to have capitalism with Chinese characteristics, and so they are a capitalist economy in many, many ways. Their firms have an enormous amount of freedom with one exception, you cannot criticize the CCP. But beyond that, you can do what you want as long as you are pushing for global market share and dominance.

So, I think it is really, really critical that we don’t compare them to the Soviets when it comes to the techno-economic threat. They are more like Taiwan, Japan, Singapore, Korea on massive amounts of steroids, and they make no bones about hiding the ball. Yi Changliang, a leading official at Chinese NDRC, wrote, “At a time when this new round of techno-scientific revolution and industrial transformation has not yet gained its full momentum, there are grand expectations for artificial intelligence, Big Data, cloud computing, and these areas have become the main battlefield for innovation.”

So, that is really the key term. They are using the term “battlefield.” We do not talk to our Canadian colleagues and say we have a battlefield for lumber. We have competition over these industries, but not a battlefield, and that is really the key point here. The Chinese see this as a global battle where there is a winner and a loser, and, in particular, they are not trying to win in the soybean market or the banking market. They are trying to win in a set of advanced industries that are critical to military capabilities as well as overall national power.

They have already shown that they can do that, for example, in solar power, in drones, in shipbuilding, in steel, in telecom equipment. And now what they are doing is they are going after a whole set of new industries: AI, quantum computing. The Chinese are building more nuclear power plants, and they have under construction, than the rest of the world combined. Chinese are putting more money into quantum computing R&D than every other government in the world combined. The Chinese installed more robots last year,

industrial robots, than the rest of the world combined. They are making enormous progress and their goal—they have now, by the way, the leading quantum communication systems in the world. So, what they are doing is an all-of-government approach to defeat us, to defeat American technology capabilities as well as allied capabilities.

So, what do we need to do? I think there are several things we should not do, and one of the things that we should not do is fall for the false hope of cooperation. So, you hear this view all the time, well, you know, there are things that we are competing with China, but we have to cooperate with them, and my two favorites are, one is infectious diseases. So, let me get this right. A country that put the COVID virus in the world—now there is the question of did it come from a lab or did it come from a wet market, I am not going to take a position on that—but there is no question the Chinese hid the ball on that and made it worse. And we are supposed to cooperate with them? And the second is climate change. A country that now is leading in global emissions has no desire to reduce emissions, zero, unless it is in their interest.

We do not need to cooperate with China. What we do need to do is figure out a way to confront them—and this part is critical—in ways that do not hurt us. So, if I am in a fight with somebody and they are fighting me, and I can punch him in the face and I break my hand, probably not the best thing for me to do. But if I can kick him in the kneecap and not hurt my leg, that is probably better. So, we have to figure out ways that can challenge them without hurting us.

And one of the key things I think we need to do is three things: put in place a more robust competitiveness strategy. And Congressman Raskin, you rightly alluded to the many things that Congress and the Biden Administration have done. I certainly applaud that, but we ought to keep going. Second, we have called for the establishment of a National Competitiveness Council in the White House focused on China and focused on coordinating all the various agencies. I really commend what your Committee has done in terms of getting agencies to figure this out because they do not think about this from a China perspective. Each agency thinks about this from their own narrow perspective, which is reasonable and understandable, but it does not work anymore. We also have to have, essentially, a training program in government where we train government agencies and officials on what the threat is. It is striking to me when I talk to government agencies and officials how little they know about this, and I think we need to do a lot more on that.

So, with that, thank you so much, and I apologize for running over.

Chairman COMER. Thank you. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Cella.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOSEPH CELLA
FORMER UNITED STATES AMBASSADOR TO
FIJI, KIRIBATI, NAURU, TONGA, AND TUVAL
FOUNDER AND PRINCIPAL
PONTIFEX GROUP**

Mr. CELLA. Good morning, Chairman Comer, Ranking Member Raskin, and distinguished Members of this Committee. Thank you for inviting me to testify.

In his February 2023 speech entitled, “An Intelligence Officer’s Perspective on China,” now retired Navy Admiral, Mike Studeman, who, then serving as Commander of ONI, stated, “The China problem is more gigantic than understood or appreciated.” Political warfare by the government of the People’s Republic of China, the Chinese Communist Party, poses an existential threat to the United States of America. My testimony today, based on my experience in this cold war with the CCP as a U.S. diplomat, a concerned American, and a resident of Michigan, focuses on failures of the Federal Government to both understand the depth and breadth of this threat and to effectively counter it.

I witnessed firsthand the CCP’s impactful use of political and economic warfare across the Indo-Pacific. Through this, China has effectively bypassed our historic defensive barriers in the Pacific, called the First and Second Island Chains, endangering Hawaii, Guam, U.S. territories, and our friends and allies there. Despite ample warning by Pacific Island leaders, the Federal Government did little over the years to stop China’s ominous advance. During my accreditation trip to Kiribati, I visited the Friendship Bridge connecting North and South Tarawa, paid for by the DoD funding and dedicated in 2010 by my former late predecessor, Ambassador Steve McGann. It was built using World War II-era Bailey Bridge construction design, certainly far deficient for the punishing weather at the equator. The bridge was well past its temporary design purpose, patched-in diamond plate sheeting scattered on it, rusting apart and unsafe. I worked aggressively with INDOPACOM to secure the funding to replace the bridge. It was ultimately approved, however, it got snagged between the Pentagon and the state Department bureaucracies. In my understanding, it remained snagged. The CCP-owned China Railway Group swooped in and built an auxiliary cement bridge, though underwater during high tide. Our Friendship Bridge is in tatters, and it is my understanding it is now impassable.

I have also witnessed malign influence through a subnational incursion and influence operation by a PRC-based and CCP-tied lithium-ion battery manufacturer, Gotion, in Green Charter Township, Michigan. And that is just one of many examples across the United States that threatens our national security and sovereignty. Roughly 70 miles from Gotion’s proposed facility is a secure U.S. military installation known as Camp Grayling. It is the hub of the National All-Domain Warfighting Center, which trains our troops and those of our allies, including Taiwan, in strategic and tactical battle operations. Gotion submitted a voluntary declaration to the Committee on Foreign Investment of the United States in the spring of 2023, quite surprisingly declared it an “uncovered real estate transaction.”

In recent weeks, the Biden Administration proposed a rule that added over 50 U.S. military bases, including Camp Grayling, for required reviews by CFIUS when a deal involving a foreign company such as Gotion falls within a 100-mile radius of a military facility. Perplexing, while our defense officials likely instituted this rule on account of mission-critical assets at Camp Grayling there, it is not retroactive and it does not apply to Gotion. Through my volunteer work for the MCESRG, in recent days I was alarmed to discover Federal officials either ignored or overlooked a February 2020 U.S. Treasury Department CFIUS rule regarding joint-use military facilities that covers the Gotion transaction given the Army Airfield at Camp Grayling.

I wrote to Mr. Paul Rosen, the Assistant Secretary of State at the Treasury for Investment Security, requesting he reexamine Gotion's declarations under that regulation and scrutinize the project accordingly. Court filings this past Friday revealed offers by Gotion to now recall trustees that seems to involve elite capture, corruption, influence peddling, and enrichment. These offers include all-expense-paid trips to China, a sweetheart real estate purchase that would have netted a recalled trustee \$2 million, and employment in the event that they were recalled. Text messages between a Gotion official and a recalled trustee read, "We got each other's backs" and "You have my back. Now it is my turn to help," as well, "You have been a great partner and becoming an even better friend. I will help however I can." Those were never disclosed and below the radar of the Federal Government.

This is precisely why our national security intelligence agencies in 2022 convened and warned a bipartisan group of state-elected and local leaders and business officials to be very careful and wary about the grave risks about engaging in these seemingly benign business deals with companies based in the PRC. And instead of following the directives to conduct them transparently, do due diligence, perform strict scrutiny, ensure transparency, integrity, and accountability, the government and business elites with this project did exactly the opposite. They moved fast and in secret, binding them and shrouding them in 5- and 10-year nondisclosure agreements using secret code names. So, this ruptures the consent of the governed and certainly jeopardizes our national security.

These events offer a cautionary tale on the importance of inter-governmental agency process that first acknowledges the serious threat, the political and economic warfare being waged by the CCP; second, it is nimble spotting these threats; and third, can defend, if not prevent, them within our sovereign Nation. Thank you for your time and attention, and I look forward to answering your questions.

Chairman COMER. Thank you very much. Mr. Stokes?

**STATEMENT OF JACOB STOKES
SENIOR FELLOW (FOCUSED ON CHINA)
INDO-PACIFIC SECURITY PROGRAM
CENTER FOR A NEW AMERICAN SECURITY**

Mr. STOKES. Chairman Comer, Ranking Member Raskin, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for the oppor-

tunity to testify today on this critical topic. I will start by assessing the challenge and then offer some thoughts on how to respond.

The People's Republic of China, particularly under the rule of CCP General Secretary, Xi Jinping, poses the most consequential challenge to American interests and values over the coming decades. How the United States wages strategic competition with China will determine the course of world affairs in this century. The challenge from Beijing is most acute in East Asia and the broader Indo-Pacific region, but China's reach is increasingly global, to include the United States. Specifically, regarding China's political warfare, the CCP's foundational goal is to combat threats to its hold on power domestically in China and generally make the world safe for authoritarianism. As part of that campaign, Beijing seeks to paint democracies as corrupt, internally divided, tumultuous, and incapable of tackling big problems facing society.

So, what should we, the United States, do about it? A comprehensive U.S. strategy to compete with China should have several pillars. First, the United States needs a credible military deterrent to guard against PRC aggression. Second, we should forge an economic, financial, and trade strategy that ensures U.S. companies and workers compete in the global economy on a level playing field. Third, we must continue to innovate cutting-edge civilian and military technologies, like artificial intelligence and quantum computing, and actively work to increase their uptake across both the private and public sectors. Fourth, our diplomacy should sustain and expand coalitions of allies, partners, and like-minded countries to magnify the impact of our activities across the other pillars.

U.S.-China competition is too often portrayed as a contest between two countries when it is actually a contest of coalitions. Coalition building is painstaking and sometimes requires frustrating compromises, but it is worth the effort because it allows the United States to effectively counterbalance Beijing's actions that violate international rules and norms, and even engage China diplomatically on a selective basis from a position of strength. As for responding to the PRC's political warfare specifically, the United States should assist vulnerable countries in exposing and punishing inappropriate PRC influence, whether in the form of political interference, transnational repression, or economic or security espionage. Washington can do so by sharing intelligence on how China operates, supporting fact-based investigations by civil society and independent media outlets, and bolstering strong institutions and the rule of law around the world. The good news is that strengthening the foundations of democracies overseas, a worthy objective in its own right, helps counter PRC influence, too.

Meanwhile, we face similar challenges from the CCP here at home, as we have heard. The United States must also protect against efforts by the PRC party-state to interfere with and weaken our democracy and sow division and discord. Front and center in that fight, of course, are law enforcement and counterintelligence activities that are both vigorous and vigilant. They should deny and impose costs on China for efforts to influence the sovereign affairs of the United States or to steal our technology or other secrets. Equally essential are transparent and accountable institutions and processes which can help inoculate us against the

tools of CCP influence. The actions we take to defend ourselves, however, will be both ineffective and self-defeating unless they accord with American values. The United States is engaged in an intense strategic competition with China. That is a geopolitical fact.

Additionally, PRC intelligence draws on a wide range of intelligence collectors. Those facts could tempt the United States to go beyond targeted commonsense controls in key sectors and instead cast all people of Chinese or even Asian descent as suspect. We could even be tempted to turn away from our country's historical role as a place where people seeking a better life yearn to live. We must resist those temptations because they would play right into the CCP's hands. America's ability to attract the best and brightest from around the world to come to our country and adopt our way of life, indeed, our political ideology is an asymmetric geopolitical advantage that we squander at our peril. It is the reason why our economy is growing when China's is not, why our innovation ecosystem leads the world. In other words, we cannot effectively protect America by becoming more like China.

Finally, in addition to disrupting the tools the CCP uses to influence and interfere, we should refute Beijing's underlying argument by demonstrating that democracy can deliver freedom, prosperity, and security for its citizens in America and around the world. To put it in political warfare terms, delivering on the promise of democracy will act as a potent counteroffensive to China's efforts.

I will conclude my remarks there. Thank you again for the opportunity to speak, and I look forward to your questions.

Chairman COMER. Thank you all very much for your opening statements. We will now begin the questions. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Gosar, for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Thayer, the United States is kind of responsible for China, right?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOSAR. And that would be the Carter Doctrine, right?

Dr. THAYER. Well, it would be an aspect of a longer tradition of that, although President Carter, of course, did illuminate that issue.

Mr. GOSAR. Right. So, what we actually did, we thought that we can make China like us, and we just gave them our technology, right?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir. We let them into our economic ecosystem, and they have thrived, obviously, within that ecosystem.

Mr. GOSAR. And I think, Mr. Atkinson, you talked about CFIUS. CFIUS is a poor constraint here because we saw that in Uranium One. That has long gone past this point. So, I guess my point is, if we are going to have some kind of a jurisdictional boundary over China, don't you think it would be better to say, instead of picking individual businesses, to say that no foreign national can sit on any operating or oversight board of any company in the United States? Wouldn't that be something of better value than trying to target one business after another?

Mr. CELLA. I think that would be a start. I think another alternative would be to perhaps consider passing an updated version of the National Security Act of 1947 where the whole of government would have to abide by such rules that you point to.

Mr. GOSAR. Yes. You know, in fact, Mr. Stokes, you talked about the rule of law, pretty much so, and if I was talking about an operating partner or an oversight partner and they had to be U.S. citizens, violation of that is treason, right?

Mr. STOKES. I do not know the legal definition, sir.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, I mean, they are a violation of other country, all these would be a national defense item, OK? Let us talk about intellectual property. When I first came here in 2010, we were No. 1 in the world. We are not even in the top 10 right now. You know, can you address that and China, Dr. Thayer?

Dr. THAYER. Well, indeed, what we have seen, of course, is a shift in relative power from the United States to the People's Republic of China. That has been conducted willingly by many American firms who have shared their technology with the People's Republic of China. China also has, through legal and illegal means, acquired our technology. And so, what we have seen, in essence, is really the greatest transfer of technology, of intellectual acumen, of knowledge about processes with respect to production, with respect to marketing, with respect to execution in history.

Mr. GOSAR. Ambassador Cella, so really, the first to file violated the whole premise of our Constitution instead of first to discover, right?

Mr. CELLA. Pardon me?

Mr. GOSAR. So, the whole premise of first to file instead of first to discover, like what we were told would change the whole concept of intellectual property, was a violation of our Constitution, right? Would you say that?

Mr. CELLA. I am not a constitutional scholar, sir.

Mr. GOSAR. Well, we gained the protections, too. Mr. Stokes, would you agree with that?

Mr. STOKES. I also do not know the law there.

Mr. GOSAR. OK. Well, what we did is we said first to file, and we allowed these trolls, whether the foreign nationals or some of these big companies here, we allowed them to file, and then we said we are going to give you this little appeasement for the guy who actually found that to challenge that. It never works that way. Our intellectual property has been sold out. We are now not even in the top 10, and that really plays a big difference in our aspects. Ambassador Cella, if you were to prioritize which parts of business you would like to look at very carefully, how would you prioritize those?

Mr. CELLA. Congressman, I would say a very finely focused laser should be targeted to any sector that involves critical technologies, particularly those that entangle military technologies and space technologies and certainly critical minerals, and there are gaping holes in that throughout the private sector and even the university sector. And there are citizens, civilians that are engaged on this and tracking and filing lawsuits, whistleblowing, where we are particularly vulnerable in this.

Mr. GOSAR. Would you agree that if we had NGO's out there, nongovernment entities, if they were to take one penny, full disclosure should become about however they get their funding? Would you agree with that?

Mr. CELLA. Yes.

Mr. GOSAR. How about you, Dr. Thayer? Would you agree with that?

Dr. THAYER. Absolutely. Yes, sir.

Mr. GOSAR. How about you, Mr. Atkinson? Would you agree with that?

Dr. ATKINSON. Sure.

Mr. GOSAR. How about you, Mr. Stokes?

Mr. STOKES. Absolutely.

Mr. GOSAR. God love you. I yield back.

Ms. MACE. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Ms. Mace.

Ms. MACE. I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record an article from March that says that, "Biden Praises Xi as a 'Smart, Smart Guy,' Promises to 'Hold China Accountable'."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Ms. MACE. And if the Ranking Member is going to harp on President Trump's comments about President Xi, he should note that President Biden praised Xi as a smart, smart guy. Good morning.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning to Ms. Mace. Thank you to all the witnesses for your excellent testimony.

Mr. Stokes, you said it is a mistake to characterize what is going on as a competition just between two countries. You are saying it is a contest between coalitions. Would you just briefly tell us who are the main actors or great powers within each coalition?

Mr. STOKES. Yes, absolutely, Ranking Member. So, certainly, I would say on the one side we have the United States and our democratic allies and partners, both in Europe and the Indo-Pacific. And I would say on the other side you have China in an increasingly close connection with Russia, working at a strategic level, and then paired in with their partners in North Korea and Iran, leading more of an authoritarian bloc. And I would say there is a group of countries in between that you can think of as sort of swing states that we should be kind of focusing on how do we bring them into our coalition?

Mr. RASKIN. But what is the role that political propaganda and disinformation play in this struggle today?

Mr. STOKES. In my view, the role that those things play is to make authoritarianism seem like it works better than it does, and to make an argument for that among people who are, you know, casting about for what system is going to give them the best way of life going forward. And so, I think we both have to be on the defensive, but also go out and make the case for democracy in an affirmative way.

Mr. RASKIN. I wonder what the panelists think about the importance of the struggle in Ukraine today against Putin's filthy imperialist invasion of Ukraine, what would a victory for the people of Ukraine against Russian aggression mean for our struggle against China, and what would a loss to Russia mean for the struggle against China. Dr. Thayer, what are your thoughts on that?

Dr. THAYER. Ranking Member Raskin, thank you for the question. It is a critically important issue. A loss to Russia, of course, would be a tremendous blow to Xi Jinping, who has made Putin his

meridian, right? Putin is a soldier executing the tasks assigned to him by Xi Jinping, in essence. We can recall, of course, the meeting that they had before the invasion in February 2022, where Xi Jinping gave him the green light. So, Ukrainian defeat of Russia is a tremendous blow to Communist China.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you. Mr. Atkinson, do you agree with that?

Dr. ATKINSON. I am not a military expert. I do not do foreign policy, so I am afraid I cannot answer that.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you. Mr. Cella, do you agree that a victory for Ukraine against Putin's invasion is critical to our ability to stand up to the tyrants and autocrats in China?

Mr. CELLA. I would say what has befallen Ukraine is a tragedy, and I would say through what has happened via Russia, China is pressure testing us. They are watching how we engage. And I am not a military expert, certainly, nor am I a foreign policy expert in that realm, but it has to be handled with all due care——

Mr. RASKIN. Great. And Mr. Stokes?

Mr. CELLA [continuing]. To ensure freedom.

Mr. STOKES. Yes. I think one lesson that Xi Jinping could draw from that would be that in a war of aggression, you only have to wait the United States and its allies and partners out, you know, 2, 2 1/2 years, and then you can get away with the, you know, grabbing the territory that you want.

Mr. RASKIN. So, what would that mean in the case of Taiwan, for example?

Mr. STOKES. I think, you know, it would make it more likely that Xi Jinping would, you know, make an attempt on Taiwan, and I think one of the ways you can, you know, analytical ways you can draw from that is just see China's support for Russia. It is both its tangible support, but also it is political and diplomatic support, "legitimate security interests" is the term that China uses. And so, it is an issue of principle in addition to an issue of military power.

Mr. RASKIN. OK. And what do you think is the importance of strengthening American political institutions against subversion and attack from those who would try to challenge our basic constitutional structure?

Mr. STOKES. Well, I think, you know, making them stronger and more resilient is a strategy of denial for those who would try to interfere in American democracy, so just make it harder to be successful in so that we can have a strategy of denial. And then add to that a strategy of punishment in those instances where we see China, Russia, other hostile nations trying to interfere directly in our system.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you very much. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Cloud.

Mr. CLOUD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all for being here. This is certainly one of the most urgent matters that we are dealing with. I find it odd that as we watch the news, very often, it is not that they are lying, although sometimes that is the case. It is just we are not talking about things that are essentially important and things that are going to matter 20, 30 years from now. Well, this topic certainly will and how we address it, so thank you for being here. Thank you, Chair, for hosting this.

Dr. Thayer, I think it was you who talked about “this is the greatest shift in American power that we have seen transferring to the east.” This was predicted. Actually, U.S. National Intelligence Council in November 2008 released a report, and they do this periodically, as I am sure you all know. But they said the unprecedented shift in relative wealth and economic power roughly from West to East is now underway and will continue. They said the United States in relative strength, even in military realm, will decline and that U.S. leverage will become more and more constrained in terms of size, speed, and directional flow. The transfer of global wealth and economic power now underway roughly from East to West is happening without precedent in modern history.

And it went on and it explained why it was happening. It said it is happening for two reasons: one, we are sending manufacturing overseas and we are sending oil and gas revenues overseas, and yet, it seems like we have not changed course when the prescription was there as it addressed the problem, that we continue to send overseas. And you also called this a cold war. I have read “Unrestricted Warfare.” I know a lot of people have, but, you know, the different ways that they talk about providing warfare, and this is not even a comprehensive list. Of course, they list the traditional ones as well.

Mr. Atkinson, you mentioned some of these: trade warfare, network warfare, biological warfare, biochemical resource warfare. I think what is going on at our border and even how they are taking advantage of what is happening at the border and causing us to use resources, not to mention what they are getting across our border in the ways of fentanyl and military-aged single adults that are coming across our border. Economic aid, warfare, regulatory warfare, smuggling, drug warfare, electronic space, it just goes on and on. As part of that, they said can special funds be set up to exert greater influence on another country’s government and legislature through lobbying? Could buying or gaining control of stocks be used to turn another country’s newspapers and television stations into tools of media warfare? I mean, they are in a no-holds-barred, all-the-collateral, it seems, warfare against the United States. And so, it seems like we have to, first of all, recognize the moment, and I know that you all do. I think you are here bringing some awareness to that, but I have not felt like our government and certainly our State Department has felt that.

I was wondering, Mr. Ceya—did I say it right—“Cella,” yes—Mr. Cella, if you could explain to me what you have seen in regards of our State Department and what you think we should be doing to counter what we are seeing coming from China?

Mr. CELLA. Certainly. Thank you for the question, sir. I would say that we are where we are. I would say that after the cold war, in 1993, we kind of pulled up tent stakes. End of history, I would say, could be symbolized in the Indo-Pacific with closing of our embassy in the Solomon Islands. China has been in that realm, in the late 80’s, doing irregular things. They had approval by UNESCO to put a tide monitoring station at Fiery Cross Reef. What is the Fiery Cross Reef now? A 10,000-foot runway, a deep-water port, some suggest some missile armaments as well.

So, they have done a lot in a period of time, where, again, obviously, our ken shifted to the Middle East and our engagements there. But we have a lot of time to make up for, and I think it is imperative for really all the interagencies, State Department, to provide information and education to the public at large. It is a whole-of-society, a whole-of-government engagement. One element, I think, that is lacking within the Foreign Service Institute, for instance, would be to have a segment, a section on political warfare. What it is, to marinate in who the CCP is, who General Secretary Xi Jinping is, what their objectives are, and what they can do before they head out to post and what they need to do when they are at post.

Mr. CLOUD. When I have talked to leaders, Ambassadors from other countries, I have heard this often from different continents, even, from different leaders, and they say right now obviously, we love the United States, its history of freedom. We want to align ourselves to that, but when we talk to China, we hear about roads, bridges. When we talk to our State Department, we get a lecture, and it is social reengineering, you know, in many cases, values that really are not embraced in their country, and it is not really about creating a relationship or certainly projecting American interests. Do you have anything to say to that?

Mr. CELLA. I would say just, back to the Foreign Service Institute, an understated tool, I think, that we really should build on that I found useful when I was at post, using our Judeo-Christian roots as a country and use it as a means of outreach in terms of soft power engagement with our host countries. That has a mighty impact. China does not do that. They do not know how to do it.

Mr. CLOUD. All right.

Mr. CELLA. It is not here and not there. That has to be complemented, I think, by some very meaningful engagements. I think the COFA, for instance, one material way. I guess that when I was there, this was an appeal from other windswept nations that I was accredited to, suffering again. There is great affinity for us, there is great comity to us, we fought for them, bled for them, died for them in World War II—would to have been to extend COFA to include countries such as Nauru and Kiribati, who, within the last 5 years, have shifted allegiance from Taiwan to Beijing.

Mr. CLOUD. I see my time has expired.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes Ms. Norton from Washington, DC.

Ms. NORTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Biden-Harris Administration knows that one of the best ways to counter the Chinese Communist Party is to outcompete them economically. That is why President Biden championed the Inflation Reduction Act and the CHIPS and Science Act, and thanks to these landmark laws, American innovation is thriving and more people have high-paying domestic manufacturing jobs. Now America is maintaining a competitive advantage over China in strategic sectors by investing in our workforce and in American businesses. Within 1 year of the CHIPS and Science Act becoming law, American companies announced over \$160 billion in investments in semiconductors and electronics, and the semiconductor manufacturing job market is now growing after decades of decline.

So, Mr. Stokes, the CHIPS and Science Act is a strong investment in America, but how does it help us compete with China?

Mr. STOKES. I think, in general, you know, chips are essential for all of modern industry. And so, to be able to have supply chains based in our own country, in addition to those based in friendly countries, allies and partners, helps improve the resilience of the American economy overall, and that makes us more able to compete with China.

Ms. NORTON. The Inflation Reduction Act also invests in manufacturing and innovation. It is projected to create 1.5 million new jobs over the next decade. Dr. Atkinson, how does the Inflation Reduction Act and its investments in electric vehicle batteries and other clean technology help reduce American dependence on Chinese manufacturers?

Dr. ATKINSON. Thank you, Congresswoman. There is no question that the generous incentives in IRA have played a big role in attracting particularly foreign investment, and we see a lot of Korean companies, Japanese companies, European companies now investing in factories and R&D facilities, so that is critical. But what I would add on the semiconductor part as well as this part, it is not enough just to attract factories here. You look at the troubles now that Intel is facing. Ultimately, what the Chinese want to do is they want to destroy Intel, they want to destroy Boeing, they want to destroy Merck. And to be fair, the CHIPS and Science Act, which we fully supported, is not really a fix for that. Intel is not making any money on this program because they are basically investing in America, a fab or fabs, that cost a lot more than if they were investing in Asia.

So, while it is a critical program to get production here, it does not address the core problem of our companies facing predatory practices against Chinese. So overall, IRA is a very important program, it helps, but there are a lot of other sectors and there is more work to be done.

Ms. NORTON. Well, the Biden-Harris Administration is securing America's economy, both now and in the future, to compete strategically with China and fight back against the Chinese Communist Party. This Administration knows what it takes to invest in America's workforce, and this Administration, unlike the Trump Administration, has a strong approach to bolstering our economy that puts American families first. Thank you, and I yield any time I have left to the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Well, thank you very kindly. Mr. Chairman, I did want to do a unanimous consent request. I looked into the article that was cited by Representative Mace, and indeed, President Biden did call President Xi a smart guy. It was in this context. He said, "We are going to hold China accountable to follow the rules," Biden said. He framed the competition between Washington and Beijing as part of a broader battle between democracy and autocracy, saying that Xi "does not have a democratic bone in his body, but he is a smart, smart guy."

Now, compare that to what we saw with President Trump, where he praised the brilliance and the genius of President Xi and said that he envied Xi's control over his body and the whole society snaps to attention when he speaks, and that is what he wants in

America, too. So, I do not think President Biden was ever emulating General Xi's political tact, but in any event, I would like to submit that for the record.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair now recognizes Dr. Foxx from North Carolina.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank our witnesses for being here today.

Dr. Thayer, as China asserts itself as a global power, it is important that the United States maintains a competitive edge so we can prevail against any potential threats. However, we see repeated instances where the United States fails to comprehend the threat posed by the Chinese Communist Party, or CCP, and allows the CCP to infiltrate and exploit our institutions for nefarious purposes. While the American university system was once one of our greatest assets in the competition for fast innovation and dynamic leadership, the CCP's malign influence and subversion have turned it into a potential liability. Foreign dollars flow into the universities without accountability and consistently undermine our domestic influence. Confucius Institutes subvert traditional American values in key areas like equipping students with the skills to enter the workforce. American universities are faltering.

How is it that the Federal Government has failed to comprehend the threat posed by the Chinese Communist Party to our institutions and especially our university system? And let me give a finer point on that: how has the lack of leadership from the Biden-Harris Administration enabled the CCP's political warfare and undermining of our institutions?

Dr. THAYER. I thank the representative for the question. Of course, that is essentially important to understand how this occurred. There are three points to make here. First, the communist leader, Deng Xiaoping, was one of the greatest strategists of the 20th century when he recognized to save the Chinese Communist Party, he was going to have to reach out to American investors. He was going to have to work out to Americans and make them partners, really, in manufacturing and trade with the People's Republic of China. That set us on a path of engagement with China, where there was the belief in the United States that by engaging with China, we would make it democratic, we would reform it. And, of course, that has not come to pass, and, in fact, the tyranny of the CCP has only hardened. With that investment in China, of course, we have communities, we have many individuals who have investments in the People's Republic of China and have, of course, their resources to employ to sustain those relationships. So, as you observed, of course, it is very a difficult problem to resolve.

Third issue, a point just succinctly to make in this respect, is that it would be very valuable for the Biden Administration to take bold measures to call out the record, the tyranny of the Chinese Communist Party so that all Americans looking at China, the People's Republic of China, can see the tyranny of the Chinese Communist Party, what they are doing, of course, in the Muslim genocide in Xinjiang and elsewhere, crushing of the Tibetan people, crushing of their own people, and in international politics, of course, hyper aggression against the Philippines, for example.

Ms. FOXX. All right. Well, I think the American people are smart enough to understand what a threat China is. I just think the Biden-Harris Administration has no clue.

Ambassador Cella, this Committee and others have uncovered countless examples of the CCP's hyper-aggressive political warfare tactics, including CCP efforts to weaken America through economic warfare, as we just heard. As we have discussed, numerous instances of the CCP exploiting academic collaborations and U.S. taxpayer funded research for its own military gain. Based on your experience as Ambassador, what examples of this kind of economic warfare have you seen, and what is China's goal?

Mr. CELLA. I will share with you an anecdote on the other side of my service in the state of Michigan, reverting back to my testimony when I mentioned the PRC-based, CCP-tied company, Gotion, that is trying to work its way there. In February 2022, the top executives of Gotion—PRC nationals that came in, leadership in the Chinese Communist Party, Chinese people's consultant of Congress—they requested to divert from their planned itinerary and asked to see the AI laboratory at Ferris State University. Ferris State University is one of only two universities in the United States of America that are funded by the NSA and the DoD to do cyber studies, satellite studies, cybersecurity, and the driver of the bus was told to not ask them any questions or have conversations with them. That program has nothing to do what Gotion's designs are. I would say probably we know what their designs are, and that is indicative and troubling. So, our guard needs to be up, and it is not, Madam Congresswoman.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you again to our witnesses. Mr. Atkinson, I am going to submit a question for the record for you. My time is up, and I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yields. The Chair now recognizes the Co-Chair of the China Task Force, the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Krishnamoorthi.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I want to turn to a comment that you made and an article that you wrote, Dr. Thayer, about engagement with China. In this article, you write, "The U.S. Must End Engagement with PRC Now." Isn't that what it says?

Dr. THAYER. What is the title, sir, if you could share?

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Title is, "The U.S. Must End Engagement with PRC Now."

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. OK. In the article, you wrote that we must halt engagement. That is what you wrote, right?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. And you wrote that, "This fundamental fact was understood during the Trump Administration," right?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir. The Trump Administration took measures to bring about fundamental change from the engagement policies that we had had in the post-cold war period.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI. Right, and to kind of reduce engagement, halt engagement, as you said. Well, let us look at the facts.

[Photos]

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Let me show you the first picture, this graphic here. Here is a picture of the first summit of Trump and Xi at Mar-a-Lago. That is Trump and Xi, right, Dr. Thayer?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir, it is.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Let me show you this next graphic.

[Photo]

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Here is Chairman Xi hosting Donald Trump in China. That is Trump and Xi, right?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Let me show you this next picture.

[Photo]

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. This is a picture of Donald Trump engaging with Chairman Xi in Hamburg, Germany. Isn't that, right?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir. It is a picture of those individuals.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And let me show you this next one.

[Photo]

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Here is a picture of Donald Trump with Xi in Buenos Aires, engaging again, right?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And let me show you this next one.

[Photo]

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Here is a picture of Donald Trump and Chairman Xi engaging with each other in Osaka, Japan. That is Trump and Xi, correct?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Dr. Thayer, these are all official meetings between Donald Trump and Chairman Xi, and I count just five in these pictures here, and I think there are a lot more. I would not agree with you at all that we should halt engagement between the U.S. and the PRC or that Trump did not engage with China. I believe that senior-level engagement with China is important. I actually agree with what President Trump did, which is engage the PRC. And I would encourage the next President, whoever he or she is, to continue that engagement, not halt it, as you would suggest, but to continue it, in order to make clear to the other side what our red lines are and what type of behavior we would expect of them. And this type of bipartisan approach by Republicans and Democrats is essential for winning the strategic competition between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party.

And I would like to turn to my next topic. One of Xi Jinping's senior-most advisors is a gentleman named Wang Huning. Wang Huning is a member of the Standing Committee of the Politburo, one of the top seven people in China. He wrote a book called, "America Against America," in which he describes America as a crisis-ridden society, hopelessly divided—hopelessly divided—including between Democrats and Republicans. Mr. Stokes, you would agree with me that the CCP and other foreign adversaries seek to keep us fighting, Republicans and Democrats fighting with each other because in that state, we are much weaker in the competition between the U.S. and China, correct?

Mr. STOKES. Yes, Congressman, I agree.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And so, I feel, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, partisanship is completely counterproductive to our China policy, and that as the Ranking Member of the Select Committee

on the CCP, we must pursue a bipartisan policy because anything else is exactly what the CCP would want. Let me turn to my final topic. Mr. Atkinson, you would agree with me that the competition between the United States and the CCP is not a quarrel with the Chinese people, correct?

Dr. ATKINSON. Correct.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And it is not a quarrel with people of Chinese origin, correct?

Dr. ATKINSON. Correct.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And, Ambassador Cella, we should never engage in stereotyping about Asian-American people or Chinese-origin people, right?

Mr. CELLA. One hundred percent, and if it happens, it should be condemned.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And if we did engage in that type of stereotyping, that is exactly what the CCP would want us to do, right?

Mr. CELLA. They are waging political warfare when they do it, and we should not be complicit in any way, shape, or form.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. And so, Mr. Stokes, in all of our comments, in all of our rhetoric, whoever we are, Democrats, Republicans, or anyone else, we should never, ever engage in any type of rhetoric or behavior that could stoke anti-Asian or anti-Chinese origin hate or stereotyping, right?

Mr. STOKES. Absolutely correct.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. BIGGS. [Presiding.] The gentleman yields. The Chair recognizes Ms. Brown from Ohio.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to, once again, discuss the ways in which—

Mr. BIGGS. Excuse me. I am sorry. One second. Oh, gracious sakes, Ms. Brown, I am sorry. I was supposed to go back to this side, and that is my bad.

Ms. BROWN. OK.

Mr. BIGGS. I apologize. We will give you the full 5 because you were just getting revved up there, so I apologize, yes. Well, we will deduct that 15 seconds from Burchett to give to you. So now, we will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Grothman.

Mr. GROTHMAN. I will do a follow-up with, who was the last guy answering questions? Mr. Cella, was that you? Is China trying to divide America and cause dislike between various groups?

Mr. CELLA. I would say that is part of gray zone political warfare. I do not have access to reports on the high side that show their engagements in that respect, but I think there are far more tangible ways that the public can see and should see.

Mr. GROTHMAN. There is a book recently written by Christopher Rufo, which has received a lot of favorable comment, in which he goes back and finds communists in the 70s pushing this racial divide, trying to divide America by race. And of course, we have a lot of DEI professionals throughout the government now who, I think, their goal is to divide America and eventually destroy America by setting one ethnic group against the other. Is that something you think that China would like to have or to push the idea that

people should view themselves as members of a subgroup rather than individuals?

Mr. CELLA. Whatever it takes. They would like to win without fighting. Back—

Mr. GROTHMAN. Right. That is exactly right. They believe that they are going to take over the United States—I think Khrushchev did—that they would take it over without a fight. And then this is the type of division that will cause them to destroy America when American Congressman push this DEI garbage, right?

Yes, probably.

OK. Question for Dr. Thayer. We have a lot of farmland in Wisconsin. You have studied China's behavior over a period of years. They are trying to acquire American farmland. How serious a threat is it when China acquires our farmland?

Dr. THAYER. It is a very serious threat. Obviously, we need the food and the product of agricultural products that are produced on that land.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Right. And what becomes of the land when China buys? Do they keep renting it out the American farmer? Do they put buildings on the land? What happens when they buy this land?

Dr. THAYER. Well, sir, oftentimes it is left fallow. It is not used or it can be, in instances, used for nefarious purposes. But by taking that farmland, when you understand, when you think like the Chinese Communist Party, what you are doing is denying those assets, of course, to the United States, and you are sending a very important political message that the Chinese Communist Party is becoming increasingly powerful in the United States.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK. Which states have been the big chunks of farmland purchased in?

Dr. THAYER. I think most of the states: North Dakota, South Dakota, sir, I know have been. Kansas, I know, is subject to this as well. Maine has as well.

Mr. GROTHMAN. And what is going on with the farmland there that used to have corn on it or whatever they have on it? It is just sitting there or what? I assume, I do not know how it is in those states—in Wisconsin, you would be paying property taxes. So, they just pay the property taxes and let it sit there, or what do they do?

Dr. THAYER. Sir, I would say, in general—of course, we are not speaking with respect to any specifics—that the land is used in a less productive or not to the extent or with the intent that we would like to see the land used from the standpoint of the health of the American people and the American economy.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK. I guess I will follow up there again because maybe I am not getting exactly the detail I want. What physically becomes of that land? If they buy land in Kansas, rent it out to another farmer, pay the property taxes and get nothing for it. What is going on?

Dr. THAYER. They can do all of that, sir, and we also are aware of a particularly pernicious practice of buying farmland around Air Force bases and other military facilities, bases, ports, where drones and other intelligence collections can exist.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Do they build anything on that land? OK. If they buy, whatever, a 2,000-acre farm in North Dakota, do they put anything on that land?

Dr. THAYER. I would say, as a rule of thumb, sir, no.

Mr. GROTHMAN. OK. And so, do you think part of it is just to exercise their power and tell the U.S., we are here, we are taking over?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir. It is a very important and powerful political message.

Mr. GROTHMAN. And do any Chinese citizens who are here wind up ever living on the land or farming the land?

Dr. THAYER. Sir, I believe that there are many reports where they are resident on the land, and I would assume that includes an aspect of living on the land there, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair recognizes—and I apologize again, but this time we are really ready to go—the gentlelady from Ohio, Ms. Brown.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you so much. I appreciate that. I would be remiss if I did not take the opportunity to address my colleague's comment as it relates to DEI. As a Black woman, I just want to point out that people that look like me in this country have been historically, traditionally, systemically, institutionally, and structurally held back because of our skin color. So, I am always disappointed when my colleagues attempt to attack, dismantle, discredit, and just discount DEI when it is really designed to provide equal opportunities when all things and qualifications are equal, to attempt to bring people who have not otherwise had these opportunities because of their gender or race, to get those opportunities. So, I just want to set the record straight that DEI does not divide, in fact, grows the pie and gives opportunity to other people.

So, I appreciate the opportunity to once again discuss the ways in which the Biden-Harris Administration is putting America in the best possible position regarding competition with the Chinese Communist Party. As a member of the Select Committee on Strategic Competition With the CCP, I have been monitoring firsthand the progress of this Administration and Democratic policies in countering everything from illegal Chinese manufacturing policies, which severely hurt American industries, to tracing the fentanyl crisis back to its roots in China.

I want to highlight three important steps the Biden Harris Administration can and should continue to build on. One, since President Biden and Vice President Harris signed the CHIPS and Science Bill into law, U.S. companies have announced more than \$160 billion in investments in semiconductor and electronics. CHIPS and Science also authorized \$170 billion to support science and innovation. No longer will the CCP continue to outpace the United States thanks to this action. No. 2, President Biden and Vice President Harris has brought together our allies and partners to achieve substantial success on the global stage, like the agreement between Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, to commit to unprecedented partnership in the Pacific. And three, the Biden-Harris Administration has taken significant steps to hold bad actors in China engaged in hacking, espionage, and cyber campaigns accountable.

Now, in March, the Department of Justice indicted seven Chinese hackers charged with targeting CCP critics, businesses, and political officials through a coordinated cyber intimidation effort, and given the unprecedented nature of these attacks, this is where I would like to focus today. So, I remain very concerned about potential misuse of artificial intelligence by our adversaries like Russia, China, and Iran to influence Americans through the spread of disinformation.

It is very troubling that social media sites, from Twitter to TikTok, can act as a funnel of MDI—mis- and disinformation—or, as I like to call it, lies, streaming directly onto our phones each and every day. Earlier this year, I introduced legislation, the Securing Elections from AI Deception Act, to prohibit the use of artificial intelligence to deprive or defraud individuals of their right to vote and require disclaimers on AI-generated election content. I also recently sent a letter to the Federal Elections Commission, urging them to clarify Federal law prohibiting fraudulent misrepresentation and how it applies to deceptive AI generated political campaign communication. At the same time, the Biden-Harris Administration is in overdrive, working to protect our elections and exposing these plots as they are uncovered.

So, Mr. Stokes, can you speak to how the CCP is using disinformation online to engage in persuasion campaigns in democracies around the world, including our own?

Mr. STOKES. Sure. Thank you. Thank you, Congresswoman. This is absolutely a major challenge. China's point of innovation, politically, for them has been the use of mis- and disinformation. They test it out at home and then kind of roll it out around the world. We have seen, for example, a group known as Spamouflage, which is really focused on impersonating U.S. people on social media platforms, again, to exacerbate existing social tensions and divide Americans. And I think that is just, as you indicated, the early edge of what AI might be able to do to supercharge mis- and disinformation. And so, I think we need to be preemptive in trying to respond to that actively.

Ms. BROWN. And with my additional 15 seconds, can you tell us, maybe, in short order, how the Biden-Harris Administration has held the CCP accountable over its spread of disinformation, and what more Congress can do to support these efforts?

Mr. STOKES. Yes. I think calling it out as it is, taking down, as you said, cyber networks that are based in China that are doing espionage and disinformation, I think those are two pieces of the puzzle.

Ms. BROWN. Thank you, and with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Thank you.

Mr. BIGGS. The gentlelady yields. The Chair now recognize the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Palmer, for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Thayer, we have heard a lot of discussion about where we are heading with renewables and EVs and things like that. But aside from that, the United States is very dependent on critical minerals, rare earth elements, and China basically controls that. They control 70 percent of the cobalt mining, 80 percent of the processing, and to my knowledge, there is not a single major

rare earth element refinery in the western hemisphere. Do you consider that a threat to our security?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir, absolutely, it is a threat.

Mr. PALMER. And one of the problems that we face in this country, and it has particularly been true in the last 3 1/2 years, is the inability to get a mine permitted, processing facility permitted, a refinery permitted. And I am very concerned about this in regard to China because China has already fired a shot across the bow a couple of years ago when they cutoff supplies of germanium, and I believe the other one was gallium, rare earth elements that we need, that our defense forces need. I think that is a clear and present danger in terms of a threat to our national economy, economic security, and our national security.

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir, it certainly is a threat to it as increasingly these minerals are needed for the sinews of American national security.

Mr. PALMER. Right, and this is true not only in United States, but in the entire Western Hemisphere.

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PALMER. When we do not have a single refinery for rare earth elements in the western hemisphere, it is a major, major problem, which leads me to the situation in Taiwan. If China were to attack Taiwan, and it appeared they were going to be successful, I think it is fairly clear that those semiconductor microchip facilities would no longer exist. China has never really mastered manufacturing of semiconductors, microchips. Now, we are building four facilities here in the United States, but we really do not make anything here, do we? We manufacture things from parts we get from China, from these critical minerals and rare earth elements.

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir, very few in the United States. Taiwan is absolutely essential.

Mr. PALMER. So, what we have got to do here, if we want to have the ability to defend ourselves against China, is we have got to get serious about procuring our own critical minerals through mining, processing, and refining, and that includes the rare earth elements. Would you agree with that?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir, and I would broaden it to the entire defense industrial base.

Mr. PALMER. Absolutely, and our economic base.

Dr. THAYER. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. I mean, the panel on your washing machine will not function without these critical minerals. I would also like to point out, if I may—

We are not in order.

Mr. BIGGS. The Committee will be in order.

Mr. PALMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. TikTok is an intelligence-gathering tool and a tool for degrading Western culture and values. I also serve on the Energy and Commerce Committee, and we had a classified briefing about this, and we voted in this Congress to ban TikTok, which the Biden Administration has delayed that until January to give ByteDance, the parent company, an opportunity to divest TikTok. Would you agree that TikTok is a threat to us as an intelligence tool of China?

Dr. THAYER. It absolutely is.

Mr. PALMER. Does it degrade our culture and our values?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PALMER. All right. I also want to address the issue of what China is doing in Sub-Saharan Africa and in South and Central America. They are basically turning these countries into vassal states through debt diplomacy. There are probably eight or nine countries that are on the verge of default as a result of this, and they are basically using these countries to provide food and mineral resources. They are pillaging, in my opinion, these countries, but at the same time, they are advancing their ability to project power through infrastructure construction, it is my understanding. And Mr. Atkins and Mr. Cella, you can address this if you have knowledge of this, it is my understanding that Xi Jinping will be in Peru in November, cutting the ribbon on a major seaport that will compete with our West Coast seaports, but will handle any naval military vessel that China puts in the water. Is that correct? Do you know?

Mr. CELLA. I can speak to my knowledge of time of service in the Indo-Pacific, and it spans the Indo-Pacific, sir.

Mr. PALMER. There is a book called, "The Hundred-Year Marathon," by Michael Pillsbury, one of the top analysts at the CIA on China, that I commend everyone should read this book. But China's agenda is, by 2049, is to establish itself as the dominant power in the world, and I think the American people and the people in the West need to be aware of this and need to wake up and need to engage. I yield back.

Mr. BIGGS. The gentleman yields back. The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Pennsylvania, Ms. Lee.

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Our national security deserves to be taken seriously. It deserves actual oversight. This hearing today and all the others before, since we are on part three now, are not serious. My Republican colleagues are so hellbent on making a boogeyman, that they are deliberately ignoring actual problems we can address and, in the process, actually undermining our national security. And while our national security must be a priority, it must also be balanced in a way that is not bigoted, xenophobic, or racist. Only focusing on China and the CCP not only leaves us vulnerable to attacks from elsewhere, but it also poses a risk to the personal safety, civil rights, and civil liberties of Chinese Americans and Chinese immigrants living in the U.S.

We saw this with the Trump Administration's China Initiative. They said this was meant to protect labs and businesses from espionage. Instead, it was used as a tool of discrimination. Nearly 90 percent of the more than 150 cases brought by the FBI under the initiative were against ethnically Chinese people, and many of the cases were the result of simple administrative errors and no obvious connection to national security or the theft of intellectual property or trade secrets. So, Mr. Stokes, how did this initiative affect Chinese American scientists, and did this impact our research landscape?

Mr. STOKES. Thank you for the question, Congresswoman. I think overall, the initiative—I think the Justice Department has said that it, you know, fostered an environment of at least apparent bias, right, and had a bit of a chilling factor over the scientific

community. So, while, on the one hand, it is certainly right that China is seeking to steal our technological and scientific secrets, I think it is right to refocus the initiative on the actual networks at play, rather than kind of casting aspersions over a broad group of people.

Ms. LEE. Thank you. It is giving major HUAC [sic] feelings right now. This was just McCarthyism in a new form. Under the initiative, scientists falsely accused of having ties to the CCP had their lives upended and their careers compromised, but Republicans want to bring back the China Initiative. In fact, House Republicans recently passed a bill that would do just that, though, under a slightly different name: the CCP Initiative. Mr. Stokes, would changing the name of the China Initiative to the CCP Initiative, without any concrete changes to its implementation, make it more effective at uncovering efforts to steal U.S. intellectual property?

Mr. STOKES. I think that the name does matter, but I think, as you indicated, what actually goes on under the auspices of the initiative matters just as much, if not more. And again because of the scope of the threat, to be able to be focusing resources on areas where are not where the threat is actually emanating from, I think means we will miss some of where the threat is actually emanating from. And so, to the extent that you can revise the initiative to focus more on the real networks at play, it would be both more effective and more consistent with our values.

Ms. LEE. So, the assumption that a person is more likely to be a CCP spy because they are Chinese or because someone might think they look Chinese is incredibly harmful, and we have seen it happen in this very Committee. In January 2023, Chairman Comer appeared to repeatedly accuse Kathy Chung, a U.S. citizen born in South Korea, very much not China, who previously served as an aide to then Vice President Biden, of being a CCP spy. We have also seen how the rhetoric around China, particularly from Republicans, has led to increased discrimination against Chinese Americans and Chinese immigrants in the United States. Just look back at what was being said during COVID. Trump frequently referred to COVID-19 as “the China virus, the Chinese virus, and Kong flu.” He has kept this going, using this phrase at RNC just this past July and just last week at a townhall in Michigan. This language led to a dramatic increase in anti-Asian hate between 2019 and 2021, and 1 in 3 members of the AAPI community experienced racial abuse in 2023.

Mr. Stokes, can you explain how this kind of language can contribute to an increase in hate incidents or racial abuse against Chinese and other Asian Americans?

Mr. STOKES. I would say, in general, the President of the United States has an immense agenda-setting power, and so to use language of that nature does contribute and, in certain cases, may even enable people to take bias and racially motivated actions. But, again, I think, at least from my expertise, about how it relates to strategic competition with China, the fact that we can be an inclusive, diverse society that is governed by the rule of law is something we have, that China does not. That is an asset that we should work very hard to retain.

Ms. LEE. Thank you. I appreciate your comments. I just want to conclude by saying, with caution, that when my colleagues speak about the CCP threat in careless or bigoted or xenophobic terms, they make all Chinese Americans and Chinese immigrants into a boogeyman, and it is wrong. We must talk about it in a way that gets very specifically at the harm, at the threats, and not in such a wide net that harms people who are innocent. I thank you, and I yield back.

Mr. BIGGS. The gentlelady yields. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Higgins.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Atkinson, I believe you would be the gentleman to address what I am going to inquire about. And please share your insight regarding the Chinese Communist Party's presence as it manifests itself within our university structures across the country, acknowledging that the university culture is inherently open, designed to include a free exchange of ideas. And of course, I support that culture, but that freedom carries with it a particular risk to our republic and to the free world when it relates to the development of emerging technologies that can be weaponized and militarized by the Communist Chinese Party. And we are essentially funding it through our universities and having CCP-associated students, in some way—they, their family—let us say, they finish their studies, they return to China, they end up working for the CCP. There are many, many instances of this, and we are concerned about it. Are you familiar with the report that was recently produced by the House Select Committee on the Chinese Communist Party and House Education and Workforce Committee, Mr. Atkinson?

Dr. ATKINSON. Somewhat.

Mr. HIGGINS. I hope you do not have it memorized. It is a lot. But they had identified over 8,000 publications that DoD funded that included papers covering topics like hypersonics, directed energy weapons, nuclear and high energy physics, and artificial intelligence, and autonomous solutions, all in the realm of the emerging modern weaponry of the 21st century, funded by DoD through our university systems that includes more than 2,000 of those papers. DoD-funded papers included the PRC coauthors who were directly affiliated with PRC's defense research and industrial base. Will you share with this Committee and with America, your opinion on what dangers that presents to the entire world when we are willingly, knowingly funding the advancement of Chinese Communist Party 21st century weaponization through our university systems, Mr. Atkinson?

Dr. ATKINSON. So, Congressman, I think the short answer is, it is outrageous. It definitely is a way that the Chinese are getting an advantage over us. Their core policy at the beginning of what they do is suction up or Hoover up as much knowledge, technical knowledge, as possible. They are using this weakness in our system to achieve that.

I will say it is important to, and you are not saying this, I know, but some people say that, you know, that certain university, we should blame them. Look, if I were a university president and I want more money and the Federal Government is cutting back, I am going to go to China. I think we need to make that a choice

there that they cannot make. So, I would say, any university, public or private, that receives any Chinese money should be ineligible for Federal funding.

A second area that I would say is, if you look at postdocs, very few Chinese postdocs, if any, stay in this country. They are coming here to advance their agenda. I think we should have a ban on Chinese postdocs, but I would not put a ban, for example, on Chinese Ph.D. students. Some of them stay here, some of them do not, but clearly there is no way we should allow any Chinese company or institution to fund our research at university.

Mr. HIGGINS. May I ask you, sir, on this topic, do you think it would be beneficial for Congress to discuss imposing requirements on universities, our research and development laboratory universities, that require basic level of security within those laboratories, because if you have been in these laboratories, and I am quite sure you have, there is virtually no security. Even when you have, like, an electronic pass on the door, commonly, you will find a door, like, propped open because that is the culture in the university—it is a free exchange of ideas and studies. So, do you think it would be beneficial for the security of our country if Congress discussed imposing security requirements on our universities?

Dr. ATKINSON. I do. You did not see this problem back in the 50's and 60's. Very few research universities collaborated with the Soviet Union because we knew they are an adversary, and yet our universities have not caught up to that. So, I 100 percent agree that we need to take stronger steps.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for this hearing, and I yield. And I thank the witnesses.

Chairman COMER. [Presiding.] The gentleman yields back. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Goldman from New York.

Mr. GOLDMAN. My, my, my, here we are for the third installment of the Defending America from the CCP's Political Warfare. After the Chairman's impeachment investigation revealed zero connections between President Biden and Chinese businesses, he nonetheless shockingly views the nakedly partisan political sham impeachment as a success. Why? Because President Biden dropped out of the Presidential race. Now, that is a blatant admission that this Committee was used improperly for partisan purposes, but that failure has not stopped the Chairman from continuing down this road. Now that Governor Tim Walz is on the ticket, Chairman Comer has quickly pivoted to focus this Committee's resource on Governor Walz's time teaching English in China, insinuating that somehow that is a problem.

What we really need to be focusing on as it relates to CCP's political warfare is defending this Committee from that political warfare. Remember, we have two witnesses who were the star witnesses of the impeachment investigation. The first, Gal Luft, turned out to be an indicted unregistered foreign agent of the Chinese Government. Among the allegations in Gal Luft's indictment was that he, at the behest of Chinese entities, recruited and paid an unnamed advisor to then President-Elect Donald Trump to adopt pro-Chinese positions. And even though he also was charged with making false statements to the FBI, Chairman Comer bragged and said Gal Luft is a very credible witness on Biden family cor-

ruption. That was not all the political warfare that we experienced during this impeachment investigation. Alexander Smirnov is a Russian indicted as a source for the FBI, who literally met with Russian officials to peddle lies to the FBI. You know what those lies were? They were the same allegations that the Chairman made against Joe Biden in this Committee, Russian propaganda.

Now, this is not, unfortunately, the Chairman's only connections to China. Just months after our last hearing on the CCP political influence, a news report alleged that while he was the agriculture commissioner and candidate for Governor of Kentucky, the Chairman was involved in a failed Chinese hemp deal that would have benefited a campaign donor's company. This deal not only failed, but it turned out that Chairman Comer accidentally imported illegal marijuana instead of legal hemp, so maybe we should be investigating Chairman Comer's ties to the CCP.

But there is more political warfare from China that this Committee should be investigating. Let us start with former President Trump, who acknowledged that he had a Chinese bank account that he used at least from 2013 to 2015 and his own lawyer said that it remained open throughout his presidency. Or let us talk about Ivanka Trump's fast-track trademarks that she received in 2 months, 18 of them, even though it usually takes 18 months. Coincidentally, I am sure, it happened right after Donald Trump intervened to save a sanctioned Chinese electronics maker, ZTE. And China's biggest state-controlled bank rented three floors in Trump Tower while Donald Trump was President, netting him \$7 million.

Now, the Chairman will not investigate these incidents because the goal is not really here to combat political warfare or foreign influence in our politics. It is simply to use this Committee to baselessly smear Democratic Presidential and vice-Presidential candidates. But the American people know which Presidential candidate is a danger to our national security, and it is the one who accepts millions of dollars from foreign governments while he is President, and it is the one who sucks up to dictators and despots all around the world, who cannot even say that the democratic country of Ukraine should win the war against Vladimir Putin.

So, this unfortunately, while an important topic, is a waste of time as we sit 6 weeks before the election, and as usual, we could have been doing so many better things with our time. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes Mr. Biggs from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, panelists, for being here. I appreciate your testimony. It has been insightful. I have read all of your statements, and one way or another, each of you has either directly mentioned or alluded to elite capture. And I just want to ask, and I will start with you, Dr. Atkinson, what kind of elites are being captured? Who does the CCP target?

Dr. ATKINSON. All. Pretty much all the elites, they try.

Mr. BIGGS. So, they would like to trap politicians. They would like to snare university professors, researchers. They would like to get media.

Dr. ATKINSON. Think tanks.

Mr. BIGGS. Think tanks. They would like to get control of these folks. I have an interesting one. I thought it was interesting because it was by the *New York Times*, and it talks about the capture

of a special interest group called Code Pink, which, in 2015, they condemned China, supported the Uyghurs. By the time 2022 rolls around, Code Pink now is being funded through a CCP cutout, and now it is the Uyghurs who are terrorists, and they are threatening to disrupt the CCP. Would that be an example of elite capture that CCP would pursue?

Dr. ATKINSON. I am not familiar with that case. I have read about it, but yes, absolutely, that would be a good example, if that were the case.

Mr. BIGGS. So, I will ask some other questions here. Now, Dr. Thayer, in one of your books—I am going to dovetail on this here—are there specific departments or offices within Federal agencies that are particularly vulnerable to CCP influence or neglecting the seriousness of the threat?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir. Yes.

Mr. BIGGS. And why do you think these departments are susceptible, and can you name some of those departments?

Dr. THAYER. Well, as a rule of thumb, all departments and agencies are going to be vulnerable to the capture. Clearly, the CCP would be putting priority on national security departments and agencies, but it is a problem which is endemic to the Federal Government, state, local, tribal, and territorial governments.

Mr. BIGGS. And I meant to ask you, Ambassador Cella, about the Gotion case because in your opening statement and in your written remarks, you talk about what I would call classic mechanisms to capture elite. Would you expand on that, please?

Mr. CELLA. Textbook. I engaged with my former Ambassadorial colleague, Peter Hoekstra, former congressional colleague of yours, in this endeavor. And from the outset, Congressman, the intertwining of this PRC-based and CCP company, the CEO, Zhen Li, and his son are both members of the Chinese People's Consultant of Congress, the policy advising body for the Chinese Communist Party, United Front Work Group. They have a Thousand Talent station in their office in California that vacuums up people, intel, intellectual property, by its nature. So, they intertwined early working government elites, business elites, economic development organizations, and requiring them to sign the binding and punitive 5- and 10-year nondisclosure agreements, again, radically contrary to the published memo from the NCSC of July 2022 that require them to do just the opposite, and it is skirted by those Federal agencies that—

Mr. BIGGS. CFIUS.

Mr. CELLA. Correct.

Mr. BIGGS [continuing]. Treasury, CFIUS.

Mr. CELLA. Yes, sir.

Mr. BIGGS. So, we have talked about elite capture a little bit here. All of you mentioned somewhere or another this is not unlike or dissimilar from the post-World War II cold war competition, adversarial relationship we had with the former Soviet Union, but it is really distinctive. And, Dr. Atkinson, you pointed out in one way earlier, and that is, there is an economic integration, right? There is an economic integration between China and the U.S. today. So, if we were to actually treat China, in particular because of the CCP, as the geopolitical adversary it really is, my question is for

all of the panelists, how do you disaggregate or decouple our relationship? Specifically, I am going to mention critical minerals, which we are dependent on. Our supply chain is dependent upon China, and if you want Green New Deal EV stuff, you have got to have the critical minerals that we do not allow to have developed here. And so, with that, I am going to ask all of you to respond. We will start with Dr. Thayer and go on down the line.

Dr. THAYER. OK. Thank you very much, indeed, for the question, Congressman Biggs. What needs to be done is to change the paradigm, to change the way that we think about China, right, and recognize that the CCP is in control of it. It is a malign force which is targeting us for destruction, and act accordingly. So, we need to move from an engagement paradigm, if you will, to one which is a realistic paradigm, recognizing the nature of the geostrategic threat that we face. With respect to critical minerals, of course that is absolutely essential. It is a major vulnerability that we pose, as we have discussed earlier, and ensuring that our supply chains are not affected by that, as well as how those minerals would feed into, of course, the defense industrial base and other critical technologies. It should be one of the top priorities that we have.

Dr. ATKINSON. So, as a think tank, we have been focused on the China challenge since 2008 and I would challenge anybody to suggest that we are weak on China. But what I will say is, I worry sometimes about the complete decoupling argument. We should be selling Starbucks in China. I mean, what difference does it make? We should be taking as much money out of the Chinese economy as possible. So, for example, the decision to cutoff Intel sales and Qualcomm sales to Huawei of chips was a mistake because Huawei got those chips on their own, and all we did is weaken a company who is already in trouble, which is Intel. So, I think what we need to do is we need to make sure that we decouple on the most critical parts.

And in terms of rare earth minerals, there are really two parts of that answer. One is we need a regulatory system that allows it to be built, but the second and most fundamental is we need a tariff floor because what the Chinese do is they do predatory pricing. As soon as somebody wants to get in the market, they undercut the price, drive them out of business, and everybody knows that is the deal. So, if we set a tariff floor that says, you cannot sell this below a cost and we get our Canadian and Australian allies with us, then we build the security for companies to be able to invest in rare earth. Absent that, I do not see it changing very much.

Mr. CELLA. You may have seen, Congressman, Deputy Secretary of State, Kurt Campbell, the other day say, frankly, the cold war pales in comparison to the multifaceted challenges that China presents. So, I think you take his words, and you look at our foot posture, and it is not commensurate with the threat. So, I really think, under the umbrella of a more modernized version of the National Security Act of 1947 that engages the China threat head-on, is vital, and it will work within the intergovernmental agency.

Mr. STOKES. Thank you for the question, Congressman. I think, as we consider decoupling, we have to think about the overall strategy. Obviously, we got to start with security areas that relate directly to security and military affairs. And then I think we should

move kind of to the next layer of strategic industries, the places that are going to command the Fourth Industrial Revolution, and what is the U.S. position vis-a-vis China and indeed the rest of the world there. And then I think a third pillar of this strategy is about, you know, again, as we think often of these U.S. China terms, we should think about how do we expand our trade ties with the rest of the world, to put ourselves in a more competitive position, but also make ourselves less reliant on China and more resilient in the face of the challenge.

Chairman COMER. The gentlemen time has expired. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Connolly from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome to the panel.

Mr. Atkinson, I was intrigued by your testimony because several parts of it really resonate with my own view about how we engage with China and how we respond to China, and I guess, the bottom line for me is always operate from strength, never from weakness. And I fear that Presidents of both parties, for a long, long time, we turned a blind eye to Chinese behavior, especially intellectual theft, which has allowed them to leapfrog technological milestones at our expense and our subsidies in terms of R&D. Why do you think the United States, frankly, and to both parties, for a long time turned a blind eye to Chinese behavior?

And just parenthetically, in 2008–2009, when I first came here, we had a listening session to a number of industries, including software industry, Microsoft, in the state of Washington. But we heard everything from software to candy manufacturers about absolute, blatant theft, even stealing the candy maker's candy box design. I mean, it is that bad, and nothing happened. The U.S. Government did nothing, and that was under the Bush Administration. I do not know that the subsequent administrations got any better. I think Trump got tough, and I think this Administration showed some serious responses. But why did we allow, such a long period of time, blatant Chinese intellectual theft and other behaviors that are malign and clearly hindered our interest?

Dr. ATKINSON. Well, Congressman, that is absolutely right, the famous case where Huawei stole the Cisco code, and they included an error in the code in their own system. So, what happened? Not very much. There was a gentleman who wrote an op-ed in the *Washington Post* about 10 years ago or whatever, and he said we should not worry about Chinese intellectual property theft, that is just going to make us innovate more, and that has been the elite view. The elite view has been we are so much better than them, our innovation system is superior to theirs, and we finally have to wake up and say, wait a minute. When you are stealing intellectual property, when your R&D expenses can be this much because you are getting everything for free, you are facing an intense, robust competitor. So, we just have to wake up. The second big problem we have is that if—

Mr. CONNOLLY. By the way, I am sorry to interrupt, but I mean, the test of that point of view is, and how did that work out for us? Are they weaker today or stronger, or we had a less competitive advantage than we were back then?

Dr. ATKINSON. We are much, much worse on.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Right.

Dr. ATKINSON. Much worse on. I would add one other component of that, and that is, we have a law on the books from 1930 and it is a program called Section 337 at the U.S. International Trade Commission. And what Section 337 allows is somebody to bring a case against a Chinese company or any company, but particularly China, that steals our intellectual property. And if you win the case, you get a 10-year exclusion order against everything the Chinese company makes. U.S. companies have lost those cases because the judge rules, yes, they have stolen your intellectual property, but they have not reduced your market because we have a provision in U.S. trade law, which, if I were God, I would erase it tomorrow, which says, you have to show harm.

The problem is, the Chinese go into these markets where that is growing. They take all the market share, and the existing companies, let us just say their sales are a million, they keep being a million. Under U.S. trade law, that American company cannot win that case, and there was a case that I can share with you where that was added. So, Congress needs to just change that law. That is an antiquated law. You should not have to require the showing of loss of sales. You just should show intellectual property theft and they are coming after you.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Yes. I guess, final question, if I may. There are various sources and observers who believe that we sometimes overstate the Chinese threat to the United States, militarily, economically. After all they have got their own economic problems. They have got a population infertility decline that could be quite dramatic. What is your view about that?

Dr. ATKINSON. It is a critical mistake to make. Look, their labor productivity will exceed ours by at least double for the next 30 or 40 years, so that alone means the Chinese economy is going to grow significantly faster than the U.S. economy. Their so-called decline in population, they have 1.3 billion people, all right? So, they get down to a billion in 30, 40 years, or 50 years, that is a billion people that we have to face.

And then on top of that, we have to remember the challenge is not about the Chinese GDP per se. China does not care about its GDP. What they care about is winning in advanced industries. They care about dominating quantum computing. They care about dominating space technology. They care about dominating biotechnology. We just finished up a study at ITI, an 18-month study looking at Chinese innovation capabilities in 10 industries. Two of them, they are ahead of us. The six of them, they were making rapid progress, and we estimated they would overtake us within a decade. So, we cannot underestimate their capabilities. They are very, very strong.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Thank you so much. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Biggs.

Mr. BIGGS. For unanimous consent, please, I admit the following articles: A Global Web of Chinese Propaganda Leads to a U.S. Tech Mogul;" "Exclusive: Alleged Chinese Spy Spent Years Rubbing Elbows with Dem Congresswoman;" "Indictment of Governor Hochul's Aide Shows Red China is Number One Threat;" "Bombshell Indict-

ment: Top New York Democrat Aide to Andrew Cuomo, Kathy Hochul, Worked as Agent of Influence for China and Communist Party;" "DoJ charges Alleged Chinese Agent Was Spying in U.S.;" "FBI Finds Chinese State Hacker Malware and Hundreds of U.S. Infrastructure-Related Routers;" "Joe Biden Calls U.S. Allies, India, and Japan Xenophobic;" "Trump Calls Chinese Leader 'a Killer,' but Rejects Olympics Boycott," and "Firebrand Leftist, Jamie Raskin, said Congress Must Disqualify Trump; Predicted Civil War Conditions."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman COMER. The Chair recognizes the ranking member.

Mr. RASKIN. Two unanimous consent requests. One is the Biden-Harris Administration's October 2022 National Security Strategy, and second is a letter to you, Mr. Chairman, from the White House, dated September 9, 2024, describing the Administration's strategy to fight China, including investing in our strength, aligning with partners, managing competition, and protecting democratic values and institutions.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Chairman Sessions, for 5 minutes.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I want to follow up on the interesting dialog that my friend and gentleman from Virginia did, and that was, good gosh, can we catch on? Can we catch on that the Chinese are here? They are not just competitors. They are for our demise. We were told years and years ago they wanted to be a part of the world market, they would respect intellectual property, rule of law, tariffs, they would do all of these things, and I think there is more than enough evidence to suggest they do not do that. The gentleman from Virginia, insightfully, and I agree with him, well, what did we do about these things that happened that we were aware of?

Mr. Atkinson, the Homeland Security in January 2021 put out a document that was entitled, "DHS Strategic Action Plan to Counter the Threat Posed by the People's Republic of China." I should have gotten each of you a copy of this, and I will make sure that happens, but before that, I will see if I can coach you along. Well into, I think, page 11, continuing to protect the homeland, border security and immigration, ensure the effective removal of PRC nationals from the United States. At present, January 21, 40,800 PRC nationals in the United States are subject to final orders of removal. Well, we are accused of making this politicized, but the bottom line is, the gentleman from Virginia and I are pretty close on the same page. What are we doing about the threat? Mr. Atkinson, what would you, say, ensure the effective removal of, back in 2021, 40,000 nationals that were subject to final orders of removal?

Dr. ATKINSON. Well, again, Congressman, with the caveat being I do not know that case. If that is the case, I do not see any reason why we would allow them to continue to be in our country.

Mr. SESSIONS. OK. How about the some 16,000, as I understand it, may be the last count I saw, Chinese that came here over some short period of time that wandered across our Southern border.

Would you call that politics, or would you call that good common sense that you would like to know who they are and remove them since they did not follow a legal process?

Dr. ATKINSON. So, I do not want to comment on immigration policy per se, but I do think it is critical to understand who they are. They are different. Look, back in the Soviet Russia days, if somebody was Russian, that raised the question, it is obvious. If somebody was French, we did not raise the same question. So, I do think having somebody coming into the country from China is in a different category.

Mr. SESSIONS. So, I am trying to really go to where the gentleman from Virginia was. What are we doing to counter the threat that we already know that the PRC has already openly said what they are attempting to manipulate, and do we just let this go on? Ambassador, do you have a thought on this?

Mr. CELLA. No, we do not let it go on, sir. I think we have to operate eyes wide open. I think there has been a great deal of naivete over a long period of time. I mean, you could say did it begin with Nixon's opening up to China, and then from there, I think there is——

Mr. SESSIONS. Yes, but they changed their mind. They lied.

Mr. CELLA. Well, so, but there has been complacency, I think, profit making. I think we have been anesthetized. I think Wall Street is engaged, but I think we really need to be nimble, informed, and educated, whole of society, whole of government, and commensurate with the threat. You look at the 2018–2019 National Intelligence Law, the 2015 National Security Law, it requires, as directed, PRC nationals, whether they are in the PRC or anywhere around the world, to surveil, collect, and report as directed or voluntarily, and sometimes they are paid for it. So, why we do not have our footing correspondingly is outrageous.

Mr. SESSIONS. Well, I think that these are things that we can find common ground to work on. I think the distinguished gentleman from Virginia should be concerned, but I think every person on this Committee should and look at this as an important hearing to ask professionals, not just us, what they think. And I think all four of you have been able to present yourself in such a way that the case is we have a problem, and we better get ourself together, and part of that means we better protect the American people, not just American intellectual property. Mr. Chairman, I yield back my time.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Very good questions, Mr. Sessions and Mr. Connolly, and that is what we want to do here. We want to identify the problem and try to come up with a bipartisan solution. The Chair recognizes Mr. Moskowitz.

Mr. MOSKOWITZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I agree with Mr. Sessions. I think the threat of China is real. That is why I voted for the China Select Committee, and I would also like to come up with bipartisan solutions, but unfortunately, that is not what the Chairman is doing with this issue. Tim Walz was announced as the vice-Presidential candidate, and immediately the Chairman opens up an investigation into the Vice President. In fact, the Chairman goes on to say, "China has a vice-Presidential candidate who has gone on record praising the country," as one of his rationales for

opening this investigation and sending letters to the FBI. It does not sound bipartisan trying to get to the root of the China issue.

But of course, you know, as we are doing that, you know, I will do, just to remind the Chairman, just a quick spirited reading of some of the things that President Trump has said: "China has been working very hard to contain the coronavirus. The United States greatly appreciates their efforts and transparency. It will all work out well. In particular, on behalf of the American people, I want to thank President Xi." Trump again: "I just spoke to President Xi last night, and you all know he is working on the problem, the virus. It is a very tough situation, but I think he is going to handle it. I think he handled it really well. We are helping where we can."

Another Trump quote: "Just had a very long conversation with President Xi on the phone. He is strong, sharp, powerful, focused on leading the counterattack on the coronavirus. He feels they are doing very well, building hospitals in a matter of days. Great discipline is taking place in China as President Xi strongly leads what will be a very successful operation. We are working closely with China to help." More Trump: "I think China is very, you know, professionally run in a sense, and that they have everything under control. I really believe they are going to have it under control very soon. You know, in April supposedly it will die with hotter weather. That is a beautiful date to look forward to, but China, I can tell you, is working very hard." More Trump: "We have very few people with it and are getting better. They are all getting better. The whole situation will work out. I think China has it really shut down."

And I bring all of that up because all of those things, all of the praising of Xi, this is the rationale that the Chairman has used to do other stuff. The Chairman went on Fox Business with Maria Bartiromo and said, yes, the Walz family, that is a scary family there, when he was talking about the Walz family. If you look at Maria's face, it looked like she vomited, it came up, and then she swallowed it again as the Chairman was talking about that, OK? I am sure the American people think Gwen Walz is really scary.

You know, the Chairman went on to say that, you know, "Walz is very concerning to me because we don't want to set our business model like China." Of course, Trump always has a quote or a tweet for that. Trump said, "Xi is now president for life, right, and that that is great. And look, he was able to do that and I think it is great. Maybe we will do the same." Huh, that is interesting. That sounds like Trump looking at the Chinese model and wanting to copy it, which is what the Chairman said about Tim Walz.

So, I am just curious. Is the Chairman going to open up an investigation into Donald Trump wanting to copy the Chinese model, which is what he accused Tim Walz of? We know the answer.

More Trump about President Xi: "We love each other." And so, knowing how this Committee has conducted investigations, knowing the evidence that they have manufactured or the witnesses they have had to deal with, the only evidence the Chairman has on Tim Walz and China is that maybe he visited a Panda Express once and he liked it. That is it. That is what is going on here. So, I do not want to hear about bipartisanship on China. We were there, and then the Chairman just goes all over TV and wants to

accuse the Walz family of basically being spies for China with no evidence.

And look, I appreciate the kind words the Chairman said about me on Newsmax the other day, calling me the court jester, so thank you, my liege. I appreciate that. But he said something else that I think really sums up what this Committee has done. The Chairman went on and said, "My job was never to impeach." Well, that is interesting. So, for almost 2 years we have sat here while we have run impeachment hearings, while we have had cameras, hundreds of interviews, millions of dollars to spend, and now the Chairman finally says, "My job was never to impeach." He only says that because it did not work out.

And so, you know, Mr. Chairman, I am going to have my staff send this to your office. I would love for you to sign it. I am going to hang it in my office as a reminder, OK, of what this Committee was used for, OK? So, I do not want to hear about bipartisanship when they destroyed this Committee over nonsense for 2 years. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Burchett.

Mr. BURCHETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I come at this maybe a little different background. My father fought in the Pacific in the Second World War and then in the Marine Corps, 1st Marine Division. Everybody has heard me tell these stories. But after the war—he was on Okinawa and they were getting ready to invade Japan, they thought, and they dropped the bomb on Japan, both bombs. They were told they were going to go home and he was not sent home. They sent some Marines over to China. And Daddy was—I think one of the greatest regrets in his life until the day he died was that he felt like we turned our back on them, and he would talk about how, you know, during the war they could literally move mountains if they had to. I mean, the people would, you know. I guess it is the slave labor, I am not sure, and they could literally move a factory from one area, just take it apart piece by piece and then just carry it, humans carrying it to another area, people dying.

And then after the war, the hunger really for democracy and capitalism. Kids would stand on a street corner with a first-grade primer and read something, and they would be stuck and they would say, "G.I., G.I., what is this word, what is this word?" and they would tell them, and they understood the value of the American dollar. And I could tell you all these stories, but I come at it from a little different angle because I see the Chinese people as wonderful folks. I see their leadership as some very abusive, horrible people. You know, the hundred-year plan, the thousand-year plan, you know, to me it does not really matter. Their folks are there and they are being abused for their own purposes for their leadership.

But Dr. Thayer, you had written that the Trump Administration was the start of an effective resistance to the Chinese Communist Party. Could you explain to me how that is?

Dr. THAYER. Certainly. Thank you, Congressman Burchett, for the question. The Trump Administration recognized the threat that we faced from the Chinese Communist Party and that it had been

waging the world's most successful political warfare campaign against the United States by making so many of the American elite partners with the Chinese Communist Party. And the Trump Administration was the first administration after, obviously, post-cold war administrations, from Clinton through Bush to Obama to Trump, that tried to turn the rudder over, recognizing the nature of the threat, that it was the regime that was the threat. It was the Chinese Communist Party that is the threat to the United States because of its ideology. It is not the Chinese people with whom we have common cause, and people who have suffered greatly, horribly, with scores of millions of individuals killed in China by the Chinese Communist Party.

So, we both suffer the consequences of that odious regime, and the Trump Administration recognized that and took measures starting to turn the rudder over. There is much more work to be done, Congressman, as you well know, as well as this Committee knows, but that was a good start.

Mr. BURCHETT. Any of you all feel like the Biden-Harris Administration implemented these same strategies?

Dr. THAYER. The Biden and Harris Administration has not implemented the same strategies. They have gone back to a form of what I call with my frequent co-author, Jim Fanell, a neo-engagement policy, which is to continue sustained rates of trade interaction, all the hallmarks that defined Clinton through Obama, which is sustaining the CCP at a time where they are incredibly weak, where they are suffering political crises within the Chinese Communist Party due to the tyranny of Xi Jinping. And they are suffering profound economic problems, ultimately, due to the misrule of their communist economic policies, but to the collapse of their real estate markets and a series of structural as well as more immediate economic problems that they face. They are supremely vulnerable. And now is the time to take advantage in the sense of political warfare against that regime.

Mr. BURCHETT. You all agree to that? Mr. Stokes?

Mr. STOKES. No. I think the Biden-Harris Administration has shared the diagnosis of the challenge with the Trump Administration but had a little bit of a different tack in terms of responding to it. So, you know, I do not think it is fair to call it neo-engagement. I would say it is still strategic competition, right, and that there is more of an emphasis on building up alliances and partnerships.

You have seen the progress with the Quad. You have seen AUKUS. You have seen revival of alliances with the Philippines and Japan and so on. On the technological side, you have seen both affirmative efforts to improve, you know, the U.S. posture in the CHIPS and Science Act, but also pretty extreme, at least in Beijing's view, actions to slow down China's technological rise really on chips and other areas as well, AI, biotech and so on, and then a very, very strong and consistent stance on human rights issues, particularly related to Uyghurs, Hong Kong, and so on, and a deepened partnership with Taiwan.

So, I think that there is, you know, a certain amount of bipartisan continuity here, and it is more about, you know, what policies

do we adopt to actually deal with this problem now that we sort of agree on what the problem is?

Mr. BURCHETT. Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I have run over. I will just say that, economically, Americans, unfortunately, are going to pay the cheapest they can get, and you just cannot get better than slave labor that we are dealing with competing with China, and that is unfortunate. Sorry, Mr. Chairman. I ran over.

Chairman COMER. Good questions. The Chair recognizes Mr. Garcia from California.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to our witnesses.

Clearly, China is our leading geopolitical challenge and a complicated one because, obviously, they are also our largest trading partner. And I think one thing that is bipartisan is no one does not think that China is not our most strategic challenge, and certainly, we all understand the gravity of China and competition as it relates to our own economy and our own national security interests. I know that we talked a lot about Joe Biden and Kamala Harris and Donald Trump today. I believe that Joe Biden and Kamala Harris have united our allies against aggressive authoritarian states. But I also think it is important, since we have talked so much about Trump and the Trump era, to compare the Biden-Harris record with the Donald Trump record as it relates to China.

[Poster]

Mr. GARCIA. And of course, we here have a story by the *Washington Post*—I am going to show a recent one as well—about President Xi and China and John Bolton's claims, which I think are very credible, that somehow Donald Trump is working and had worked with President Xi to actually encourage election interference.

Now, during a one-on-one meeting between President Xi and Trump, Donald Trump asked to buy more soybeans and wheat to help him actually win reelection, as John Bolton had noted and the *Washington Post* reported. And, in fact, in that same meeting, Trump actually said that Democrats were the party that was actually tougher on China. Now, Mr. Stokes, does this sound to you like Trump was pursuing some type of electoral gain and putting it above the national security interest?

Mr. STOKES. I was not in the room, so I cannot speak to what was or was not said. I think, in general, you know, we should not have any hostile foreign states or any foreign states interfering in U.S. elections, period, full stop, no matter if they are supporting Democrats or Republicans.

Mr. GARCIA. And if Donald Trump was encouraging election interference, that would be, obviously, unethical and illegal as far as I am concerned. But we know that Donald Trump has also used the power of the presidency for his own political gain before. Now, Mr. Stokes, can you remind us why President Trump was actually impeached the very first time he was impeached?

Mr. STOKES. This is not my area of expertise, but presumably Russia's influence in the election.

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you. And it is also true, if we remember, that Jared Kushner, the President's son-in-law, received \$2 billion from Saudi Arabia for his investment fund after leaving the White House, just 2 months after leaving the White House. And these al-

legations of foreign interference of Donald Trump, his relationship with China, I think should be very concerning. Now, I want to show you this photo right here.

[Slide]

Mr. GARCIA. There have been recent reports, again, in the *Washington Post*—and Ranking Member Raskin and I have asked actually for an investigation into allegations—that the Egyptian Government may have sent \$10 million in campaign contributions to Donald Trump in the closing days of the Trump campaign. And this raises serious questions, of course, about what Donald Trump has done, whether it has been his meetings with President Xi, whether it has been his conversations with the Egyptian president, and others, of which he was impeached for the first time as to why he is trying to gain favors around elections. Donald Trump, of course, is resisting this investigation, but, Mr. Stokes, do you think that the American people should be concerned about potential quid pro quos?

Mr. STOKES. Yes, from any Presidential candidate or a former President.

Mr. GARCIA. Absolutely, and I want to talk about one other. We know that President Donald Trump also received at least \$7.8 million from at least 20 foreign states and authoritarian leaders, including China, of which we are talking about today, in blatant violation of the constitution. And I think it is important to remember that that \$7.8 million is just the minimum that we know about because we have a very limited number of the actual receipts of money that was going into the Trump Organization, including money that was coming in directly from China. So, as we are talking about the Chinese Government and the Chinese influence, we have to ensure that we note the influence that China and other foreign actors were having on Donald Trump. So, with that, I am going to yield back and remind us that that is the investigation that we should be having.

Mr. RASKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARCIA. Yes.

Mr. RASKIN. But I just wonder, Dr. Thayer, you have made a very strong argument that the Trump Administration confronted China, and yet there is all of this evidence that Donald Trump and his businesses were pocketing millions of dollars from the Chinese Government, the dozens of trademarks that went to his daughter, his lavish praise of President Xi. And I just wonder how you reconcile that in your mind. Is there any cognitive dissonance there, or are you saying that the Administration did one thing and then the President was sort of a loose cannon, off doing his own?

Dr. THAYER. Well, Ranking Member Raskin, thank you for the comment. My thoughts are these. First, the threat from the Chinese Communist Party should be a nonpartisan issue in that the CCP is killing Americans every day. Over last year, the CDC said 107,000 Americans were killed by fentanyl overdoses, precursor chemicals being—

Mr. RASKIN. I got you. I guess my question is about elite capture.

Chairman COMER. And the gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. I mean, was the elite capture strategy targeted at Donald Trump, but you are saying his Administration somehow survived it.

Chairman COMER. I do not know that that is what he said, but the gentleman's time has expired. The Chair recognizes Ms. McClain from Michigan.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. The CCP is clearly not our friend. Let me repeat: the Chinese Communist Party is not our friend. It is well known that if you are a Chinese company, you must turn over all of your requested information to the CCP. Lawmakers from my state of Michigan have approved nearly \$800 million in taxpayer dollars to incentivize the construction of the Gotion plant. Gotion, Inc. is a subsidiary company of Gotion High-Tech, which is a state-owned company of the Chinese Communist Party. State lawmakers are using taxpayer dollars to pay the CCP to implant thousands of Chinese workers and billions worth of Chinese technology strategically close to an intelligence program and a military facility. Coincidence? I think not. In the past several years, the U.S. has found Chinese technology to be a CCP tool used to spy on Americans, undermine our interests, and steal proprietary information from our intellectual leaders. Anyone who is looking can see that this is a very troubling pattern.

So, Ambassador Cella, FBI Director Chris Wray has warned that colleges and universities are prone to political warfare from China and targeted for intellectual property theft. Now, Ferris State University is just a few miles from the proposed Gotionsite. Again, coincidence? Not much. Have you heard of any collaboration between Ferris State and the Gotion plant?

Mr. CELLA. I have, Congresswoman McClain. Thank you for the question. So, the previous president of Ferris State began sort of intertwining with Gotion leaders and executives as they set the stage to make their way into Michigan. And apparently, there was a soft agreement where they would house workers, PRC nationals, unvetted, and his regime changed. It came to a new one. So, there was talk of that. And there were also conversations that are known that Gotion had concept conversations with the university to support various elements of building. I do not know if it ever came to pass, but, again, I think that would just highlight another element of what has all the textbook markings of an influence operation.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. I would agree, and I just want to make sure you said "unvetted."

Mr. CELLA. Yes. So, I would just say that if you look at the backdrop of the 2018–2019 National Intelligence Law of China, the 2015 National Security Law, this is just the law that they have to follow whether they are in China or around the world to surveil, collect, and report. So, I just think that as it now stands, our apparatus, our preparedness is not commensurate with that threat. That is why I shared with some of your other colleagues perhaps a more footed and a more nimble approach would begin with passing a more modern version of the National Security Act of 1947 that engages the China threat.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Thank you. It is widely known that stakeholders and other supporters of the deal, so to speak, with the Gotion, signed a nondisclosure, so signed non-disclosure agreements. This,

in my opinion, is a huge red flag for our national security and intelligence agencies when it comes to dealing with a company with deep ties to the CCP. Why would elected and appointed officials sign a 5- to 10-year NDA regarding Gotion? Is that not a red flag? It seems a little weird to me.

Mr. CELLA. It is a big red flag. And in February 2022, I had mentioned to some of your other colleagues, national security and intelligence agencies convened state and local elected officials on a bipartisan basis and business leaders to say, look, China is on the hunt. You better have your dukes up. Do not be duped by seemingly benign business deals because if you do not follow directives of strict scrutiny, transparency, which NDAs are not, our national security is jeopardized.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. What is the issue with being transparent?

Mr. CELLA. Well, I think that by being transparent, much of what has gone on that is now in the court filings that we mentioned with Gotion would be known in terms of elite capture, influence operations, what appears to be corruption and enrichment. Books have never been opened over the course of this deal. They ought to be, and they are really, I think, emanating from a retrenching of National Security Act of 1947, in a modern sense, would get us there.

Mrs. MCCLAIN. Thank you. I am just going to remind everyone again, this is going on under our noses within our state, and I am gravely concerned. It is next to a military facility, and it is right next to Ferris State with NDAs, and everything is under the cloak of darkness, very concerning for me and the people of the state of Michigan. Thank you. I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentlelady yield back. The Chair recognizes Ms. Crockett from Texas.

Ms. CROCKETT. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. I am going to take a little bit of a different approach to this. You know, interestingly enough, I will say that our position on China should be one of bipartisanship. I will absolutely say that, and we do not find very much bipartisanship specifically in this Committee. I think some of the concerns that I have, though, is just about the fact that we are not speaking more holistically. Let me explain to you kind of what I mean by that.

One of the things that has been brought up has been fentanyl, and I appreciate the conversation around fentanyl because for so long in this Committee, it has been put out there to the American people that fentanyl is only coming from the Southern border and the only reason we have a crisis is because of the Southern border, when the reality is that China is playing a huge role as it relates to the fentanyl crisis, and so we have got to approach any of these crises more holistically. And the reason that I have a problem with this particular hearing, like some of my colleagues have already stated, is that we are not really talking about the bigger picture. The bigger picture is that it is not China as an isolated bad actor.

What is really making and exacerbating this issue is the fact that China is teaming up with Russia, who is also teaming up with Iran. Is there anyone that disagrees that these three have actually started to work in concert together and it is all for the harm of us?

[No response.]

Ms. CROCKETT. By your silence, I will say that you agree with me. And so, I think that we need to be honest with the American people and talk about the dynamic of this threat and that it is a lot larger, and that is actually what makes it even scarier. And it is why we do need someone that will lead this Nation and will not just call out one bad actor, but call them all out because they are definitely working together.

As it has already been pointed out, not being able to say that we want Ukraine to defeat Russia, it is a very simple thing, but it means a lot. In addition to that, there is one portion of this world that I have traveled to most since I have been in Congress, and that is the Indo-Pacific area. And to go into places like Taiwan and to listen to what people in Taiwan, what people in Thailand, what people in Indonesia, what they are all experiencing as it relates to the CCP, it, like, hurts my heart.

And so, I do want to come up with solutions because a lot of times when I am listening to this, I am wondering if they are talking about mobsters or what because that is how bad it sounds when they are dropping off these bags of money, and then the next thing you know, it is like they own these people. Yet we know that there is a lack of security, and we have to do our part in America to make sure that we are helping out these modern-day democracies. But also, we have got to be smart about our policies, right? Like, our trade policies have to be smart and they have to keep up. And we also have to make sure that we are protecting those here in our country whether we are talking about from military attacks or whether we are talking about interfering with our elections or whether we are talking about literally our economy, and China somehow has their hands in all three of these spaces.

So, one of the issues that has not been talked about a lot is the tariffs and the tariffs that have been proposed by Donald Trump if he becomes President of the United States again, and how those tariffs specifically have impacted our farmers. Mr. Stokes, are you aware of the impact that the tariffs that were imposed during the previous Trump Administration how that impacted our farmers?

Mr. STOKES. Well, I think, broadly speaking, the tariffs, on the one hand, are meant to be a tool to combat unfair trade practices by China, but on the other hand, they impose costs on consumers in the United States. So, in many ways, we have got to kind of strike a balance because we have not been able to deal with unfair trade practices from China effectively and this has been one of our most effective tools, but it does come at a cost for middle class people. And so, we have got to strike a balance there, and that is, in general, how I would approach the tariff issue.

Ms. CROCKETT. That is absolutely right, and more specifically, when we went through this before because doing the same thing over and over is the definition of insanity if we are expecting a different result. Farmers who exported soybeans, cotton, and sorghum to China were hit by Beijing's decision to raise tariffs on those products as much as 25 percent. Even despite Trump's attempt to mitigate his colossal failure by providing offsets and financial support for farmers, giving \$23 billion in 2018 and 2019, he failed to distribute the support evenly to farmers, to say nothing that the support only partially mitigated the harm caused by these tariffs.

And what is being proposed now is Trump is proposing a worldwide tariff of 10 percent and 60 percent on Chinese goods, which would lower the average after-tax incomes of U.S. households in 2025 by \$1,800 and reduce imports to the U.S. by \$5.5 trillion or 15 percent.

The thing is, I want us to come up with policies, and I am charging and requesting each of you as you sit here, and you have studied this, to talk about this in a very holistic mindset and give us some actual proposals that you believe would be bipartisan, where we can definitely deal with not just China, but Iran, as well as Russia, as they are working as a collective to harm us. Thank you so much for your time, and I will yield.

Chairman COMER. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Burlison from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Thayer, are you familiar with an individual named Neville Roy Singham?

Dr. THAYER. No, Congressman, I am not.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Atkinson?

Dr. ATKINSON. No, sir.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Cella?

Mr. CELLA. I am not, sir.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Stokes?

Mr. STOKES. No, sir.

Mr. BURLISON. OK. So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record an article from the *New York Times* titled, "A Global Web of Chinese Propaganda Leads to a U.S. Tech Mogul."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BURLISON. So, Mr. Singham is an individual, a former, as was mentioned, tech mogul. According to these articles, he has been financing groups like the group that is protesting outside this door, Code Pink. In fact, he is married to the individual who co-founded this organization. He has also been a contributor to many left-leaning Democrats, including Members of this Committee, so certainly Members in this Committee know who he is. But the question is, what is his involvement with China? Because so much of his philanthropy is funding groups that are sympathetic to the Chinese Communist Party.

And so, this is of concern. You would think that it would not result in anything. And yet, as this Times article points out, in fact, when the Committee on China was formed in the House, several of those Members that received contributions protested the creation, in fact, rallied votes against the creation of that Committee. There are other items that are listed in the article, and I would encourage you guys to read that. To me, this is an example of elite capture, OK?

So, Mr. Thayer, let us talk about the history of the current Governor, Tim Walz, and his connections with China. It is estimated that he has been to China and organized trips up to 30 times, and then he no longer started doing those trips. Then he became a member of a group while he was a Member of Congress called the Macao Polytechnic University, which is a Chinese institution that characterizes itself as having a long-held devotion to and love for the motherland. Mr. Thayer, are you aware of his interactions with China?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, Congressman Burlison. Those incidences and his corporation, which was in existence in the 1990's and into the 21st century, the business that ran, essentially, educational exchange and brought American students to the peninsula.

Mr. BURLISON. For over 10 years.

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLISON. For over 10 years, he made numerous trips and organized numerous trips that were funded.

My real concern is his connection to this organization, the Macao Polytechnic University. Can you describe that?

Dr. THAYER. I believe, if I am not mistaken, Congressman Burlison, that he was a researcher there or a fellow at that institution in Macau.

Mr. BURLISON. One might think there has been a pivot in the United States, but certainly by the time the Trump Administration had taken office, the Trump Administration started sending warnings to universities about the Confucius Institutes and their involvement, and many universities pulled those from their campuses. But strangely, the universities in Mr. Walz's state while he is governor are uniquely still having the Confucius Institutes. Are you familiar with that?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURLISON. Could you elaborate on why that is a concern?

Dr. THAYER. Certainly. Well, Confucius Institute is an aspect of political warfare. It is an institution which purports to tout the greatness of Chinese civilization, but it really is advancing the agenda of the Chinese Communist Party. My concern with respect to the businesses is that he would have to have a Chinese partner, at least one partner or maybe multiple partners in the People's Republic of China, and would have to receive permission at the local level, provincial level, and at the central level to conduct business. And that certainly would involve contacts with the MSS, so with the Chinese Intelligence Service, and with the Chinese Communist Party, in order to conduct that business. To my knowledge, we do not have information about his Chinese partner or Chinese partners there. Additionally, of course, for MSS intelligence collections, having students come over, of course, allows MSS to have access to those individuals, which may provide a benefit for their intelligence collection in the future.

Mr. BURLISON. Thank you. My time has expired.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair recognizes the Ranking Member.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you kindly, just for a UC request. The first is an article from the *Washington Post* dated August 7 of this year. It is entitled, "Walz Has a Long History With China, But He is Not Pro-China." The second is from the *Post*, dated August 8, 2024, entitled, "Walz's Deep China Experience is Good for the Country." Both articles conclude Walz's deep knowledge relating to China are an asset and not a liability.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

I will now recognize myself for 5 minutes of questions and just to go around the panel real quick. I have a few questions. I am going to give you plenty of time to answer my last question.

Everyone on the panel has already testified and agrees that the CCP is a huge threat to America and a huge threat to our government. Does anyone disagree that as we speak, the Chinese Communist Party is trying to infiltrate our government, various government agencies, and our political system in general? Now, I am going to ask each one of you “yes” or “no,” and then we will go into more in-depth questions, but is the average government agency aware of the threat the CCP poses? I mean, in other words, does anyone have confidence that the government agencies here in Washington, DC. are aware of the threat? We are not even talking about do they have a plan to combat Chinese infiltration, but do you believe the government agencies are aware, Dr. Thayer?

Dr. THAYER. Thank you, Chairman Comer. Not sufficiently, sir.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Atkinson?

Dr. ATKINSON. Overall, I do not believe they are.

Chairman COMER. Ambassador?

Mr. CELLA. Our response is woefully not commensurate with the current threat.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Stokes?

Mr. STOKES. I think the foreign and security-focused agencies, our intelligence agencies in particular, are very aware. I think the more domestically focused agencies, given that the threat is outside their domain, it might be less.

Chairman COMER. OK. All right. Thank you. Ambassador Cella, has the CCP used political and economic warfare to weaponize the obsession with green energy?

Mr. CELLA. We need not look any further than Michigan. So, we have talked about Gotion. Your colleagues have raised the Gotion matter and, again, as a textbook influence operation, subnational coercion. The one project that it did not talk about that is also present is a joint project with Ford CATL that left Virginia after Governor Youngkin said is a national security threat, ended up on our shores. So, malign things are affiliated with both of these. You have three congressional committees looking at the CATL deal for a reason, because it is a threat.

Chairman COMER. I am concerned about the Green Deal specifically because I believe that this would give China a much greater competitive advantage, and I believe that China has fueled a lot of the discussion about the Green New Deal. What should Federal agencies do to address this problem?

Mr. CELLA. In my humble opinion, I would just say, we need not look any further than, I think, Germany, who, I think, got way out over their skis with green technology, integrating with the EVs, and I think it is perilous for the United States to get on that same track. Michigan is the automobile capital of the world, and I think they are on a perilous track by heading where they are. Toyota, I think, struck the right balance between hybrids and conventional internal combustion engines, but we really need to be aware of this technology and mindful of the malignness of China.

Chairman COMER. OK. And I am going to ask, for time’s sake, Dr. Thayer, Mr. Atkinson, and Ambassador Cella, if you could convince Federal agencies to do one thing to secure Americans from the cold war that CCP is waging, what would it be? Dr. Thayer?

Dr. THAYER. Work with Congress and the executive to formulate a strategy of victory over the CCP.

Chairman COMER. Mr. Atkinson?

Dr. ATKINSON. I think each agency needs to develop an internal plan and strategy and implementation of how they would see the CCP threat, vis-a-vis the areas that they cover as an agency.

Chairman COMER. Ambassador?

Mr. CELLA. I think the footing of the National Security Act of 1947 modernized so these agencies are working with you, and what that would look like, it would involve a top-to-bottom assessment and then adjust accordingly, plugging the gaping holes that exist.

Chairman COMER. OK. Mr. Atkinson, you have expressed concerns that America's technology powerhouses have allowed themselves to become increasingly dependent on China for manufacturing various components and ending in a vulnerable Taiwan. We all know about the semiconductors and all of that. Could you explain why this happened and what Federal agencies need to do to solve this issue, our dependence on China and Taiwan for so much of our technology, if not all of our technology?

Dr. ATKINSON. Well, first of all, we failed for many decades to put in place an effective techno-economic policy. I will give you an example. President Reagan was the big cheerleader of putting in place a research and development tax credit, as was every administration.

Chairman COMER. Uh-huh.

Dr. ATKINSON. In the Clinton Administration, we had the most generous R&D tax credit in the world. Now, the Chinese R&D tax credit is 3.75 times bigger than ours, so we need to just do simple things like use the Tax Code to drive more innovation and investment. But the other part of that is we have had a long history of where Federal agencies have turned a blind eye. For example, as we speak, the National Science Foundation has a joint quantum computing research program with the Chinese. We gave away our most advanced nuclear technology.

Chairman COMER. Uh-huh.

Dr. ATKINSON. Oak Ridge National Laboratory. We had a Chinese delegation there in the 2000's, and they were there for over 6 months and we just did not care. And so, it is time to raise that level of awareness much, much higher.

Chairman COMER. Very good, very good. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Perry from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. I thank the Chairman. Gentlemen, great to see you. Dr. Thayer and Mr. Atkinson, I do not hold a lot of hope for Congress to do sweeping things in this arena for a lot of different reasons. Unfortunately, I think it is going to take unilateral action, which then Congress can follow by any President from any party. And let us start with the fact that, I think, and if you will confirm this, that many Americans in investment are funding our own demise through investments in China, and China operates under a different set of rules in our financial markets than our own United States companies do. Can you confirm that assertion, No. 1, and, No. 2, what would be the answer that an administration could take unilaterally while Congress continues to ponder the implications?

Dr. THAYER. Congressman Perry, thank you for the question. Sir, it is correct, that is the case, and the solution to that would be to demand and require transparency from Chinese entities operating within the United States. U.S. firms and Chinese firms should play by the same rules.

Mr. PERRY. Go ahead, Mr. Atkinson.

Dr. ATKINSON. Well, Congressman, I agree with you that, ultimately, this is going to have to come from an administration because there is so much complexity, but, for example, we could delist Chinese firms from our equity market because of lack of transparency. I believe the SEC has the ability to do that now, and they have chosen not to.

Mr. PERRY. So, they have the unilateral ability, but choose not to. And just out of curiosity, other than what the founders described that the avarice of man, right, greed, what other reason would they have to not do that to protect America? Why wouldn't they just demand that a foreign entity be operating under the same rules as our own entities, especially a foreign entity that is described as their enemy?

Dr. ATKINSON. I do not think you can underestimate inertia in the Federal bureaucracy. It is just because they have been doing it that way, and it is very, very hard to change that attitude and that mindset, which is really ultimately what Presidential leadership is about.

Mr. PERRY. Are these the actions of the Secretary of the SEC or the Treasury guided by the direction of the President? Is that simply how difficult it is, or is it something much more complicated that requires papers and boards and meetings and/or can this be done essentially with the stroke of a pen?

Dr. ATKINSON. Quick, there are a lot of things that could be done by a stroke of a pen or just basically the Presidential bully pulpit.

Mr. PERRY. Dr. Thayer?

Dr. THAYER. As Chairman Comer recognized, it is an aspect of recognizing the nature of the threat, of the immediacy of the threat, and, essentially, this is thinking of the Ancient regime. This is old thinking. They are thinking that the People's Republic of China is going to be a responsible stakeholder, as it was once observed. They simply do not recognize the nature of the CCP threat.

Mr. PERRY. I just got to say, Dr. Thayer, if you are working at the SEC or the Treasury or the Administration and have that mindset, I think it is long past time that you go find a job in the private sector. That having been said, Ambassador, what has frustrated me, among a million other things on this topic, is the World Trade Organization and that China continues to operate as a developing nation, right? Again, while Congress ponders the implications and does nothing, how can an administration unilaterally take action to right this thing and treat China and have the rest of the world treat China for what it actually is?

Mr. CELLA. Well, I am not a trade policy expert, but I would just begin taking steps to see how you could derisk or decouple them from the WTO. Not uncomplicated, but I think that conversation has to happen. Again, our footing is not commensurate with the threat. I think we need to be nimble and aggressively work with

our Five Eyes partners and others with more oars in the water, and have them pedaling much faster than they are now.

Mr. PERRY. So, I think what I just heard you say is, look, we got to at least start by having a view toward doing that and then laying out the steps. But I gather from that comment that that step or those steps have not even occurred at this point.

Mr. CELLA. Widely controversial.

Mr. PERRY. Why would it be widely controversial? Who considers China a developing Nation like they are, you know, like they are still farming with oxen out in the rice paddies or something like that, and they all eat, like, you know, 4 ounces of rice and drink a cup of water a day for sustenance? Is that what people believe literally?

Mr. CELLA. I think there are a lot of people making a lot of money. I think it is driven by Wall Street, and I think it is also driven by consumer appetites as well. So, I think we have settled into this kind of arcadia or sloth period for a number of years, and one of your colleagues on the other side of the aisle raised it, but it needs to be engaged accordingly and not have this China blindness that the great Admiral Studeman referred to in a speech last year.

Mr. PERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. The Chair recognizes Mr. Fallon from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to all the witnesses. I think the greatest threat to stability and prosperity and liberty that not only our country faces, but the world, is the Chinese Communist Party. The United States, though, is uniquely poised and positioned to thwart the ambitions of the ruling elite in Beijing as we are the only Nation really that is strong enough to stymie China's ever-growing aggressiveness and their expansionist ideas. It is incumbent upon us here in Congress to protect our country, our allies, and nations across the globe from the CCP's political warfare and their malign influence and aggression. Mr. Stokes, do you think that the great power competition that we currently see will continue?

Mr. STOKES. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. I mean, I do as well. You do not think that China is going to change direction and amend their ways anytime soon, do you?

Mr. STOKES. No.

Mr. FALLON. No. I agree with that, and I think technology is going to be the currency of competition moving forward. Do you think that we should work together—when I say “we,” meaning Congress—in either this or the next administration, to protect our domestic RDT&E from foreign exploitation?

Mr. STOKES. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. I think that is critical because it seems to me that every day, China is trying to not only close the gap, but really even exceed our expectation or our capabilities. And we have got, you know, limited time, and I got a few more questions, and I am going to go through them really quickly. Do you think that the Congress and the next administration should also be proactively countering the China's Belt and Road Initiative?

Mr. STOKES. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. Do you think DoD could play a role in countering it as well?

Mr. STOKES. Yes, mostly for the military, dual-use military installations part.

Mr. FALLON. Well, because that is what I was thinking because tasking organizations within the Pentagon—I serve on the Armed Services Committee—with executing some of the regionally based ops may be a very good idea, and because considering the resources and the relationships and partnerships that they have already established. Are we tracking?

Mr. STOKES. Yes.

Mr. FALLON. Yes, you know, and also, let us talk real quickly about missile defense. I am concerned because of the advances that the Chinese have made and the Russians, with hypersonics. Do you think that our missile defense should be a critical component of our national security architecture?

Mr. STOKES. I think, in general, yes, defending against hypersonic missiles is incredibly difficult as a technical challenge.

Mr. FALLON. Sure, and so developing our own advanced missile defense system should be something that we should really focus on.

Mr. STOKES. Yes, in general, but I think we have to weigh across the whole portfolio of our capabilities, where our money is best spent.

Mr. FALLON. You know, and thank you. I want to appreciate your honest answers. And what I find interesting is that what we just discussed, every single question that was asked could be found in the Department of Defense chapter in Project 2025, that, like, it seems to be the boogeyman of many Democrats, and it is the policy Freddy Krueger, if you will. And in fact, the Ranking Member last week mentioned Project 2025 12 times in a 7 1/2-minute opening statement, and nearly every Democrat did as well. They were talking about Project 2025 and the malign and influence, and it is nefarious in nature. But you know what Project 2025 really is? It is policy thoughts and a wish list from a think tank. That is what think tanks do. No Republican on the Hill or senior advisor to the Trump Administration or Presidential campaign commissioned it. It is 920-pages-plus of ideas, some good, some excellent, and some I am sure I do not agree with because I did not read all 920 pages. But because the Democrats talked about it so much last week, I actually picked it up this weekend and read a few excerpts from it.

And I find that curious that there were pejoratives thrown out there. It was extreme and it was chaos and corruption. Well, I have another word: “yawn.” It was much to-do about nothing or at least very little. Essentially, what the Oversight Democrats’ argument seems to be is that President Trump is going to push a policy platform he has never endorsed, but Kamala Harris will not champion any position she has endorsed even recently. I find that quite amazing that those Democrats’ whole argument relies on the American people having the attention span and memory of a goldfish, or at least Joe Biden. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman yields back. Now, we are waiting for Mr. Langworthy, who is en route, to ask questions. So, after that, we are going to close and give our closing remarks. But if the

Ranking Member is OK, I may yield to him to give some brief closing remarks, and then if Langworthy gets here, he could ask questions. If you object to that, we can hold off until he gets here, he is about 3 or 4 minutes away.

Mr. RASKIN. No, that is fine. I can take it until he arrives. That is cool. Thank you.

Chairman COMER. OK. You know, take your time——

Mr. RASKIN. I appreciate it.

Chairman COMER [continuing]. Within reason.

Mr. RASKIN. You know, it has been a fascinating hearing, Mr. Chairman, and it is the third of three. I do not know if we are going to do another about the CCP before it is all over in this Congress, but it does give an opportunity for some closing reflections.

One is that Americans have got to stand strong and stand together against all of the foreign autocratic regimes, including China, including Russia and Iran and others when they try to attack our democracy. For the vast majority of human history, people have lived under dictators and thugs and bullies and autocrats and theocrats and those who irrigate themselves the power to lord it over everybody else and to act as dictators, and the American founders had a different idea. They wanted to center government on the principle of the consent of the governed, political participation and governance by the people with freedom and rights of the people. And that is always been controversial, both in America, but also among our autocratic adversaries abroad. And so, in this century, a number of our foreign adversaries have directly intervened in American politics to try to undermine our elections in order to fix our elections or corrupt our elections by guaranteeing that this or that candidate or party would win.

Russia intervened systematically in our Presidential election in 2016, according to the findings of more than a dozen of our own intelligence agencies. I know Donald Trump said he agreed with Vladimir Putin that Putin had not intervened, but it was simply an incontestable and indisputable truth that is well documented and well understood both by Congress and also by the national security departments. The Director of National Intelligence tells us it is happening again in this election, as it happened in 2020, and I appreciate the fact that I believe all of our witnesses, at least most of them, were able to opine that they acknowledged that there was a very close strategic political alliance between the Chinese Communist Party and Vladimir Putin, the former chief of the KGB, who has set himself at war against Democratic political institutions in America and around the world.

The second point I want to make is that political propaganda and disinformation and elite capture are indeed critical tools for the authoritarian powers, and we need look no further than the political career of Donald Trump, who has been played like a fiddle by the Chinese Communist Party and by Vladimir Putin. He has lavished praise as President on President Xi dozens of times. His daughter got more than 40 trademarks from the Chinese Government. He pocketed more than \$3 million directly from the Chinese Government, Mr. Chairman, and we were able to determine that from the documents that were turned over before the Committee stopped them from being turned over, according to the Mazars' litigation.

And we have seen, of course, this same kind of capitulation to Vladimir Putin, that is, elite capture, that is propaganda and disinformation infecting our political system. And we have had Republican luminaries complaining about the fact that there are Republican Members of Congress who have been parroting disinformation put out by Putin and the Chinese Government.

But what we have got that the rest of the world does not have is we have got a true devotion to rule by the people. And in the process of this election, a statement was just released by a bipartisan group of 741 national security leaders for Kamala Harris, and they wrote, “We don’t agree on everything—the Republicans, Democrats, Independents—but we all adhere to two fundamental principles. First, we believe America’s national security requires a serious and capable Commander-in-Chief. Second, we believe American democracy is invaluable. Each generation has a responsibility to defend it. That is why we, the undersigned, proudly endorse Harris to be the next President of the United States. The election is a choice between serious leadership and vengeful impulsiveness. It is a choice between democracy and authoritarianism. We do not make such an assessment lightly,” and I would like to submit that for the record, and I yield back to you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

The Chair recognizes Mr. Langworthy for 5 minutes.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just 3 weeks ago, in my home state of New York, the Deputy Chief of Staff to Governor Kathy Hochul, was arrested on Federal charges for acting as a secret agent of the Chinese Government. Let me repeat that for everyone: a senior aide for the current Governor of one of the most populous states in our country infiltrated state politics and served as an asset and agent for the Chinese Communist Party and the Chinese government. Dr. Thayer, are you familiar with the situation?

Dr. THAYER. Yes, Congressman, I am.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Thank you. Well, I could go on and on about, you know, what I think of the competence level of Governor Hochul’s Administration. What I think is particularly alarming is that Linda Sun was not some low-level bureaucrat in some deep department. She held a very senior position, advising Governor Hochul on critical matters of state policy. Sun blocked Taiwanese Government representatives from getting access to high-ranking New York state officials and altered the messaging of state officials on issues of importance to the Chinese Government, all at the request of Chinese officials. Sun also helped Chinese Government officials travel to the United States and to meet with New York officials by providing unauthorized invitation letters from high level state officers.

Dr. Thayer, if a foreign agent can operate with such impunity within one of the largest states in the union for over a decade, how many more are there? How many more are there working in the shadows in other state houses or other municipalities or even here in our departments in Washington, D.C.? Is it hundreds? Is it thousands, hundreds of thousands? I mean, you know, the Federal Government is, you know, so bloated, you know. How deep is this problem?

Dr. THAYER. Well, that is a key question, of course, in terms of illuminating it. The Sun case is really an archetype of how they proceed, of how their both intelligence collection as a broader component of political warfare proceeds. And so, it is a sad and unfortunate reminder of this problem that we see in the United States, that we see in other countries as well. So, with respect to your question, there must be orders of magnitude more in terms of agents as well as agents of influence, the evidence of the success of their political warfare campaign.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. I mean, this should scare the hell out of everyone on both sides of the aisle that in a state where the budget is \$220-plus billion, you know, the financial capital of the world, I mean, this is not, you know, a small and unsophisticated government, and the fact that this was able to happen in New York, I just find staggering. And to make matters worse, this is not the first time New York state has been compromised by the CCP. Last year, several individuals were arrested on charges that they had helped to establish secret police stations in New York City on behalf of the Chinese Government, and dozens of officers with China's National Police were charged with using social media to harass dissidents in New York state and across the country. Dr. Thayer, can you elaborate on why the Chinese Government would establish a secret police station in New York City?

Dr. THAYER. It is a tool of coercion. It is a violation of our sovereignty. These centers which exist, which they call service centers, of course, but they are police stations, and their purpose is to intimidate and coerce Chinese Americans, other members of the Chinese diaspora, for example, and why we tolerate such a violation of our sovereignty, I simply do not know.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. And unfortunately, New York state responded with absolutely no coherent strategy to combat the CCP at the state level, and New York state is not the only one to blame here. The Biden Administration has done nothing to address the alarming level of CCP infiltration into this country. Dr. Thayer, you have emphasized that the Trump Administration initiated a strong and effective resistance to China's growing interest. However, you have also noted that the Biden Harris-Administration shifted away from this strategy, altering the course of what you had acknowledged as a successful approach countering China's actions. How did the Biden-Harris Administration shift away from President Trump's strategy of strong and effective resistance to China's growing threat?

Dr. THAYER. It did so in many ways, but to touch on three which are most significant, what the Biden-Harris Administration did was to move away in terms of our political signaling to allies that engagement was returning, and that as a result of that, the CCP recognized that they, again, had the opportunity to pressure their hyper-aggressive activities, for example, against the Philippines, in the South China Sea, other allies, and partners.

The second step that they took was to step away—the messaging, Congressman, is absolutely essential. Trump was recognizing the CCP as a threat and it was going to be dealt with by the United States, as many members of the Administration recognized. The United States was seeking to identify and to describe the nature

of the threat and also to advance a solution to that threat, involving allies and partners, and the Biden-Harris Administration has regrettably and sadly backed away from it. And so those signals reverberate for all global audiences, those who wish us well in international politics, for example, and those who are our foes in international politics.

But we have seen under Biden-Harris, a return to hyper-aggression of the Chinese Communist Party, a violation of Japanese sovereignty, numerous threats against Taiwan, missiles deployed against Taiwan. Again, the Philippines, a treaty ally of the United States, right now is being evicted from its territory, as recognized by the 2016 Permanent Court of Arbitration decision and by the 2002 Code of Conduct between ASEAN states and the PRC. It is being essentially evicted out of its sovereign territory, coerced out of its sovereign territory by the PRC. So, we are seeing, sadly, this hyper-aggressive regime applying all of its means to advance while the Biden-Harris Administration are not taking the steps necessary to deter these actions by the CCP.

Mr. LANGWORTHY. Well, I thank you very much for your time. I wish I had another 10 minutes to ask you questions, but I yield back.

Chairman COMER. The gentleman from Buffalo yields back, and before I close, I would recognize Ranking Member for some unanimous consents.

Mr. RASKIN. Yes. Thank you kindly. This one is an *Associated Press* article called, "The Arrest of a Former Aide to New York Governor Highlights Efforts to Root Out Chinese Agents in the U.S." It is about aggressive Department of Justice investigation of CCP interference.

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. RASKIN. I have got one from CNN, saying, "Trump Claims Not to Know Who is Behind Project 2025. A CNN Review Found at Least 140 People Who Worked for Him Were Involved."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. RASKIN. And then finally, from *Salon*: "In Resurfaced Speech, Trump Endorses Heritage Foundation's Project 2025."

Chairman COMER. Without objection, so ordered.

Chairman COMER. And I want to thank our witnesses for being here today and wanted to have a few closing remarks and just state for the record, the Oversight Committee has investigated 25 sectors of the Federal Government. The findings of this governmentwide investigation are very alarming. The Federal Government under the Biden-Harris Administration has no cohesive strategy to secure America in this cold war. None, zero. Now, they can send talking points to their very obedient Democrat Members of Congress, and they can say there is a strategy, but there really is not a strategy.

And for example, when the Oversight Committee requested a briefing, just a briefing from the National Security Council about the Federal Government's response to CCP unrestricted warfare, the National Security Council declined to brief the Committee and instead stated that the Biden-Harris Administration strategy is to be resilient, that is the type of subsistence that we are seeing from candidate Harris is just talking points, we will be resilient. Now,

that does not appear to be the case at all. So, what this Committee wants to do is to identify the problems, and I think with our three hearings, we have, in a bipartisan manner, agreed for the most part. Most people on this Committee are serious. There are a few that are not, and I think everyone in America who watched C-SPAN today saw the ones who are not. We agree there is a problem with Chinese Communist Party.

The witnesses testified today there is a problem with the Chinese Communist Party trying to infiltrate our government agencies and our political system and what we have to do as a Congress is come together in a bipartisan way to come up with solutions to the problem. And I believe that we can come up with solutions, but the first step is for our government agencies to fully understand the threat, what is a threat and to have a plan to combat that threat. And certainly, Congress, I believe, can come together and talking about the manufacturing threat, when we talk about the national security concerns with so much of our technology, our semiconductors, and things being made from China and Taiwan, we certainly want to bring that back to the United States, and that starts with a tax policy. It starts with a trade policy. We need to identify, as a Congress, the most critical manufactured items that we import from China that are of the utmost importance to our national security, whether it be our technology or whether it be certain pharmaceuticals that are manufactured in China. We need to be manufacturing that in the United States, if not in the United States, then in a friendlier country than the United States. So, I think these are things that Congress can come together on.

I want to thank the Committee staff, most of the Committee as a whole, for working together on this issue. This is something that I think we have to identify, and I think there is bipartisan opportunity. Hopefully, after the election, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will be rid of their Trump derangement syndrome, and we can focus on substantive policy to work with our government, regardless of who wins the election, to try to be able to first identify the threat within these government agencies, and then to be able to have a solution to combat the threat because China is not going away. They are in better financial shape than we are. They are certainly more united than our government is, but we have to come together on this issue, and I think we will. And I am proud that this has been a priority of this Congress, for this Committee. This is our last Committee before November, and we have had a lot of accomplishments within our goal of identifying waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in the Federal Government, and this is certainly a huge threat in our Federal Government.

So, again, I want to thank our witnesses for being here today.

With that and without objection, all Members have 5 legislative days within which to submit materials and additional written questions for the witnesses, which will be forwarded to the witnesses.

Chairman COMER. If there is no further business, without objection, the Committee stands adjourned. Thank you, all.

[Whereupon, at 1:19 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.]

