

S. HRG. 111-249

**NOMINATION OF HILLARY R. CLINTON  
TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE**

---

---

**HEARING**

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS  
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————  
JANUARY 13, 2009  
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/index.html>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

54-615 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2010

---

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office  
Internet: [bookstore.gpo.gov](http://bookstore.gpo.gov) Phone: toll free (866) 512-1800; DC area (202) 512-1800  
Fax: (202) 512-2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

JOHN F. KERRY, Massachusetts, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut	RICHARD G. LUGAR, Indiana
RUSSELL D. FEINGOLD, Wisconsin	Republican Leader designee
BARBARA BOXER, California	BOB CORKER, Tennessee
ROBERT MENENDEZ, New Jersey	JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
BENJAMIN L. CARDIN, Maryland	JAMES E. RISCH, Idaho
ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., Pennsylvania	JIM DEMINT, South Carolina
JIM WEBB, Virginia	JOHN BARRASSO, Wyoming
JEANNE SHAHEEN, New Hampshire	ROGER F. WICKER, Mississippi
EDWARD E. KAUFMAN, Delaware	
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York	

DAVID McKean, *Staff Director*

KENNETH A. MYERS, JR., *Republican Staff Director*

## CONTENTS

---

	Page
Clinton, Hon. Hillary Rodham, U.S. Senator from New York, nominated to be Secretary of State .....	15
Prepared statement .....	25
Dodd, Hon. Christopher J., U.S. Senator from Connecticut .....	11
Prepared statement .....	13
Feingold, Hon. Russell D., U.S. Senator from Wisconsin, prepared statement ..	38
Kerry, Hon. John F., U.S. Senator from Massachusetts, opening statement .....	1
Lugar, Hon. Richard G., U.S. Senator from Indiana, opening statement .....	4
Prepared statement .....	8
Schumer, Hon. Charles E., U.S. Senator from New York, statement .....	14

### APPENDIX

Responses of Senator Clinton to questions submitted by the following  
Senators:

John F. Kerry .....	99
Richard G. Lugar .....	147
Russell D. Feingold .....	192
Barbara Boxer .....	195
Bill Nelson .....	198
Robert Menendez .....	199
Robert P. Casey, Jr. ....	212
George V. Voinovich .....	216
Lisa Murkowski .....	217
Jim DeMint .....	217
Johnny Isakson .....	234
David Vitter .....	235



## NOMINATION OF HILLARY R. CLINTON TO BE SECRETARY OF STATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 13, 2009

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m., in room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, Hon. John F. Kerry (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Kerry, Dodd, Feingold, Boxer, Nelson, Menendez, Cardin, Casey, Webb, Lugar, Corker, Voinovich, Murkowski, DeMint, Isakson, Vitter, and Barrasso.

Also Present: Senator Schumer and Senator Shaheen.

### OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN F. KERRY, U.S. SENATOR FROM MASSACHUSETTS

The CHAIRMAN. Well, good morning, everyone. We welcome you all here. We're delighted to welcome Senator Clinton, Secretary of State-designate.

I think every member of the committee believes very strongly that, in Senator Clinton, we have a nominee who is extraordinarily capable and smart, an individual with the global stature and influence to help shape events. She will take office on a first-name basis with numerous heads of state, but also with billions of people in every corner of the globe, those billions of people that the Obama administration hopes to reach, inspire, and influence. Her presence overseas will send a strong signal immediately that America is back.

This morning, we look forward to a good, healthy dialogue; and, over the coming years, we particularly look forward to a strong, close, cooperative working relationship.

This is a historic moment for this committee. For the first time in American history, one of our Members will be sworn in as President, and another one as Vice President. Before any of the newer members of our committee get too excited about future prospects, let Dick Lugar, Chris Dodd, and myself, and perhaps even Hillary will join in this, in saying, "Trust us, it ain't automatic." [Laughter.]

For me, it is a particularly special and personal privilege to be sitting here, having testified before Chairman Fulbright, in 1971, and having worked closely with the chairmen since who have set a strong example for this committee's ability to contribute to our security.

And this morning we should remember one chairman, in particular. Last week, Dick, Chris, Sheldon, and I attended memorial services for Claiborne Pell in Rhode Island. President Clinton, who first met Chairman Pell when he was a college student interning on this committee, spoke movingly at the funeral. And today, I know we all join together in expressing our gratitude for Chairman Pell's exemplary service. His commitment to bipartisanship and multilateralism remains the guideposts by which this committee will continue its efforts.

I'm privileged also to follow in the more recent footsteps of two respected chairmen and good friends. Vice President-elect Biden and I first ran for office together in 1972. We grew up together in politics. I know Joe and his family well, as many of the members of this committee do. I value his friendship, and the country will come to value the wisdom and strength which he brings to the vice-presidency. The committee is grateful for his leadership.

I also have the good fortune, as chairman, to have beside me, as ranking member, the senior-most Republican in the Senate, a Nobel Peace Prize nominee for his groundbreaking nonproliferation work, and a trusted, thoughtful voice in our national security dialogue.

Senator Lugar, I look forward to working with you in the same cooperative way that Senator Biden did, and others have in the past, and I know that that will characterize the work of this committee as we go forward and I could not have a better partner, and I thank you for that.

If we do our job correctly as we begin a new Presidency and a new Congress, we stand on the brink of a new era of American diplomacy, with great potential for significant, if not transformational, steps forward across the globe. And I look forward to working with Secretary Clinton to seize that potential.

In the last 7 years, we have spent the treasure of our Nation— young American soldiers, first and foremost, and billions of dollars—to fight terrorism; and yet, grave questions remain as to whether or not we have chosen our battles correctly, pursued the right strategy, defined the right goals. That we are engaged in fighting a global insurgency is beyond doubt, but our task is to define the method and means of our response more effectively, and no challenge will be greater in the days ahead than to get this right.

Pakistan and Afghanistan are definitively the front line of our global counterterrorism efforts. Having visited, several times recently, it is clear that no amount of additional troops will succeed, absent the effective instruments of a functioning state. We face a gargantuan task, and, to be successful, I believe we must fundamentally redefine our approach.

We went into Afghanistan to deny al-Qaeda sanctuary. Our goals must be defined by our original mission, by the regional security context, and by the tribal, decentralized nature of Afghan society. I'm eager to hear Senator Clinton's thoughts on the road ahead in Afghanistan.

Nor should anyone believe that Iraq is a completed task. Despite the Status of Forces Agreement that sets out a schedule for reduction of United States forces, Sunni and Shia tensions, the unre-

solved status of Kirkuk, the distribution of oil revenues, and setbacks to political reconciliation, each threaten to upend our fragile progress, and they will require active diplomatic engagement by Secretary of State Clinton and the rest of the Obama administration with Iraq's Government, and particularly with its neighbors.

Iraq, as well as Iran, Syria, the West Bank, and Gaza, all require an approach that recognizes the interconnectedness of each of these challenges. We look forward to working with the administration and with Secretary Clinton on a significantly expanded and vigorous diplomatic effort.

In the age of catastrophic terrorism, it is also urgent—and I know Senator Lugar joins me in expressing this—urgent that we restore America's leadership on nonproliferation. Whatever our differences, we must reengage with Russia on nuclear security—specifically, the START Treaty. It is my hope that we will embrace deep, reciprocal cuts in our nuclear arsenals, and I'm eager to hear Senator Clinton's thoughts on this matter.

Consistent with our security needs, I believe we should set a goal of no more than 1,000 deployed warheads; and that goal should be just a beginning. We should also lay the groundwork for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The last 8 years have resulted in increased suspicion of our motives abroad, especially in the Muslim world, where we must do much more to reduce the prevalent and costly perception of an assault on Islam. It is vital that we redouble our efforts to find common ground, including through interfaith dialogue.

We must integrate all of the disparate elements of our national power into a single unified effort. And I agree with Secretary Gates that we need a State Department with more resources and greater capacity to deal with 21st century challenges in conflict zones and in weak and failing states.

I was heartened to hear Senator Clinton signal her desire to radically improve our diplomatic capacity and finally give the State Department the tools it needs to put civilian functions back in civilian hands, and she can count on our support in that effort. She can also count on our support in efforts to reengage with Latin America and recognize how crucial renewed and expanded relationships with Russia and China are to our overall goals.

I believe, Madam Secretary-designate, that China offers us extremely important opportunities for a more productive partnership, and we need to approach that relationship with greater respect for, and understanding of, our common interests.

Before turning to Senator Lugar, let me just say one thing about global climate change. Many today do not see global climate change as a national security threat. But it is; profoundly so. And the consequences of our inaction grow more serious by the day. In Copenhagen, this December, we have a chance to forge a treaty that would profoundly affect the conditions of life on our planet itself. The resounding message from the recent Climate Change Conference in Poland was that the global community is looking, overwhelmingly, to our leadership. This committee will be deeply involved in crafting a solution that the world can agree to and that the Senate can ratify. And as we proceed, the lesson of Kyoto must

remain clear in our minds: all countries must be part of the solution.

Each of these challenges present major opportunities for a new administration and for a new Secretary of State. After the polarization of the last 8 years, diplomacy must be directed domestically, as well. Senator Clinton's record in the Senate shows her to be an alliance builder in the finest traditions of this body. She has repeatedly sought out the best people, the best ideas, and the common ground upon which solutions could be found.

While the committee still has some questions with respect to the fundraising activities of the Clinton Foundation, I'm pleased that Senator Clinton will have an opportunity today to address them beyond the ways, in-depth, that they have already been addressed. I understand that Senator Lugar will be speaking to this issue in greater detail, and we look forward to hearing the Senator's responses.

Let me just say, personally, that, in the year 2000, I had the privilege of joining the then-First Lady and her husband on the first visit by an American President to Vietnam after the normalization of relations. I have seen Senator Clinton's diplomatic acumen up close. I saw her immense curiosity, her quick and impressive grasp of detail, and her authoritative approach, all of which will serve her well in this new undertaking.

Hillary Clinton has shown the intelligence to navigate the complex issues that we face, the toughness and the tireless work ethic that this job will require, the stature to project America's world leadership, and the alliance-building, at home and abroad, that will be vital to our success in the years ahead. As Senator, Hillary has earned the respect of her colleagues—Democrat and Republican alike—and we are honored to welcome her here today to our committee for confirmation as America's next Secretary of State.

Senator Lugar.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD G. LUGAR,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM INDIANA**

Senator LUGAR. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate you on taking the gavel. We wish you every success, and we appreciate the very gracious comments you have made about previous chairmen. And I join you especially in your tribute to our former colleague, Senator Pell, and the life we celebrated together last week.

It is a great pleasure to welcome Senator Hillary Clinton to the Foreign Relations Committee. Those of you who have served with her during the past 8 years can attest to her impressive skills, her compassion, her collegiality. I've enjoyed the opportunity to work with her in the Senate, and I look forward to the prospect of much more frequent collaboration when she is Secretary of State.

I also want to congratulate Senator Kerry on the assumption of chairmanship of this committee. My first hearing as chairman of the committee, in 1985, was one of the proudest moments of my career, and I'm sure Senator Kerry is feeling the gravity, as well as the joy, of this historic occasion. And I want to thank him and his staff for their great assistance during the last several weeks. It's been a pleasure to work with them. I look forward to all that we can achieve together under Senator Kerry's chairmanship.



I have frequently said the foremost criteria for selection of a national security Cabinet official should be whether the nominee is a big-leaguer who has achieved extraordinary accomplishments, is well known to the world, understands both process and policy, and can command global respect. In Senator Clinton, President-elect Obama has boldly chosen the epitome of a big-leaguer. Her qualifications for the post are remarkable. Her presence at the helm of the State Department could open unique opportunities for United States diplomacy and can bolster efforts to improve foreign attitudes toward the United States. She has a longstanding relationship with many world leaders that could be put to great use in the service of our country. Her time in the Senate has given her a deep understanding of how United States foreign policy can be enriched by establishing a closer relationship between the executive and legislative branches. She is fully prepared to engage the world on myriad of issues that urgently require attention.

During the last 6 years, this committee has held more hearings than any other committee in the Senate, and we have tried to come to grips with issues involving Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, North Korea, Russia, the Middle East peace process, Africa, the Western Hemisphere, the NATO alliance, nonproliferation, foreign assistance reform, the State Department budget, and numerous other priorities. All of these challenges will continue to occupy Senator Clinton as Secretary of State.

I would highlight several other points to which I hope the Secretary will give very high priority in addition to the ongoing crises that will press for her attention.

First, it is vital that the START Treaty with Russia be renewed. When the Senate gave its consent to ratification of the Moscow Treaty in 2002, it did so knowing that the United States could rely on the START Treaty's verification regime. It provides important assurances to both sides. At the time, this committee was assured that extension of START was a very high priority. Unfortunately, little progress has been made and the treaty will expire in 11 months. In other words, the conceptual underpinning of our strategic relationship with Russia depends upon something that is about to expire. Such an outcome will be seen as weakening the international nonproliferation regime.

Second, energy security must be given a much higher priority in our diplomacy. Earlier this month, Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered a cutoff—or, rather, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin ordered a cutoff in natural gas supplies that struck allies across Europe, and this dispute is only the most recent example of how energy vulnerability constrains our foreign policy options around the world, limiting effectiveness in some cases, and forcing our hand in others. I look forward to supporting President-elect Obama in taking the necessary steps to dramatically reduce our domestic dependence on oil. Yet, domestic reform alone will not be sufficient to meet the global threats to our national security, our economic health, or climate change. In my judgment, energy security must be at the top of our agenda with nearly every country. Progress will require personal engagement by the Secretary of State.

Third, eradicating global hunger must be embraced as both a humanitarian and national security imperative. Precipitous food

price increases that occurred in 2007 and 2008 created havoc in many parts of the world, causing riots in some 19 countries, and plunging an additional 75 million people into poverty and increased vulnerability to malnourishment. Nearly 1 billion people are presently food-insecure. It is predicted the world's population will grow to such an extent that, by 2050, current food production will need to double in order to meet demand. There is no reason why people should be hungry when we have the knowledge, the technology, and the resources to make everyone food-secure. The United States is uniquely situated to help the world feed itself and has the opportunities to recast its image by making the eradication of hunger a centerpiece of United States foreign policy.

Now, with these issues in mind, it is especially important we move forward with Senator Clinton's nomination. President-elect Obama has expressed his confidence in her, and he deserves to have the Secretary of State in place at the earliest opportunity.

The main issue related to Senator Clinton's nomination that has occupied the committee has been the review of how her service as Secretary of State can be reconciled with the sweeping global activities of President Bill Clinton and the Clinton Foundation. To this end, the Obama transition and the Clinton Foundation completed a memorandum of understanding outlining steps designed to minimize potential conflicts of interest. I share the President-elect's view that the activities of the Clinton Foundation, and President Clinton himself, should not be a barrier to Senator Clinton's service, but I also share the view implicitly recognized by the memorandum of understanding that the work of the Clinton Foundation is a unique complication that will have to be managed with great care and transparency.

The core of the problem is that foreign governments and entities may perceive the Clinton Foundation as a means to gain favor with the Secretary of State. Although neither Senator Clinton nor President Clinton has a personal financial stake in the Foundation, obviously its work benefits their legacy and their public service priorities.

There is nothing wrong with this, and President Clinton is deservedly proud of the Clinton Foundation's good work in addressing HIV/AIDS, global poverty, climate change, and other pressing problems. But the Clinton Foundation exists as a temptation for any foreign entity or government that believes it could curry favor through a donation. It also sets up potential perception problems with any action taken by the Secretary of State in relation to foreign givers or their countries.

The nature of the Secretary of State post makes recusal from specific policy decisions almost impossible, since even localized U.S. foreign policy activities can ripple across countries and continents. Every new foreign donation that is accepted by the Foundation comes with the risk it will be connected in the global media to a proximate State Department policy or decision. Foreign perceptions are incredibly important to United States foreign policy, and mistaken impressions or suspicions can deeply affect the actions of foreign governments toward the United States. Moreover, we do not want our own government's deliberations distracted by avoidable controversies played out in the media.

The bottom line is that even well-intentioned foreign donations carry risk for United States foreign policy. The only certain way to eliminate this risk going forward is for the Clinton Foundation to forswear new foreign contributions when Senator Clinton becomes Secretary of State. I recommend this straightforward approach as the course most likely to avoid pitfalls that could disrupt United States foreign policy or inhibit Senator Clinton's own activities as Secretary of State.

Alternatively, the Clinton Foundation and the Obama transition have worked in good faith to construct a more complex approach based on disclosure and ethics reviews that would allow the Foundation the prospect of continuing to accept foreign donations deemed not to have the appearance of a conflict of interest. The agreement requires, among other measures, the disclosure of all Foundation donors up to this point; an annual disclosure of donations going forward; and a State Department ethics review process that would evaluate proposed donations from foreign governments and governmental entities. All of these are positive steps, but we should be clear that this agreement is a beginning and not an end. It is not a guarantee against conflict of interest or its appearance. And for the agreement to succeed, the parties must make the integrity of United States foreign policy their first principle of implementation.

For this reason, the requirements for transparency and the memorandum of understanding should be considered a minimum standard. I am hopeful the Clinton Foundation and the Obama administration will go further to ensure that the vital business of United States foreign policy upon which the security of our country rests is not encumbered by perceptions arising from donations to the Foundation. If there is a slightest doubt about the appearance that a donation might create, the Foundation should not take that donation. If there are issues about how a donation should be disclosed, the issue should be resolved by disclosing the donation sooner and with as much specificity as possible.

Operational inconveniences for the Foundation or a reduction in some types of donations that have been accepted in the past are small prices to pay when balanced against the serious business of United States foreign policy that affects the security of every American.

With this in mind, I have suggested several additional transparency measures that could be embraced by the Clinton Foundation and the Obama administration, going forward.

Because time is limited, I will not discuss each one explicitly now, but I have provided a background sheet—Attachment A—that outlines these measures. And my understanding is the Clinton Foundation has already accepted the fourth item listed. The willingness of all parties to voluntarily implement these additions would strengthen the commitment to transparency and at least partially mitigate the risks inherent in foreign contributions.

I believe that every member of this committee will seek ways to support Senator Clinton's work as Secretary of State. I am certain every member wants her to succeed. We have the opportunity, through the leadership of President-elect Obama and Senator Clin-

ton, to establish a new foreign policy path that will greatly benefit security and prosperity of the United States.

And I look forward to our discussion with our esteemed colleague today. I applaud her willingness to take on the role of Secretary of State at a very difficult moment in history.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Senator Lugar follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD G. LUGAR, U.S. SENATOR FROM INDIANA

It is a pleasure to welcome Senator Clinton to the Foreign Relations Committee. Those of us who have served with her during the past 8 years can attest to her impressive skills, her compassion, and her collegiality. I have enjoyed the opportunity to work with her in the Senate, and I look forward to the prospect of much more frequent collaboration when she is Secretary of State.

I also want to congratulate Senator Kerry on assuming the chairmanship of our committee. My first hearing as chairman of this committee in 1985 was one of the proudest moments of my career, and I am sure Senator Kerry is feeling the gravity of this historic occasion. I want to thank him and his staff for their graciousness during the last several weeks. It has been a pleasure to work with them, and I look forward to all that we can achieve together under Senator Kerry's chairmanship.

I have frequently said that the foremost criteria for selecting a national security Cabinet official should be whether the nominee is a "big-leaguer" who has achieved extraordinary accomplishments, is well known to the world, understands both process and policy, and can command global respect. In Senator Clinton, President-elect Obama has boldly chosen the epitome of a big-leaguer. Her qualifications for this post are remarkable. Her presence at the helm of the State Department could open unique opportunities for U.S. diplomacy and could bolster efforts to improve foreign attitudes toward the United States. She has longstanding relationships with many world leaders that could be put to great use in the service of our country. Her time in the Senate has given her a deep understanding of how U.S. foreign policy can be enriched by establishing a closer relationship between the executive and legislative branches. She is fully prepared to engage the world on myriad issues that urgently require attention.

During the last 6 years, this committee has held more hearings than any other committee in the Senate, as we have tried to come to grips with issues involving Iraq, Afghanistan, Iran, North Korea, Russia, the Middle East peace process, Africa, the Western Hemisphere, the NATO alliance, nonproliferation, foreign assistance reform, the State Department budget, and numerous other priorities. All of these challenges will continue to occupy Senator Clinton as Secretary of State. I would highlight several other points to which I hope the Secretary will give very high priority in addition to ongoing crises that will press for her attention.

First, it is vital that the START Treaty with Russia be renewed. When the Senate gave its consent to ratification to the Moscow Treaty in 2002, it did so knowing that the U.S. could rely on the START Treaty's verification regime. It provides important assurances to both sides. At the time, this committee was assured that extension of START was a very high priority. Unfortunately, little progress has been made and it will expire in 11 months. In other words, the conceptual underpinning of our strategic relationship with Russia depends upon something that is about to expire. Such an outcome will be seen as weakening the international nonproliferation regime.

Second, energy security must be given a much higher priority in our diplomacy. Earlier this month Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin ordered a cutoff in natural gas supplies that struck allies across Europe. This dispute is only the most recent example of how energy vulnerability constrains our foreign policy options around the world, limiting effectiveness in some cases and forcing our hand in others. I look forward to supporting President-elect Obama in taking the necessary steps to dramatically reduce our domestic dependence on oil. Yet domestic reform alone will not be sufficient to meet the global threats to our national security, economic health, and climate. In my judgment, energy security must be at the top of our agenda with nearly every country. Progress will require personal engagement by the Secretary of State.

Third, eradicating global hunger must be embraced as both a humanitarian and national security imperative. Precipitous food price increases that occurred in 2007 and 2008 created havoc in many parts of the world, causing riots in some 19 countries, and plunging an additional 75 million people into poverty and increased vul-

nerability to malnourishment. Nearly 1 billion people are presently food-insecure. It is predicted that the world's population will grow to such an extent that by 2050, current food production will need to double in order to meet demand. There is no reason why people should be hungry when we have the knowledge, technology, and resources to make everyone food-secure. The United States is uniquely situated to help the world feed itself, and has the opportunity to recast its image by making the eradication of hunger a centerpiece of U.S. foreign policy.

With all these issues in mind, it is especially important that we move forward with Senator Clinton's nomination. President-elect Obama has expressed his confidence in her, and he deserves to have his Secretary of State in place at the earliest opportunity.

The main issue related to Senator Clinton's nomination that has occupied the committee has been a review of how her service as Secretary of State can be reconciled with the sweeping global activities of President Bill Clinton and the Clinton Foundation. To this end, the Obama Transition and the Clinton Foundation completed a Memorandum of Understanding outlining steps designed to minimize potential conflicts of interest.

I share the President-elect's view that the activities of the Clinton Foundation and President Clinton himself should not be a barrier to Senator Clinton's service. But I also share the view, implicitly recognized by the Memorandum of Understanding, that the work of the Clinton Foundation is a unique complication that will have to be managed with great care and transparency.

The core of the problem is that foreign governments and entities may perceive the Clinton Foundation as a means to gain favor with the Secretary of State. Although neither Senator Clinton, nor President Clinton has a personal financial stake in the Foundation, obviously its work benefits their legacy and their public service priorities. There is nothing wrong with this, and President Clinton is deservedly proud of the Clinton Foundation's good work in addressing HIV/AIDs, global poverty, climate change, and other pressing problems.

But the Clinton Foundation exists as a temptation for any foreign entity or government that believes it could curry favor through a donation. It also sets up potential perception problems with any action taken by the Secretary of State in relation to foreign givers or their countries. The nature of the Secretary of State post makes refusal from specific policy decisions almost impossible, since even localized U.S. foreign policy activities can ripple across countries and continents. Every new foreign donation that is accepted by the Foundation comes with the risk that it will be connected in the global media to a proximate State Department policy or decision. Foreign perceptions are incredibly important to U.S. foreign policy, and mistaken impressions or suspicions can deeply affect the actions of foreign governments toward the United States. Moreover, we do not want our own government's deliberations distracted by avoidable controversies played out in the media. The bottom line is that even well-intentioned foreign donations carry risks for U.S. foreign policy.

The only certain way to eliminate this risk going forward is for the Clinton Foundation to forswear new foreign contributions when Senator Clinton becomes Secretary of State. I recommend this straightforward approach as the course most likely to avoid pitfalls that could disrupt U.S. foreign policy or inhibit Senator Clinton's own activities as Secretary of State.

Alternatively, the Clinton Foundation and the Obama Transition have worked in good faith to construct a more complex approach based on disclosure and ethics reviews that will allow the Foundation the prospect of continuing to accept foreign donations deemed not to have the appearance of a conflict of interest. The agreement requires, among other measures, the disclosure of all Foundation donors up to this point, an annual disclosure of donations going forward, and a State Department ethics review process that would evaluate proposed donations from foreign governments and government entities.

All of these are positive steps. But we should be clear that this agreement is a beginning, not an end. It is not a guarantee against conflict of interest or its appearance. For the agreement to succeed, the parties must make the integrity of U.S. foreign policy their first principle of implementation. For this reason, the requirements for transparency in the MOU should be considered a minimum standard.

I am hopeful that the Clinton Foundation and the Obama administration will go further to ensure that the vital business of U.S. foreign policy upon which the security of our country rests, is not encumbered by perceptions arising from donations to the Foundation. If there is the slightest doubt about the appearance that a donation might create, the Foundation should not take it. If there are issues about how a donation should be disclosed, the issues should be resolved by disclosing the donation sooner and with as much specificity as possible. Operational inconveniences for the Foundation or a reduction in some types of donations that have been accepted

in the past are small prices to pay when balanced against the serious business of U.S. foreign policy that affects the security of every American.

With this in mind, I have suggested several additional transparency measures that could be embraced by the Clinton Foundation and the Obama administration going forward. Because time is limited, I will not discuss each one now, but I have provided a background sheet [Attachment A] that outlines these measures. My understanding is that the Clinton Foundation has already accepted the fourth item listed. The willingness of all parties to voluntarily implement these additions would strengthen the commitment to transparency and at least partially mitigate the risks inherent in foreign contributions.

I believe that every member of this committee will seek ways to support Senator Clinton's work as Secretary of State. I am certain that every member wants her to succeed. We have the opportunity through the leadership of President-elect Obama and Senator Clinton to establish a new foreign policy path that will greatly benefit the security and prosperity of the United States. I look forward to our discussion with our esteemed colleague today and applaud her willingness to take on the role of Secretary of State at a very difficult moment in history.

#### ATTACHMENT A

1. All donations of \$50,000 or more in a given year from any source (foreign or domestic) should be disclosed immediately upon receipt, rather than waiting up to 12 months to list them in the annual disclosure. Multiple gifts of less than \$50,000 should be disclosed at the time they collectively exceed \$50,000 in a given calendar year.

There is no appreciable administrative burden in having a staffer post these notable donations on the Web site at the time they are received. According to the Clinton Foundation Web site, 499 donors have given \$50,000 or more during the entire period since the Foundation's inception in 1997—an average of less than one a week. They could be posted as part of the normal routine of processing a large donation. The transparency benefits of this simple step would be significant, and it would strengthen the Foundation's commitment to protecting the integrity of U.S. foreign policy activities.

2. Pledges from foreign entities to donate more than \$50,000 in the future should be disclosed both at the time the pledge is made and when the donation eventually occurs.

This is likely to involve a very small number of cases, but it would mitigate the risk that large donors might seek to circumvent disclosure by promising donations in future years, including years beyond Senator Clinton's service at the State Department, when no disclosure would be required.

3. Gifts of \$50,000 or more to the Clinton Foundation from any foreign source, including individuals, should be submitted to the State Department designated agency ethics official for the same ethics review that will be applied to donations from foreign governments and government controlled entities.

The MOU only commits the Foundation to submit gifts from foreign governments and government controlled entities for State Department ethics review. In many foreign countries, the line between the government and private citizens is blurred. Individuals with close connections to governments or governing families often act as surrogates for those governments. Consequently, contributions from foreign governments or government controlled companies are not the only foreign contributions that could raise serious conflict of interest issues. For example, conflicts of interest could arise from a donation from a Gazprom executive or a member of the Saudi Royal family as easily as from the governments of Russia and Saudi Arabia. All large foreign donations should be vetted by the State Department to discover any connections between the giver and a foreign government or other potential conflicts of interest.

4. The annual disclosure requirement in the MOU does not specify the format of the disclosure. The Foundation should clarify that it will annually disclose a distinct list of the donors and corresponding donation amounts (or the amounts within a dollar range) for that year.

It is important that each annual disclosure provides a distinct picture of donations for the previous year. Other formats might not satisfy the spirit of the annual disclosure requirement. For example, merely updating the original donor list released in December 2008 would not achieve transparency, because even a large donation might not push some previous donors into the next highest dollar range. To illustrate, a past donor who has given \$5 million and has been disclosed in the Decem-

ber 2008 disclosure within the \$5 to \$10 million range, could give almost \$5 million more without altering where their name appears.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I thank you, Senator Lugar. And let me just say that, for the record, first of all, the attachment will be made part of the record, with the statement. And second, I think it's fair to say that Senator Lugar is not speaking from a partisan perspective, but I think he is really expressing the view of the committee as a whole, and we look forward to having a good discussion about this.

If I could just say to my colleagues that what we're going to do is at—I'm about—I want to take a point of personal privilege to let Senator Dodd say something, because he has to go chair a hearing—but, we're going to have a 10-minute round. We have not yet, obviously, been able to have our organizational meeting so we'll have a chance to talk about procedures, going forward. But, today we will go, as we have in the past, as a matter of seniority. My hope is, we can get a full round, maybe plus, before we break. We will take a break at about 12:45, until 2 o'clock, thereabouts. And that's by agreement with Senator Clinton and some other needs that we have to attend to.

We also intend to try to do the business meeting, in order to try to expedite this nomination, Thursday morning, when we have another hearing on another nominee. So, we look forward to trying to have the cooperation of everybody to be able to do that.

I think Senator Lugar, again, spoke for the committee in expressing our desire to have a Secretary of State in place and ready to go as rapidly as possible, and obviously on Tuesday of next week.

That said, let me turn to Senator Dodd. I know, Senator Schumer, you're being very patient, and we appreciate it.  
Senator Dodd.

**STATEMENT OF HON. CHRISTOPHER DODD,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT**

Senator DODD. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I apologize to my colleagues, but as we are in the midst of all of this, this is sort of a New York day. Sean Donovan is the nominee to be the new Secretary of HUD, and I have to chair that hearing, as chairman of the Banking Committee. Mr. Duncan is the designee to the new Secretary of Education; I'm the ranking Democrat on that committee, as well. We all have a busy day in front of us, so I'm going to be very, very brief and ask consent, Mr. Chairman, that a longer statement be included in the record.

But, Mr. Chairman, I wanted to first of all commend you. You are so well suited to this job, as chairman of this committee—your background and experience, your knowledge of these issues. And I'm very excited about your leadership of this committee. And let me underscore the points you made about Claiborne Pell and Dick Lugar—as well as Joe Biden. We've been blessed in this committee over the years, with some remarkable people to chair this committee, and you're going to carry on in that tradition.

Let me also welcome and congratulate my wonderful friend from New York, the nominee, Senator Clinton. I've worked with her over the years, and I am very excited, as all of us are, about your nomi-

nation, and I look forward to having a very strong and healthy relationship between the State Department and this committee.

I don't think it's overstating the case to say that you will be inheriting some of the largest and most difficult international challenges the United States has faced in over half a century. And it's been said by Senator Kerry and Senator Lugar, the threat of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction still loom large. Our own prestige, influence, and elements of our soft power have been questioned as has our commitment to the rule of law.

And while these issues and others, including the crisis in Gaza and our relationships with China and Russia, are very much at the forefront of our minds, I want to just raise one issue briefly before departing and hopefully get back later in the day to discuss this with you further.

But, as I mentioned, I'm chairman of the Banking Committee. And the one issue that overlaps almost all of this, in many ways, is the global economic crisis. While we're very much aware of it here in our own country, with the problems we're grappling with every single day, I think most are aware today that this is not just a localized problem.

In a sense, every other issue we are dealing with will be affected by our ability to grapple effectively with the economic crisis we face. This crisis has inflicted serious and wide-reaching damage from which no nation is immune. As important as our domestic response to this crisis is, I think it is particularly critical that we develop a well-coordinated international strategy to deal with what, in many ways, is fundamental to our own well-being as our physical security or economic security. Both the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as well as the Senate Committee on Banking maintain jurisdiction over a wide array of international economic issues. And my intent is, along with Senator Kerry and Senator Lugar, to work together on these issues. We have jurisdiction, in the Banking Committee, over many of the international institutions, and yet, obviously it's a matter of deep concern to this committee, as well. So, we need to coordinate our activities. And I raise that because the jurisdictional overlap is similar to the jurisdictional overlap that currently exists within the executive branch, the State Department, and the Treasury Department.

Senator Clinton, you and I have discussed this issue briefly, had a chance to talk about it, but in order to implement an effective international policy in response to the economic crisis, we first must ensure that there is coordinated leadership on this issue. And so, I raise this point before leaving. You may address it in your statement; I'm not sure if you're going to, but it's tremendously important. And I certainly look forward to working with Senator Kerry and you and others on these issues, and how we can coordinate our activities.

And again, I welcome you. I'm excited about your leadership role as the new Secretary of State. I commend you and President-elect Obama. There's been a lot of speculation about having two candidates who sought the Presidency taking on these responsibilities. I think it says volumes about both of you. The idea that this President-elect is not in any way threatened by a significant challenger,



to ask her to be a part of his team, and your willingness to step up and accept that challenge, is, I think, what makes this country so unique in the eyes of the world. So, I wish you the very best.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Dodd follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. CHRIS DODD, U.S. SENATOR FROM CONNECTICUT

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I have a longer statement which I'd like to submit for the record. I would like to join my colleagues in congratulating you, Senator Clinton, on your nomination. I have had the pleasure of working closely with you on a wide range of issues for many years, and I look forward to our continued partnership and to your leadership as Secretary of State. I have no doubt you will do a remarkable job.

I don't think it is overstating the case to say that you will be inheriting some of the biggest international challenges the United States has seen in over 50 years. We are waging simultaneous wars overseas. The threat of terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction still loom large, and our own prestige, influence, and elements of our "soft power" have been questioned, as has our commitment to the rule of law.

And while these issues and others, including the crisis in Gaza, and our relationships with China and Russia, are very much at the forefront of our minds this morning, I want to raise with you another issue of particular importance before I must leave to chair a hearing at the Banking Committee: The global economic crisis.

This crisis has inflicted serious and far-reaching damage, from which no nation is immune. As important as is our domestic response to the crisis, I think it is also critical that we develop a well-coordinated international strategy to deal with what is in many ways as fundamental to our well-being as our physical security—our economic security.

Both the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations as well as the Senate Committee on Banking, which I chair, maintain jurisdiction over a wide array of international economic issues.

This jurisdictional overlap is similar to the jurisdictional overlap that currently exists within the executive branch, between the State Department and the Treasury Department and others.

And Senator Clinton, as you have already pointed out, in order to implement an effective international policy response to the economic crisis, we must first ensure that there is coordinated leadership on this issue. In my view, the Secretary of State's leadership is key, and a well-coordinated strategy including aggressive diplomatic initiatives, Treasury's initiatives, and those of other Federal agencies is absolutely essential. We must ensure that the United States Government speaks with one coherent voice as we implement a set of strategic and well-coordinated international policies.

In the short time that I have this morning, I was hoping you could respond to these thoughts and tell this committee how you envision coordinating and leading such a strategy from the State Department. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to jump the queue and, Senator Clinton, thank you for your years of remarkable, dedicated, and historic public service to this country.

I am fully confident that under your leadership we can restore not only American foreign policy but also our leadership in the world. I look forward to our conversation today, to your swift confirmation, and to working with you as Secretary of State.

Again, congratulations on your nomination.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Dodd, for those warm and generous comments, and we appreciate it. And we very much look forward, obviously, to working very closely with you on that. The international and global economic linkages nowadays have really transformed foreign policy, and we're already looking, within our staff structure on the committee, for ways to try to address that more effectively.

Senator Schumer and Senator Clinton, you've both been very patient. We appreciate it enormously. Let me, as I introduce you, Senator Schumer, also welcome Chelsea.

We are delighted to have you here. Your mother said, as we were walking across the dais, that she wished you weren't sitting behind her, that she could look at you up here. So, since your father served as an intern on this committee, maybe we can make you an intern for a day. Chairman's prerogative. [Laughter.]

So, if you want to come here later, and look out, you know, we're happy to welcome you.

So, Senator Schumer, thanks so much for joining us here. Happy to have you here.

[Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is that for Senator Schumer or for Chelsea? [Laughter.]

Senator SCHUMER. Chelsea, for sure. [Laughter.]

**STATEMENT OF HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW YORK**

Senator SCHUMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And it is a true honor to be here. I want to thank you and Ranking Member Lugar, all the members of the committee, for the opportunity, the honor—the true honor of introducing my friend and colleague Senator Clinton.

Before I do, I want to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, on your ascension to the chairmanship. And I share the confidence of many that you'll be a truly great chairman of this committee, and I look forward to watching the committee work.

Now, colleagues, I've known Hillary a long time, and I'm confident that there is no one—no one who would better serve our country and the world as the next Secretary of State. We're in a new era. The world is yearning for strong, but consultative, American leadership in foreign policy. Hillary Rodham Clinton, as Secretary of State, is exactly the right person at the right time. Hillary has spent more time under the national political spotlight than almost anyone; first as First Lady, then in her race for the New York Senate seat, the subsequent 8 years of Senate, and then her historic victories in her campaign for the Democratic Presidential nomination, and now, finally, as President-elect Obama's choice for Secretary of State.

Through all of this time, Hillary has demonstrated the equanimity, the prudence, the fortitude that have made her an exceptional leader and public servant. In her years as First Lady, Senator Clinton was one of the country's most important and best-loved ambassadors. She traveled to over 80 countries, meeting with heads of state from the Czech Republic to Nepal. She served as a representative to the United Nations, addressing forums around the world. She has negotiated aid packages in Asia, pushed democratic reforms in the former Soviet bloc, and promoted peace plans in Northern Ireland and Serbia.

But, Hillary didn't just meet with world leaders; she has met with private citizens around the world whose lives are shaped by international decisions. She has met survivors of the Rwandan genocide, she's met with advocates for social justice and women's rights in Pakistan, and with the families of children kidnapped in Uganda.

And after serving her country 8 years as First Lady, when most people would retire, Hillary stepped up and has served as a vital and powerful advocate on behalf of the people of New York. Going from the White House to White Plains, Hillary has continued to show just as much acumen in her dealings with national and global leaders as she shows empathy and interest in the needs of private individuals around New York.

In all of her many roles as a public servant, Hillary has always shown the insight to see the heart of the problem, the courage to tackle it, and the talent to solve it. What could be a better description of what we need as Secretary of State?

And no matter how abstract the problem, no matter how esoteric the question, Hillary has never once forgotten the peoples whose lives and happiness depend on her work.

Hillary, you've dedicated your career to improving the lives of the least fortunate. Since your work, 30 years ago with the Children's Defense Fund, you've come a long way, but you've always retained your tireless efforts to better the world.

For me, it's been a pleasure and a privilege serving with you in the Senate, and I will sorely miss you. But, I wish you the best of luck. And I know that you will be a brilliant Secretary of State.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Schumer. And I know we need to excuse you, post-hug—

[Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. To go about other duties. And I know that our Republican colleagues are thrilled that those duties no longer include being chairman of the Campaign Committee. [Laughter.]

Senator SCHUMER. Mr. Chairman, it is, as Chris Dodd, mentioned, a New York day, and I have to go in to do Sean Donovan at—

The CHAIRMAN. We understand that.

Senator SCHUMER [continuing]. The Banking Committee. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much.

Senator SCHUMER. Thank you, colleagues.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator SCHUMER. Appreciate it very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Madam Secretary-designate, we are, again, really delighted to welcome you here, and we look forward to your testimony and to have a chance to get some questions in. Thanks so much.

**STATEMENT OF HON. HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON,  
U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW YORK**

Senator CLINTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And as he's leaving, I want to thank Senator Schumer for that generous introduction, and, even more, for his support and our partnership over so many years. He's been a valued and trusted colleague, a friend, and a tribute to the people of New York whom he has served with such distinction.

Mr. Chairman, I join in offering my congratulations as you take on this new role. You've traveled quite a distance from that day, back in 1971, when you testified here as a young Vietnam veteran.

You have never faltered in your care and concern for our Nation, its foreign policy, and its future. And America is in good hands with you leading this committee.

And, Senator Lugar, I look forward to working with you on a wide range of issues, especially those of greatest concern to you, including the Nunn-Lugar initiative.

And let me say a word to Senator Voinovich, because of his announcement yesterday. I want to commend you for your service to the people of Ohio, and I ask for your help, in the next 2 years, on the management issues that you have long championed.

It is an honor and a privilege to be here this morning as President-elect Obama's nominee for Secretary of State. I am deeply grateful for the trust, and keenly aware of the responsibility, that the President-elect has placed in me to serve our country, and to serve our people at a time of such grave dangers and great possibilities. If confirmed, I will accept the duties of the office with gratitude, humility, and firm determination to represent the United States as energetically and faithfully as I can.

At the same time, I must confess that sitting across the table from so many colleagues brings me sadness, too. I love the Senate. And if you confirm me for this new role, it will be hard to say goodbye to so many Members, Republicans and Democrats, whom I have come to know, admire, and respect deeply, and to this institution, where I have been so proud to serve on behalf of the people of New York through some very difficult days over the past 8 years. But, I assure you, I will be in frequent consultation and conversation with the members of this committee, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Appropriations Committees, and with Congress as a whole. And I look forward to working with my good friend Vice-President-elect Biden, who's been a valued colleague and a very valued chairman of this committee.

For me, consultation is not a catch word, it is a commitment. The President-elect and I believe that we must return to the time-honored principle of bipartisanship in our foreign policy, an approach that has served our Nation well. I look forward to working with all of you to renew America's leadership through diplomacy that enhances our security, advances our interests, and reflects our values.

Today, our Nation and our world face great perils, from ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to the continuing threats posed by terrorist extremists to the spread of weapons of mass destruction, from the dangers of climate change to pandemic disease, from financial meltdowns to worldwide poverty. The 70 days since the Presidential election offer fresh evidence of these challenges. New conflict in Gaza, terrorist attacks in Mumbai, mass killings and rapes in the Congo, cholera in Zimbabwe, reports of record-high greenhouse gases and rapidly melting glaciers, and even an ancient form of terror, piracy, asserting itself in modern form off the Horn of Africa.

Always, and especially in the crucible of these global challenges, our overriding duty is to protect and advance America's security, interests, and values, to keep our people, our Nation, and our allies secure, to promote economic growth and shared prosperity at home and abroad, and to strengthen America's position of global leadership so we remain a positive force in the world, whether in working

to preserve the health of our planet or expanding opportunity for people on the margins whose progress and prosperity will add to our own.

Our world has undergone an extraordinary transformation in the last two decades. In 1989, a wall fell and old barriers began to crumble after 40 years of a cold war that had influenced every aspect of our foreign policy. By 1999, the rise of more democratic and open societies, the expanding reach of world markets, and the explosion of information technology had made globalization the word of the day.

For most people, it had primarily an economic connotation; but, in fact, we were already living in a profoundly interdependent world in which old rules and boundaries no longer held fast, a world in which both the promise and the peril of the 21st century could not be contained by national borders or vast distances. Economic growth lifted more people out of poverty faster than at any time in our history, but economic crises can sweep across the globe even more quickly. A coalition of nations stopped ethnic cleansing in the Balkans, but the conflict in the Middle East continues to inflame tensions from Africa to Asia.

Nonstate actors fight poverty, improve health, and expand education in the poorest parts of the world, while other nonstate actors traffic in drugs, children, and women, and kill innocent civilians across the globe.

Now, in 2009, the clear lesson of the last 20 years is that we must both combat the threats and seize the opportunities of our interdependence. And to be effective in doing so, we must build a world with more partners and fewer adversaries. America cannot solve the most pressing problems on our own, and the world cannot solve them without America.

The best way to advance America's interest in reducing global threats and seizing global opportunities is to design and implement global solutions. That isn't a philosophical point; this is our reality.

The President-elect and I believe that foreign policy must be based on a marriage of principles and pragmatism, not rigid ideology; on facts and evidence, not emotion or prejudice. Our security, our vitality, and our ability to lead in today's world oblige us to recognize the overwhelming fact of our interdependence.

I believe that American leadership has been wanting, but is still wanted. We must use what has been called "smart power," the full range of tools at our disposal—diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal, and cultural—picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation.

With smart power, diplomacy will be the vanguard of our foreign policy. This is not a radical idea. The ancient Roman poet Terence declared that, "In every endeavor, a seemly course for wise men is to try persuasion first." The same truth binds wise women, as well.

I assure you that, if I am confirmed, the State Department will be firing on all cylinders to provide forward-thinking, sustained diplomacy in every part of the world, applying pressure wherever it may be needed, but also looking for opportunity, exerting leverage, cooperating with our military and other agencies of government, partnering with nongovernmental organizations, the private sector, and international organizations, using modern technologies

for public outreach, empowering negotiators who can protect our interests while understanding those of our negotiating partners.

Diplomacy is hard work; but, when we work hard, diplomacy can work, not just to defuse tensions, but to achieve results that advance our security, interests, and values.

Secretary Gates, as the chairman said, has been particularly eloquent in articulating the importance of diplomacy. As he notes, it's not often that a Secretary of Defense makes the case for adding resources to the State Department and elevating the role of the diplomatic corps. Thankfully, Secretary Gates is more concerned about having a unified, agile, and effective U.S. strategy than in spending precious time and energy on petty turf wars. As he has stated, "Our civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long." That is a statement that I can only heartily say "amen" to. President-elect Obama has emphasized that the State Department must be fully empowered and funded to confront multidimensional challenges, from thwarting terrorism to spreading health and prosperity in places of human suffering, and I will speak in greater detail about that in a moment.

We should also use the United Nations and other institutions whenever possible and appropriate. Both Democratic and Republican Presidents have understood that these institutions, when they work well, enhance our influence; and when they don't work well, as in the cases of Darfur and farce of Sudan's election to the former U.N. Commission on Human Rights, we should work with like-minded friends to make them more effective.

We will lead with diplomacy, because that's the smart approach, but we also know that military force will sometimes be necessary, and we will rely on it to protect our people and our interests, when and where needed, as a last resort.

All the while, we must remember that, to promote our interests around the world, America must be an exemplar of our values. Senator Isakson made the point to me the other day that our Nation must lead by example, rather than edict. Our history has shown that we are most effective when we see the harmony between our interests abroad and our values at home. Our first Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, subscribed to that view, reminding us across the centuries, "The interests of a nation, when well understood, will be found to coincide with their moral duties."

Senator Lugar, I'm going to borrow your words here, too. As you said, "The United States cannot feed every person, lift every person out of poverty, cure every disease, or stop every conflict, but our power and status have conferred upon us a tremendous responsibility to humanity."

Of course we must be realistic. Even under the best of circumstances, our Nation cannot solve every problem or meet every global need. We don't have unlimited time, treasure, or manpower, especially with our own economy faltering and our budget deficits growing. So, to fulfill our responsibility to our children, to protect and defend our Nation while honoring our values, we have to establish priorities.

I'm not trying to mince words here. As my colleagues in the Senate know, establishing priorities means making tough choices.

Because these choices are so important to the American people, we must be disciplined in evaluating them, weighing the costs and consequences of action or inaction, gauging the probability of success, and insisting on measurable results.

Right after I was nominated, a friend told me, “The world has so many problems, you’ve got your work cut out for you.” Well, I agree, but I don’t get up every morning thinking only about the threats and dangers we face. In spite of all the adversity and complexity, there are so many opportunities for America out there calling forth the optimism and can-do spirit that has marked our progress for more than two centuries. Too often, we see the ills that plague us more clearly than the possibilities in front of us, but it is the real possibility of progress, of that better life, free from fear and want and discord, that offers our most compelling message to the rest of the world.

I’ve had the chance to lay out and submit my views on a broad array of issues in written responses to questions from the committee, so this statement will only outline some of the major challenges we face, and the major opportunities we see, as well.

First, President-elect Obama is committed to responsibly ending the war in Iraq and employing a broad strategy in Afghanistan that reduces threats to our safety and enhances the prospects of stability and peace. Right now, our men and women in uniform, our diplomats, and our aid workers are risking their lives in these two countries. They have done everything we have asked of them and more. But, over time, our larger interests will be best served by safely and responsibly withdrawing our troops from Iraq, supporting a transition to full Iraqi responsibility for their sovereign nation, rebuilding our overtaxed military, and reaching out to other nations to help stabilize the region and employ a broader arsenal of tools to fight terrorism.

We will use all the elements of our power—diplomacy, development, and defense—to work with those in Afghanistan and Pakistan who want to root out al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and other violent extremists who threaten them, as well as us, in what President-elect Obama has called the “central front in the fight against terrorism.”

As we focus on Iraq, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, we must also actively pursue a strategy of smart power in the Middle East that addresses the security needs of Israel and the legitimate political and economic aspirations of the Palestinians, that effectively challenges Iran to end its nuclear weapons program and its sponsorship of terror, and persuades both Iran and Syria to abandon their dangerous behavior and become constructive regional actors, and that also strengthens our relationship with Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, other Arab states, along with Turkey and our partners in the gulf, to involve them in securing a lasting peace in the region.

As intractable as the Middle East problems may seem—and many Presidents, including my husband, have spent years trying to work out a resolution—we cannot give up on peace. The President-elect and I understand, and are deeply sympathetic to, Israel’s desire to defend itself under the current conditions and to be free of shelling by Hamas rockets. However, we have also been reminded of the tragic humanitarian costs of conflict in the Middle

East and pained by the suffering of Palestinian and Israeli civilians. This must only increase our determination to seek a just and lasting peace agreement that brings real security to Israel, normal and positive relations with its neighbors, independence, economic progress, and security to the Palestinians in their own state. We will exert every effort to support the work of Israelis and Palestinians who seek that result. It is critical, not only to the parties involved, but to undermining the forces of alienation and violent extremism around the world.

For terrorism, we must have a comprehensive strategy, leveraging intelligence, diplomacy, and military assets to defeat al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups by rooting out their networks and drying up their support for violent and nihilistic extremism.

The gravest threat that America faces is the danger that weapons of mass destruction will fall into the hands of terrorists. We must curb the spread and use of these weapons—nuclear, biological, chemical, or cyber—and prevent the development and use of dangerous new weapons.

Therefore, while defending against a threat of terrorism, we will also seize the parallel opportunity to get America back in the business of engaging other nations to reduce nuclear stockpiles. The Non-Proliferation Treaty is the cornerstone of the nonproliferation regime. The United States must exercise leadership needed to shore it up. So, we will seek agreements with Russia to secure further reductions in weapons under START. We will work with this committee and the Senate toward ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and we will dedicate efforts to revive negotiations on a verifiable fissile-material cutoff treaty. At the same time, we will continue to work to prevent proliferation in North Korea and Iran, to secure loose nuclear weapons and materials, and to shut down the market for selling them, as Senator Lugar has pushed for so many years.

These threats, however, cannot be addressed in isolation. Smart power requires reaching out to both friends and adversaries to bolster old alliances and to forge new ones. That means strengthening the alliances that have stood the test of time, especially with our NATO partners and our allies in Asia. Our alliance with Japan is a cornerstone of American policy in Asia, essential to maintaining peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region and based on shared values and mutual interests. We also have crucial economic and security partnerships with South Korea, Australia, and other friends in ASEAN. We will build on our economic and political partnership with India, the world's most populous democracy and a nation with growing influence in the world.

Our traditional relationships of confidence and trust with Europe will be deepened. Disagreements are inevitable, but, on most global issues, we have no more-trusted allies. The new administration will reach out across the Atlantic to leaders in France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and others, including, and especially, the new democracies.

President-elect Obama and I seek a future of cooperative engagement with the Russian Government on matters of strategic importance while standing strongly for American values and international norms.



China is critically important as an actor who will be changing the global landscape. We want a positive and cooperative relationship with China, one where we deepen and strengthen our ties on a number of issues and candidly address differences where they persist. But, this is not a one-way effort. Much of what we will do depends on the choices China makes about its future at home and abroad.

With both Russia and China, we should work together on vital security and economic issues, like terrorism, proliferation, climate change, and reforming financial markets. The world is now, as Senator Dodd said, in the crosscurrents of the most severe global economic contraction since the Great Depression. The history of that crisis teaches us the consequences of diplomatic failures and uncoordinated reaction. We have already seen this crisis extend beyond the housing and banking sectors, and our solutions will have to be as wide in scope as the causes themselves, taking into account the complexities of the global economy, the geopolitics, and the continued political and economic repercussions from the damage already done.

But, here again, as we work to repair the damage, we can find new ways of working together. For too long, we've merely talked about the need to engage emerging powers in global economic governance. The time to take action is upon us. The recent G20 meeting that President Bush hosted as a first step, but developing patterns of sustained engagement will take hard work and careful negotiation. We know that emerging markets, like China and India, Brazil, and South Africa, and Indonesia, are feeling the effects of the current crisis, and we all stand to benefit, in both the short and long term, if they are part of the solution and become partners in maintaining global economic stability.

In our efforts to return to economic growth here in the United States, we have an especially critical need: to work more closely with Canada, our largest trading partner, and Mexico, our third largest. Canada and Mexico are also our biggest suppliers of imported energy. More broadly, we must build a deeper partnership with Mexico to address the shared dangers arising from drug trafficking and the challenges along our border, an effort begun this week with the meeting between President-elect Obama and President Calderon.

Throughout our hemisphere, we have opportunities to enhance our relationships that will benefit all of us. We will return to a policy of vigorous involvement, partnership even, with Latin America, from the Caribbean to Central America to South America. We share common political, economic, and strategic interests with our friends to the south, as well as many of our citizens who share ancestral and cultural legacies. We're looking forward to working on many issues during the Summit of the Americas in April and taking up the President-elect's call for a new energy partnership around shared technology and new investments in renewable energy.

And in Africa the foreign policy objectives of the Obama administration are rooted in security, political, economic, and humanitarian interests, including combating al-Qaeda's efforts to seek safe havens in failed states in the Horn of Africa, helping African

nations conserve their natural resources and reaping fair benefits from them, stopping war in the Congo, ending autocracy in Zimbabwe and human devastation in Darfur. But, we also intend to support the African democracies, like South Africa and Ghana, which just had its second peaceful change of power in a democratic election. We must work hard with our African friends to reach the Millennium Development goals in health, education, and economic opportunity.

Many significant problems we face will challenge us, not only a bilateral basis, but all nations. You, Mr. Chairman, were among the very first, in a growing chorus from both parties, to recognize that climate change is an unambiguous security threat. At the extreme, it threatens our very existence; but, well before that point it could well incite new wars of an old kind over basic resources, like food, water, and arable land.

President-elect Obama has said America must be a leader in developing and implementing a global and coordinated response to climate change. We will participate in the upcoming U.N. Copenhagen Climate Conference and a global energy forum, and we'll pursue an energy policy that reduces our carbon emissions while reducing our dependence on foreign oil and gas, fighting climate change, and enhancing our economic and energy security.

George Marshall noted that our gravest enemies are often not nations or doctrines, but hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos. So, to create more friends and fewer enemies, we must find common ground and common purpose with other peoples and nations to overcome hatred, violence, lawlessness, and despair. The Obama administration recognizes that even when we cannot fully agree with some governments, we share a bond of humanity with their people. By investing in that common humanity, we advance our common security.

Mr. Chairman, you were one of the first, again, to underscore the importance of our involvement in the global AIDS fight. Now, thanks to a variety of efforts, including President Bush's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, as well as the work of NGOs and foundations, the United States enjoys widespread support in public opinion polls in many African countries. Even among Muslim populations in Tanzania and Kenya, America is seen as a leader in the fight against AIDS, malaria, and TB. We have an opportunity to build on this success by partnering with NGOs to help expand health clinics in Africa so more people can have access to life-saving drugs, fewer mothers transmit HIV to their children, and fewer lives are lost. We can generate more goodwill through other kinds of social investments; again, partnering with international organizations, NGOs, to build schools and train teachers. The President-elect supports a global education fund to bolster secular education around the world.

I want to emphasize the importance to us of this bottom-up approach. The President and I—the President-elect and I believe in this so strongly. Investing in our common humanity through social development is not marginal to our foreign policy, but essential to the realization of our goals. More than 2 billion people worldwide live on less than \$2 a day, they're facing rising food prices and widespread hunger. We have to expand civil and political rights in

countries that are plagued by poverty, hunger, and disease, but our pleas will fall on deaf ears unless democracy actually improves people's lives while weeding out the corruption that too often stands in the way of progress.

Our foreign policy must reflect our deep commitment to help millions of oppressed people around the world, and of particular concern to me is the plight of women and girls, who comprise the majority of the world's unhealthy, unschooled, unfed, and unpaid. If half the world's population remains vulnerable to economic, political, legal, and social marginalization, our hope of advancing democracy and prosperity is in serious jeopardy. The United States must be an unequivocal and unwavering voice in support of women's rights in every country on every continent.

As a personal aside, I want to mention that President-elect Obama's mother, Ann Dunham, was a pioneer in microfinance in Indonesia. In my own work on microfinance around the world, from Bangladesh to Chile to Vietnam to South Africa and many other countries, I've seen firsthand how small loans given to poor women to start businesses can raise standards of living and transform local economies. The President-elect's mother had planned to attend a microfinance forum at the Beijing Women's Conference in 1995 that I participated in. Unfortunately, she was very ill and couldn't travel, and, sadly, passed away a few months later. But, I think it's fair to say that her work in international development, the care and concern she showed for women and for poor people around the world, mattered greatly to her son, our President-elect. And I believe that it has certainly informed his views and his vision. We will be honored to carry on Ann Dunham's work in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I know we'll address many issues in the question-and-answer session, but I want to underscore a final point. Ensuring that our State Department is functioning at its best is absolutely essential to America's success. The President-elect and I believe strongly that we need to invest in our capacity to conduct vigorous American diplomacy, provide the kind of foreign assistance that I've mentioned, reach out to the world, and operate effectively alongside our military.

Now, the entire State Department bureaucracy in Thomas Jefferson's day consisted of a chief clerk, three regular clerks, and a messenger, and his entire budget was \$56,000 a year. But, over the past 219 years, the world has certainly changed. Now the Department consists of Foreign Service officers, the civil services, and our locally engaged staff, working not only at Foggy Bottom, but in offices across our country and in some 260 posts around the world. And USAID carries out its critical development missions in some of the most difficult places on our earth.

These public servants are too often the unsung heroes, they are in the trenches, putting our policies and values to work in a complicated and dangerous world. Many risk their lives, and some have lost their lives, in service to our Nation. They need and deserve the resources, training, and support to succeed.

I know this committee—and, I hope, the American public—understand that Foreign Service officers and civil service professionals and development experts are doing invaluable work, and it

is the work of the American people, whether helping American businesses make inroads in new markets, or being on the other end of the phone when someone gets in trouble beyond our shores, needs a passport, needs advice at an embassy, or doing the delicate work of diplomacy and development with foreign governments that leads to arms control and trade agreements, peace treaties and post-conflict reconstruction, standing up for greater human rights and empowerment, broader cultural understanding, and building alliances.

State Department is a large, multidimensional organization, but not the placid, idle bureaucracy that some have suggested. It is an outpost for American values that protects our citizens and safeguards our democratic institutions in times both turbulent and tame. State Department employees offer a lifeline of hope and help, often the only lifeline, for people in foreign lands who are oppressed, silenced, and marginalized. We must not shortchange them or ourselves.

One of my first priorities is to make sure that the State Department and USAID have the resources they need—and I will be back to make the case to the committee for full funding of the President's budget request—but I will work just as hard to make sure we manage those resources prudently, efficiently, and effectively.

Now, like most Americans, when I was growing up I never had the chance to travel widely. Most of my early professional career was as a lawyer and an advocate for children and the poor who found themselves disadvantaged here at home. But, during the 8 years of my husband's Presidency, and now of 8 years as the Senator from New York, I have been privileged to travel on behalf of our country, and I've had the opportunity to get to know many world leaders. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I've spent time with our military commanders, as well as our brave troops, I've immersed myself in a number of military issues, and I've spent many hours with American and non-American aid workers, business men and women, religious leaders, teachers, doctors, nurses, students, volunteers, all who have made it their mission to help other people across the world. And I've seen countless ordinary people in foreign capitals, small towns, and rural villages, who live in a world far removed from our experiences.

In recent years, as other nations have risen to compete for military, economic, and political influence, some have argued that we have reached the end of the American moment in world history. Well, I disagree. Yes, the conventional paradigms have shifted, but America's success has never been solely a function of our power, it has always been rooted in, and inspired by, our values. With so many troubles here at home and around the world, millions of people are still trying to come to this country, legally and illegally. Why? Because we are guided by unchanging truths that all people are created equal, that each person has the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And in these truths, we will find, as we have for more than two centuries, the courage, the discipline, and the creativity to meet the challenges of this ever-changing world.

I am humbled to be a public servant and honored by the responsibility placed on me, should I be confirmed, by our President-elect, who embodies the American dream, not only here at home, but far beyond our shores. No matter how daunting the challenges may be, I have a steadfast faith in this country and in our people, and I am proud to be an American at the dawning of this new American moment.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, for granting me your time and attention today. I know there's a lot more territory to cover, and I'd be delighted to answer questions. [The prepared statement of Senator Clinton follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON, U.S. SENATOR FROM  
NEW YORK, NOMINEE FOR SECRETARY OF STATE

Thank you, Senator Schumer, for your generous introduction, and even more for your support and our partnership over so many years. You are a valued and trusted colleague, a friend, and a tribute to the people of New York whom you have served with such distinction throughout your career.

Mr. Chairman, I offer my congratulations as you take on this new role. You certainly have traveled quite a distance from that day in 1971 when you testified here as a young Vietnam veteran. You have never faltered in your care and concern for our Nation, its foreign policy or its future, and America is in good hands with you leading this committee.

Senator Lugar, I look forward to working with you on a wide range of issues, especially those of greatest concern to you, including the Nunn-Lugar initiative.

And Senator Voinovich, I want to commend you for your service to the people of Ohio and ask for your help in the next 2 years on the management issues you champion.

It is an honor and a privilege to be here this morning as President-elect Obama's nominee for Secretary of State. I am deeply grateful for the trust—and keenly aware of the responsibility—that the President-elect has placed in me to serve our country and our people at a time of such grave dangers, and great possibilities. If confirmed, I will accept the duties of the office with gratitude, humility, and firm determination to represent the United States as energetically and faithfully as I can.

At the same time I must confess that sitting across the table from so many colleagues brings me sadness, too. I love the Senate. And if you confirm me for this new role, it will be hard to say good-bye to so many members, Republicans and Democrats, whom I have come to know, admire, and respect deeply, and to the institution where I have been so proud to serve on behalf of the people of New York for the past 8 years.

But I assure you that I will be in frequent consultation and conversation with the members of this committee, with the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the appropriations committees, and with Congress as a whole. And I look forward to working with my good friend, Vice President-elect Biden, who has been a valued colleague in the Senate and valued chairman of this committee.

For me, consultation is not a catch-word. It is a commitment.

The President-elect and I believe that we must return to the time-honored principle of bipartisanship in our foreign policy—an approach that past Presidents of both parties, as well as members of this committee, have subscribed to and that has served our Nation well. I look forward to working with all of you to renew America's leadership through diplomacy that enhances our security, advances our interests, and reflects our values.

Today, 9 years into a new century, Americans know that our Nation and our world face great perils: From ongoing wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, to the continuing threat posed by terrorist extremists, to the spread of weapons of mass destruction; from the dangers of climate change to pandemic disease; from financial meltdown to worldwide poverty.

The 70 days since the Presidential election offer fresh evidence of the urgency of these challenges. New conflict in Gaza; terrorist attacks in Mumbai; mass killings and rapes in the Congo; cholera in Zimbabwe; reports of record high greenhouse gasses and rapidly melting glaciers; and even an ancient form of terror—piracy—asserting itself in modern form off the Horn of Africa.

Always, and especially in the crucible of these global challenges, our overriding duty is to protect and advance America's security, interests, and values: First, we

must keep our people, our Nation, and our allies secure. Second, we must promote economic growth and shared prosperity at home and abroad. Finally, we must strengthen America's position of global leadership—ensuring that we remain a positive force in the world, whether in working to preserve the health of our planet or expanding dignity and opportunity for people on the margins whose progress and prosperity will add to our own.

Our world has undergone an extraordinary transformation in the last two decades. In 1989, a wall fell and old barriers began to crumble after 40 years of a cold war that had influenced every aspect of our foreign policy.

By 1999, the rise of more democratic and open societies, the expanding reach of world markets, and the explosion of information technology had made “globalization” the word of the day. For most people, it had primarily an economic connotation, but in fact, we were already living in a profoundly interdependent world in which old rules and boundaries no longer held fast—one in which both the promise and the peril of the 21st century could not be contained by national borders or vast distances.

Economic growth has lifted more people out of poverty faster than at any time in history, but economic crises can sweep across the globe even more quickly. A coalition of nations stopped ethnic cleansing in the Balkans, but the conflict in the Middle East continues to inflame tensions from Asia to Africa. Nonstate actors fight poverty, improve health, and expand education in the poorest parts of the world, while other nonstate actors traffic in drugs, children, and women and kill innocent civilians across the globe.

Now, in 2009, the clear lesson of the last 20 years is that we must both combat the threats and seize the opportunities of our interdependence. And to be effective in doing so we must build a world with more partners and fewer adversaries.

America cannot solve the most pressing problems on our own, and the world cannot solve them without America. The best way to advance America's interest in reducing global threats and seizing global opportunities is to design and implement global solutions. This isn't a philosophical point. This is our reality.

The President-elect and I believe that foreign policy must be based on a marriage of principles and pragmatism, not rigid ideology. On facts and evidence, not emotion or prejudice. Our security, our vitality, and our ability to lead in today's world oblige us to recognize the overwhelming fact of our interdependence.

I believe that American leadership has been wanting, but is still wanted. We must use what has been called “smart power”: The full range of tools at our disposal—diplomatic, economic, military, political, legal, and cultural—picking the right tool, or combination of tools, for each situation.

With smart power, diplomacy will be the vanguard of foreign policy. This is not a radical idea. The ancient Roman poet Terence, who was born a slave and rose to become one of the great voices of his time, declared that “in every endeavor, the seemly course for wise men is to try persuasion first.” The same truth binds wise women as well.

The President-elect has made it clear that in the Obama administration there will be no doubt about the leading role of diplomacy. One need only look to North Korea, Iran, the Middle East, and the Balkans to appreciate the absolute necessity of tough-minded, intelligent diplomacy—and the failures that result when that kind of diplomatic effort is absent. And one need only consider the assortment of problems we must tackle in 2009—from fighting terrorism to climate change to global financial crises—to understand the importance of cooperative engagement.

I assure you that, if I am confirmed, the State Department will be firing on all cylinders to provide forward-thinking, sustained diplomacy in every part of the world; applying pressure and exerting leverage; cooperating with our military partners and other agencies of government; partnering effectively with NGOs, the private sector, and international organizations; using modern technologies for public outreach; empowering negotiators who can protect our interests while understanding those of our negotiating partners. There will be thousands of separate interactions, all strategically linked and coordinated to defend American security and prosperity. Diplomacy is hard work; but when we work hard, diplomacy can work, and not just to defuse tensions, but to achieve results that advance our security, interests, and values.

Secretary Gates has been particularly eloquent in articulating the importance of diplomacy in pursuit of our national security and foreign policy objectives. As he notes, it's not often that a Secretary of Defense makes the case for adding resources to the State Department and elevating the role of the diplomatic corps. Thankfully, Secretary Gates is more concerned about having a unified, agile, and effective U.S. strategy than in spending our precious time and energy on petty turf wars. As he has stated, “our civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chron-

ically undermanned and underfunded for far too long,” both relative to military spending and to “the responsibilities and challenges our Nation has around the world.” And to that, I say, “Amen!”

President-elect Obama has emphasized that the State Department must be fully empowered and funded to confront multidimensional challenges—from working with allies to thwart terrorism, to spreading health and prosperity in places of human suffering. I will speak in greater detail about that in a moment.

We should also use the United Nations and other international institutions whenever appropriate and possible. Both Democratic and Republican Presidents have understood for decades that these institutions, when they work well, enhance our influence. And when they don’t work well—as in the cases of Darfur and the farce of Sudan’s election to the former U.N. Commission on Human Rights, for example—we should work with like-minded friends to make sure that these institutions reflect the values that motivated their creation in the first place.

We will lead with diplomacy because it’s the smart approach. But we also know that military force will sometimes be necessary, and we will rely on it to protect our people and our interests when and where needed, as a last resort.

All the while, we must remember that to promote our interests around the world, America must be an exemplar of our values. Senator Isakson made the point to me the other day that our Nation must lead by example rather than edict. Our history has shown that we are most effective when we see the harmony between our interests abroad and our values at home. And I take great comfort in knowing that our first Secretary of State, Thomas Jefferson, also subscribed to that view, reminding us across the centuries: “The interests of a nation, when well understood, will be found to coincide with their moral duties.”

So while our democracy continues to inspire people around the world, we know that its influence is greatest when we live up to its teachings ourselves.

Senator Lugar, I’m going to borrow your words here, because you have made this point so eloquently: You once said that “the United States cannot feed every person, lift every person out of poverty, cure every disease, or stop every conflict. But our power and status have conferred upon us a tremendous responsibility to humanity.”

Of course, we must be realistic about achieving our goals. Even under the best of circumstances, our Nation cannot solve every problem or meet every global need. We don’t have unlimited time, treasure, or manpower. And we certainly don’t face the best of circumstances today, with our economy faltering and our budget deficits growing.

So to fulfill our responsibility to our children, to protect and defend our Nation while honoring our values, we have to establish priorities.

Now, I’m not trying to mince words here. As my colleagues in the Senate know, “establishing priorities” means making tough choices. Because those choices are so important to the American people, we must be disciplined in evaluating them—weighing the costs and consequences of our action or inaction; gauging the probability of success; and insisting on measurable results.

Right after I was nominated a friend told me: “The world has so many problems. You’ve got your work cut out for you.” Well, I agree that the problems are many and they are big. But I don’t get up every morning thinking only about the threats and dangers we face. With every challenge comes an opportunity to find promise and possibility in the face of adversity and complexity. Today’s world calls forth the optimism and can-do spirit that has marked our progress for more than two centuries.

Too often we see the ills that plague us more clearly than the possibilities in front of us. We see threats that must be thwarted; wrongs that must be righted; conflicts that must be calmed. But not the partnerships that can be promoted; the rights that can be reinforced; the innovations that can be fostered; the people who can be empowered.

After all, it is the real possibility of progress—of that better life, free from fear and want and discord—that offers our most compelling message to the rest of the world.

I’ve had the chance to lay out and submit my views on a broad array of issues in written responses to questions from the committee, so in this statement I will outline some of the major challenges we face and some of the major opportunities we see.

First, President-elect Obama is committed to responsibly ending the war in Iraq and employing a broad strategy in Afghanistan that reduces threats to our safety and enhances the prospect of stability and peace.

Right now, our men and women in uniform, our diplomats, and our aid workers are risking their lives in those two countries. They have done everything we have asked of them and more. But, over time we have seen that our larger interests will

be best served by safely and responsibly withdrawing our troops from Iraq, supporting a transition to full Iraqi responsibility for their sovereign nation, rebuilding our overtaxed military, and reaching out to other nations to help stabilize the region and to employ a broader arsenal of tools to fight terrorism.

Equally important will be a comprehensive plan using all elements of our power—diplomacy, development, and defense—to work with those in Afghanistan and Pakistan who want to root out al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and other violent extremists who threaten them as well as us in what President-elect Obama has called the central front in the fight against terrorism. We need to deepen our engagement with these and other countries in the region and pursue policies that improve the lives of the Afghan and Pakistani people.

As we focus on Iraq, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, we must also actively pursue a strategy of smart power in the Middle East that addresses the security needs of Israel and the legitimate political and economic aspirations of the Palestinians; that effectively challenges Iran to end its nuclear weapons program and sponsorship of terror, and persuades both Iran and Syria to abandon their dangerous behavior and become constructive regional actors; that strengthens our relationships with Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, other Arab states, with Turkey, and with our partners in the gulf to involve them in securing a lasting peace in the region.

As intractable as the Middle East's problems may seem—and many Presidents, including my husband, have spent years trying to help work out a resolution—we cannot give up on peace. The President-elect and I understand and are deeply sympathetic to Israel's desire to defend itself under the current conditions, and to be free of shelling by Hamas rockets.

However, we have also been reminded of the tragic humanitarian costs of conflict in the Middle East, and pained by the suffering of Palestinian and Israeli civilians. This must only increase our determination to seek a just and lasting peace agreement that brings real security to Israel; normal and positive relations with its neighbors; and independence, economic progress, and security to the Palestinians in their own state.

We will exert every effort to support the work of Israelis and Palestinians who seek that result. It is critical not only to the parties involved but to our profound interests in undermining the forces of alienation and violent extremism across our world.

Terrorism remains a serious threat and we must have a comprehensive strategy, leveraging intelligence, diplomacy, and military assets to defeat al-Qaeda and like-minded terrorists by rooting out their networks and drying up support for their violent and nihilistic extremism. The gravest threat that America faces is the danger that weapons of mass destruction will fall into the hands of terrorists. To ensure our future security, we must curb the spread and use of these weapons—whether nuclear, biological, chemical, or cyber—while we take the lead in working with others to reduce current nuclear stockpiles and prevent the development and use of dangerous new weaponry.

Therefore, while defending against the threat of terrorism, we will also seize the parallel opportunity to get America back in the business of engaging other nations to reduce stockpiles of nuclear weapons. We will work with Russia to secure their agreement to extend essential monitoring and verification provisions of the START Treaty before it expires in December 2009, and we will work toward agreements for further reductions in nuclear weapons. We will also work with Russia to take U.S. and Russian missiles off hair-trigger alert, act with urgency to prevent proliferation in North Korea and Iran, secure loose nuclear weapons and materials, and shut down the market for selling them—as Senator Lugar has done for so many years.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty is the cornerstone of the nonproliferation regime, and the United States must exercise the leadership needed to shore up the regime. So, we will work with this committee and the Senate toward ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and reviving negotiations on a verifiable Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty.

Today's security threats cannot be addressed in isolation. Smart power requires reaching out to both friends and adversaries, to bolster old alliances and to forge new ones.

That means strengthening the alliances that have stood the test of time—especially with our NATO partners and our allies in Asia. Our alliance with Japan is a cornerstone of American policy in Asia, essential to maintaining peace and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region, and based on shared values and mutual interests. We also have crucial economic and security partnerships with South Korea, Australia, and other friends in ASEAN. We will build on our economic and political partnership with India, the world's most populous democracy and a nation with growing influence in the world.



Our traditional relationships of confidence and trust with Europe will be deepened. Disagreements are inevitable, even among the closest friends, but on most global issues we have no more trusted allies. The new administration will have a chance to reach out across the Atlantic to leaders in France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and others across the continent, including the new democracies. When America and Europe work together, global objectives are well within our means.

President-elect Obama and I seek a future of cooperative engagement with the Russian Government on matters of strategic importance, while standing up strongly for American values and international norms.

China is a critically important actor in a changing global landscape. We want a positive and cooperative relationship with China, one where we deepen and strengthen our ties on a number of issues, and candidly address differences where they persist.

But this not a one-way effort—much of what we will do depends on the choices China makes about its future at home and abroad.

With both Russia and China, we should work together on vital security and economic issues like terrorism, proliferation, climate change, and reforming financial markets.

The world is now in the cross currents of the most severe global economic contraction since the Great Depression. The history of that crisis teaches us the consequences of diplomatic failures and uncoordinated reactions. Yet history alone is an insufficient guide; the world has changed too much. We have already seen that this crisis extends beyond the housing and banking sectors, and our solutions will have to be as wide in scope as the causes themselves, taking into account the complexities of the global economy, the geopolitics involved, and the likelihood of continued political and economic repercussions from the damage already done.

But here again, as we work to repair the damage, we can find new ways of working together. For too long, we have merely talked about the need to engage emerging powers in global economic governance; the time to take action is upon us. The recent G-20 meeting was a first step, but developing patterns of sustained engagement will take hard work and careful negotiation. We know that emerging markets like China, India, Brazil, South Africa, and Indonesia are feeling the effects of the current crisis. We all stand to benefit in both the short and long term if they are part of the solution, and become partners in maintaining global economic stability.

In our efforts to return to economic growth here in the United States, we have an especially critical need to work more closely with Canada, our largest trading partner, and Mexico, our third largest. Canada and Mexico are also our biggest suppliers of imported energy. More broadly, we must build a deeper partnership with Mexico to address the shared danger arising from drug-trafficking and the challenges of our border; an effort begun this week with a meeting between President-elect Obama and President Calderon.

Throughout our hemisphere we have opportunities to enhance cooperation to meet common economic, security, and environmental objectives that affect us all. We will return to a policy of vigorous engagement throughout Latin America, seeking deeper understanding and broader engagement with nations from the Caribbean to Central to South America. Not only do we share common political, economic, and strategic interests with our friends to the south, our relationship is also enhanced by many shared ancestral and cultural legacies. We are looking forward to working on many issues during the Summit of the Americas in April and taking up the President-elect's call for a new energy partnership of the Americas built around shared technology and new investments in renewable energy.

In Africa, the foreign policy objectives of the Obama administration are rooted in security, political, economic, and humanitarian interests, including: Combating al-Qaeda's efforts to seek safe havens in failed states in the Horn of Africa; helping African nations to conserve their natural resources and reap fair benefits from them; stopping war in Congo; ending autocracy in Zimbabwe and human devastation in Darfur; supporting African democracies like South Africa and Ghana—which just had its second change of power in democratic elections; and working aggressively to reach the Millennium Development Goals in health, education, and economic opportunity.

Many significant problems we face challenge not just the United States, but all nations and peoples. You, Mr. Chairman, were among the first, in a growing chorus from both parties, to recognize that climate change is an unambiguous security threat. At the extreme it threatens our very existence, but well before that point, it could very well incite new wars of an old kind—over basic resources like food, water, and arable land. The world is in need of an urgent, coordinated response to climate change and, as President-elect Obama has said, America must be a leader in developing and implementing it. We can lead abroad through participation in

international efforts like the upcoming U.N. Copenhagen Climate Conference and a Global Energy Forum. We can lead at home by pursuing an energy policy that reduces our carbon emissions while reducing our dependence on foreign oil and gas—which will benefit the fight against climate change and enhance our economy and security.

The great statesman and general, George Marshall, noted that our gravest enemies are often not nations or doctrines, but “hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos.” To create more friends and fewer enemies, we can’t just win wars. We must find common ground and common purpose with other peoples and nations so that together we can overcome hatred, violence, lawlessness, and despair.

The Obama administration recognizes that, even when we cannot fully agree with some governments, we share a bond of humanity with their people. By investing in that common humanity we advance our common security because we pave the way for a more peaceful, prosperous world.

Mr. Chairman, you were one of the first to underscore the importance of our involvement in the global AIDS fight. And you have worked very hard on this issue for many years. Now, thanks to a variety of efforts—including President Bush’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief as well as the work of NGOs and foundations—the United States enjoys widespread support in public opinion polls in many African countries. This is true even among Muslim populations in Tanzania and Kenya, where America is seen as a leader in the fight against AIDS, malaria, and TB.

We have an opportunity to build on this success by partnering with NGOs to help expand the infrastructure of health clinics in Africa so that more people can have access to life-saving drugs, fewer mothers transmit HIV to their children, and fewer lives are lost.

And we can generate even more goodwill through other kinds of social investment, by working effectively with international organizations and NGO partners to build schools and train teachers, and by ensuring that children are free from hunger and exploitation so that they can attend those schools and pursue their dreams for the future. This is why the President-elect supports a Global Education Fund to bolster secular education around the world.

I want to take a moment to emphasize the importance of a “bottom-up” approach to ensuring that America remains a positive force in the world. The President-elect and I believe in this strongly. Investing in our common humanity through social development is not marginal to our foreign policy but integral to accomplishing our goals.

Today more than 2 billion people worldwide live on less than \$2 a day. They are facing rising food prices and widespread hunger. Calls for expanding civil and political rights in countries plagued by mass hunger and disease will fall on deaf ears unless democracy actually delivers material benefits that improve people’s lives while weeding out the corruption that too often stands in the way of progress.

Our foreign policy must reflect our deep commitment to the cause of making human rights a reality for millions of oppressed people around the world. Of particular concern to me is the plight of women and girls, who comprise the majority of the world’s unhealthy, unschooled, unfed, and unpaid. If half of the world’s population remains vulnerable to economic, political, legal, and social marginalization, our hope of advancing democracy and prosperity will remain in serious jeopardy. We still have a long way to go and the United States must remain an unambiguous and unequivocal voice in support of women’s rights in every country, every region, on every continent.

As a personal aside, I want to mention that President-elect Obama’s mother, Ann Dunham, was a pioneer in microfinance in Indonesia. In my own work on microfinance around the world—from Bangladesh to Chile to Vietnam to South Africa and many other countries—I’ve seen firsthand how small loans given to poor women to start small businesses can raise standards of living and transform local economies. President-elect Obama’s mother had planned to attend a microfinance forum at the Beijing women’s conference in 1995 that I participated in. Unfortunately, she was very ill and couldn’t travel and sadly passed away a few months later. But I think it’s fair to say that her work in international development, the care and concern she showed for women and for poor people around the world, mattered greatly to her son, and certainly has informed his views and his vision. We will be honored to carry on Ann Dunham’s work in the months and years ahead.

I’ve discussed a few of our top priorities and I know we’ll address many more in the question-and-answer session. But I suspect that even this brief overview offers a glimpse of the daunting, and crucial, challenges we face, as well as the opportunities before us. President-elect Obama and I pledge to work closely with this committee and the Congress to forge a bipartisan, integrated, results-oriented sus-

tainable foreign policy that will restore American leadership to confront these challenges, serve our interests, and advance our values.

Ensuring that our State Department is functioning at its best will be absolutely essential to America's success. This is a top priority of mine, of my colleagues' on the national security team, and of the President-elect's. He believes strongly that we need to invest in our civilian capacity to conduct vigorous American diplomacy, provide the kind of foreign assistance I've mentioned, reach out to the world, and operate effectively alongside our military.

I realize that the entire State Department bureaucracy in Thomas Jefferson's day consisted of a chief clerk, three regular clerks, and a messenger—and his entire budget was \$56,000 a year.

But over the past 219 years the world, and the times, have certainly changed. Now the Department consists of Foreign Service officers, the civil service, and locally engaged staff working at Foggy Bottom, in offices across our country, and at some 260 posts around the world. And today, USAID carries out a critical development mission that is essential to representing our values across the globe.

These public servants are too often unsung heroes. They are in the trenches putting our policies and values to work in an increasingly complicated and dangerous world. Many risk their lives, and some lose their lives, in service to our Nation. And they need and deserve the resources, training, and support to succeed.

I know this committee, and I hope the American public, understand that right now Foreign Service officers, civil service professionals, and development experts are doing work essential to our Nation's strength—whether helping American businesses make inroads in new markets; being on the other end of the phone at a United States embassy when an American citizen needs help beyond our shores; doing the delicate work of diplomacy and development with foreign governments that leads to arms control and trade agreements, peace treaties and post-conflict reconstruction, greater human rights and empowerment, broader cultural understanding and stronger alliances.

The State Department is a large, multidimensional organization. But it is not a placid or idle bureaucracy, as some would like to paint it. It is an outpost for American values that protects our citizens and safeguards our democratic institutions in times both turbulent and tame. State Department employees also offer a lifeline of hope and help—often the only lifeline—for people in foreign lands who are oppressed, silenced, and marginalized.

Whether they are an economic officer in a large embassy, or an aid worker in the field, or a clerk in a distant consulate, or a country officer working late in Washington, they do their work so that we may all live in peace and security. We must not shortchange them, or ourselves, by denying them the resources they need.

One of my first priorities is to make sure that the State Department and USAID have the resources they need, and I will be back to make the case to Congress for full funding of the President's budget request. At the same time, I will work just as hard to make sure that we manage those resources prudently so that we fulfill our mission efficiently and effectively.

In concluding, I hope you will indulge me one final observation. Like most Americans, I never had the chance to travel widely outside our country as a child or young adult. Most of my early professional career was as a lawyer and advocate for children and who found themselves on society's margins here at home. But during the 8 years of my husband's Presidency, and then in my 8 years as a Senator, I have been privileged to travel on behalf of the United States to more than 80 countries.

I've had the opportunity to get to know many world leaders. As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee I've spent time with our military commanders, as well as our brave troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan, and I have immersed myself in an array of military issues. I've spent many hours with American and non-American aid workers, business men and women, religious leaders, teachers, doctors, nurses, students, volunteers and others who have made it their mission to help people across the world. I have also learned invaluable lessons from countless ordinary citizens in foreign capitals, small towns, and rural villages whose lives offered a glimpse into a world far removed from what many of us experience on a daily basis here in America.

In recent years, as other nations have risen to compete for military, economic, and political influence, some have argued that we have reached the end of the "American moment" in world history. I disagree. Yes, the conventional paradigms have shifted. But America's success has never been solely a function of our power; it has always been inspired by our values.

With so many troubles here at home and across the world, millions of people are still trying to come to our country—legally and illegally. Why? Because we are guided by unchanging truths: That all people are created equal; that each person

has a right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And in these truths we will find, as we have for more than two centuries, the courage, the discipline, and the creativity to meet the challenges of this ever-changing world.

I am humbled to be a public servant, and honored by the responsibility placed on me by our President-elect, who embodies the American dream not only here at home but far beyond our shores.

No matter how daunting our challenges may be, I have a steadfast faith in our country and our people, and I am proud to be an American at the dawning of this new American moment.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for granting me your time and attention today. I know there is a lot more territory to cover and I'd be delighted to answer your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you very much, Senator, for a very comprehensive and thoughtful statement. And I can tell you, from certainly this Senator's perspective, it's wonderful to hear so many of these issues set out as priorities for the new administration, and we're excited about the prospect of working with you in order to implement the policies in greater detail that will support the agenda that you've set out.

I'd just say to all my colleagues—and I think we all know this—that this committee and the Congress in its role in foreign policy has been at its strongest when we've been bipartisan. And I think the old adage about politics ending at the water's edge with respect to diplomacy and our national security interests is something that would serve us well as a guidepost as we think about the enormity of the choices that we're going to face in the days ahead.

We will begin, now, a 10-minute question round. And in deference to Senator Corker, who has the same obligations as Senator Dodd, since we let Senator Dodd go, I'm going to let him go after Senator Lugar. Is that amenable to you? And then we'll go through the—is that all right?

So, we'll start the clock running on a 10-minute series of questions.

And I think, Senator, that in your opening, you wonderfully covered a broad array of the challenges. And the task, obviously, before all of us is really now to try to hone in a little bit and see how these are really going to play out with specific regions and specific countries and challenges.

Obviously, one of the most pressing issues we face—and it was underscored in the New York Times on Sunday—is a question of Iran's nuclear program and the entire relationship with Iran, which was, needless to say, a subject of discussion throughout the campaign. The time when Iran is going to be capable of producing enough weapons-grade uranium to build a bomb, if they choose to, is very fast approaching. The clock is ticking. And yet, Iran continues to defy the U.N. resolutions, enriching more uranium to reactor-grade levels, installing and operating more and more centrifuges, failing to address the concerns of inspectors, and so forth. And recent efforts to get tough, as you know, failed with respect to the U.N. Security Council.

So, I would ask you—during the campaign, President-elect Obama said that he would employ, "big carrots and big sticks" to deal with Iran's nuclear program. We do know that there's a significant package of incentives already on the table from the "P5-plus-1," and the prospect of increased Security Council sanctions may be questionable, at best. So, could you share with us the

thinking, at this stage—I know it’s early—but, can you share with us what additional carrots the administration might have in mind? Why do you believe those might be enough to change Iran’s calculations? Are tougher sanctions achievable? And how are you and the administration viewing this, at this point?

Senator CLINTON. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. And obviously the incoming administration views, with great concern, the role that Iran is playing in the world, its sponsorship of terrorism, its continuing interference with the functioning of other governments, and its pursuit of nuclear weapons. There is an ongoing policy review that the Obama administration has undertaken. But, I think, as the President-elect said just this past weekend, our goal will be to do everything we can pursue, through diplomacy, through the use of sanctions, through creating better coalitions with countries that we believe also have a big stake in preventing Iran from becoming a nuclear-weapon power, to try to prevent this from occurring.

We are not taking any option off the table at all, but we will pursue a new, perhaps different, approach that will become a cornerstone of what the Obama administration believes is an attitude toward engagement that might bear fruit. We have no illusions, Mr. Chairman, that, even with a new administration looking to try to engage Iran in a way that might influence its behavior, that we can predict the results. But, the President-elect is committed to that course, and we will pursue it.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you believe that tougher U.N. sanctions are available from which to choose? And second, are they achievable?

Senator CLINTON. You know, it’s kind of like the experimenter’s bias, in a way. We won’t know what we’re capable of achieving until we’re actually there working on it. We have a commitment to engaging with international organizations in a very intense and ongoing way. We are going to be working with our friends and our adversaries in the United Nations. We’re going to be making the case to members of the Security Council, who have been either dubious or unwilling to cooperate up until now, that a nuclear-armed Iran is in no one’s interests under any circumstances.

So, Mr. Chairman, it’s hard to predict how successful we will be, but I promise you our very best efforts in doing all that we can to try to achieve greater international support for sanctions and actions that could actually influence the behavior of the Iranian Government, the Supreme Leader, and the Religious Council, and the Revolutionary Guard and the Quds Force; because, as you know so well, all these are players. And so, our task will be to try to figure out the appropriate and effective pressure that will perhaps lead to us dissuading Iran from going forward.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I happen to agree with you that it is, in fact, legitimately impossible to be able to determine exactly what options are available until you begin to get into a conversation and begin to see what the play is. But, as a matter of fundamental American policy, let me ask you a question. Is it the policy of the incoming administration, as a bottom line of our security interests and our policy, that it is unacceptable that Iran has a weapon, under any circumstances, and that we will take any steps necessary to prevent that? Or is there—is it simply “not desirable”? I

think, as you said “It’s in no one’s interest,” which is less than an affirmation of a prohibition.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Mr. President—the President-elect—Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. I’ll take that.

Senator CLINTON. Yes, it was a Freudian slip. The President-elect——

The CHAIRMAN. We’re both subject to those, I want you to know.

Senator CLINTON. Yes. Indeed. [Laughter.]

On this subject, especially.

The President-elect has said, repeatedly, it is unacceptable. It is going to be United States policy to pursue diplomacy, with all of its multitudinous tools, to do everything we can to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear-weapons state. As I also said, no option is off the table. But, the President-elect has been very clear that it is unacceptable; and that is our premise, and that is what we are going to be basing our actions on.

The CHAIRMAN. The Bush administration sent Under Secretary Burns to the last round of those talks, essentially as an observer. Do you plan to send a U.S. representative to engage directly in those kinds of discussions almost immediately?

Senator CLINTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, we are looking at a range of possibilities. One very important aspect of the decisions we make is that we engage in consultation with our friends in the region and beyond. We don’t want anything I say today, or anything the President-elect says, to take our friends and allies by surprise. So, we cannot tell you with specificity exactly the steps we will take, but I think it’s fair to say that the President-elect, as recently as this weekend, has said that we’re going to be trying new approaches, because what we’ve tried has not worked; they are closer to nuclear weapons capacity today than they were. So, we’re going to be looking broadly, but in consultation. And I want to underscore that, because it’s very important that those who have to live in the region, many of whom are our allies—Israel and others who have a legitimate set of concerns about Iran’s growing power and its use of that power—should know that the Obama administration will be consulting broadly and deeply so that, when we move, we will move in concert, insofar as possible.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you plan, personally, to engage in personal diplomacy with Iranian officials at high level in the near term?

Senator CLINTON. Well, again, Mr. Chairman, I want to wait to determine the exact contours of how we proceed until we’re actually in office and have a chance to consult with others, because it is very clear to me that we have not as full a brief as we need on the feelings of many of the important players. We have carefully hued to the President-elect’s position: there’s one President at a time. We have not spoken with foreign leaders, we have not, in many instances, taken their calls, because we want to be very respectful of the ongoing work of the Bush administration. As soon as we are in a position to do so, we will be consulting and we will be setting forth a series of actions, and we will be consulting and informing this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I know you've been very careful about that, and I think it's been appropriate and, I think, a wise course, and I look forward to you being able to get deeply engaged.

Last question, just quickly. Last year, six colleagues and I, including Senator Levin, wrote to Secretary Rice, urging her to establish an intersection in Tehran. It just seems counterproductive and almost incomprehensible that we're not on the ground in some of these places. We don't have an ambassador in Syria, for instance. We should. So, I would ask you if you have made a decision, and will there be—will you proceed forward to create an intersection in Tehran and immediately put an ambassador back into Syria?

Senator CLINTON. Again, Mr. Chairman, these are matters that are part of our policy review, and we will turn to them with, you know, great diligence and attention as soon as we are able to.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I hope the question establishes some sense of priority.

Senator CLINTON. I think I got your drift, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Mr. Chairman, could you recognize Senator Corker—

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, absolutely.

Senator LUGAR [continuing]. And then Senator Feingold and—

The CHAIRMAN. You want to do that?

Senator LUGAR. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. I'd be delighted to—

Senator LUGAR. We can expedite his work.

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. Do that. Thank you so much.

Senator Corker.

Senator CORKER. Thank you, Senator Lugar, I appreciate that. And, Chairman Kerry, I'm glad you're going to be leading us here. I think you're the right person to be doing it at this time, and I thank you for your leadership.

Madam Secretary-designate, we welcome you. We're always glad to see when one of our own does well, has a real job. And I certainly welcome your daughter.

Along the comments of—and I think you have tremendous opportunities. You laid out, in your opening comments, sort of a travelogue of opportunities, and I know that many of the opportunities that exist, you didn't mention. You mentioned those, certainly, in Q&A back to us. So, the opportunities that you have as Secretary of State are just huge, and I think you will succeed in that role; I really do.

I want to piggyback, and not dwell, on the comments that Senator Lugar made early on regarding the Clinton Foundation. And I'm just a junior Senator from Tennessee, but, you know, it seems to me that everything has seasons.

And this is your season. And I look at the opportunities that you have to influence the world and our place in the world. I look at the resources that our government can bring to that, under your leadership. And then, I look at the Foundation. And regardless of who's running it and how great it is, it's a speck in relation to the huge magnitude of efforts that you can put forth on behalf of our government. And so, without dwelling on the details, I would encourage the steps that Senator Lugar requested to be taken.

There's just no need to sully or dampen, or anything, the tremendous opportunities that you have. And I do hope that, sometime over the next 2 weeks, you'll educate us all as to how that's going to be done. But, the potential is so vast in the role that you have, and so small in the other role, it just seems to me there's no reason whatsoever to have continual press comments and other kinds of things that might take away from, I think, what might be extraordinary efforts on your part. So, thank you so much for your service.

You know, I noticed, as I've traveled the world in my short tenure here, the State Department, as you mentioned toward the end of your comments, is vast. We have people in tough parts of the world that are carrying out tough duties. It's my sense that—when Colin Powell was Secretary, that he really built the Department. He understood, being a military person, what it meant to have a culture and for people to have the tools and training and those kinds of things necessary to really exceed in their jobs—or to excel in their jobs. I think that's been a little bit lesser the case recently, and—and I'm not in any way criticizing. It seems to me a Secretary of State really has two major responsibilities. One is to be our chief dealmaker. And that's how you get recorded in history. And I know that there'll be many things that you'll be recorded in that way. But, then there's the whole issue of running the Department. My sense is, that's not, probably, your basic strength. That you're probably going to see to the other responsibilities. And I wonder if you might educate us as to how you're going to ensure that the Department really does have the support, the tools, the culture, the morale necessary to be successful while we're working on the more major accomplishments.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Corker, this is, to me, one of the most important questions, because we can talk about all of the good work we'd like to do, and how grateful we are to those people who are out there doing it, but if we don't enhance our diplomatic and development efforts, and move toward more equilibrium, as Secretary Gates even has said, we will not be as successful as we need to be in promoting our foreign policy.

So, to that end, in consultation with the President-elect and the Vice-President-elect, as well as the leaders of this committee, I decided to fill a position that had not been filled, although it had been created, 10 years ago, and that was the deputy for resources and management. And I concluded that that was important, because what happens in every government agency, but certainly in the State Department, is, you get consumed by the crisis of the moment. You have the best intentions to deal with the management challenges, the resource shortages, but the Secretary's time and the, you know, top diplomats' time are spent, you know, on Gaza or on Iran or on Russia and the Ukraine pipeline issue. So, it seemed to me that, in order to really fulfill my responsibility to you and the American people, we needed to have someone whose total job focus was to manage the Department, along with the career professionals, to work to manage USAID to be more effective, and to represent the interests of the Department, as well as the Presidential budget here on the Hill when it came to these resource matters.



I feel very fortunate that you will be seeing before you for confirmation two extraordinary deputies. The principal deputy filling the role that has been there, historically, will be Jim Steinberg, a very accomplished foreign policy expert. He's leaving the deanship of the LBJ School, at the University of Texas, to take on this responsibility. And filling the second deputy position for resources and management will be Jack Lew, a former director of the Office of Management and Budget, someone with deep experience here on Capitol Hill, who is diving into work already. Because I want you, as well as me, to have someone who is accountable and the point-person.

You know, the argument kind of stops when you say, "Well, what about more training for our Foreign Service officers? What about, you know, more funding for all of the responsibilities, from reconstruction and stabilization efforts, the Office on Trafficking, and so much else? How do we do that? How do we do more with less?"—we've got to have somebody who will take charge of all those issues. And I really believe, Senator, that this will be a significant step on the way toward putting the State Department on a sounder financial and management footing.

Senator CORKER. We have a maze of aid efforts that are underway. Every Senator that travels and sees some need authorizes another aid program. I wonder if you would consider, during the first 6 months you're there, rationalizing that for us and reporting back as to some of those things that need to be done away with. Again, it's—all are in good intentions, but they seem to water each other down and not have the focus that they might otherwise have. I'm wondering if you might commit to doing that during some short period of time after you're there.

Senator CLINTON. Well, in fact, Senator, that's going to be one of the responsibilities that will be given to this second deputy, under my direction, to take a look at our existing authorities, to determine what works, what doesn't work, to try to eliminate redundancies, to fill gaps; because, you know, we do have some of those, as well, obviously.

You know, it matters greatly to me, as it does to the President-elect, these development efforts, these humanitarian commitments by the United States Government, are often the way we are perceived. And frequently, to our advantage, if they are done correctly.

But, I think it's fair to say that USAID—our premiere aid agency—has been decimated. You know, it has half the staff it used to have, it's turned into more of a contracting agency than an operational agency with the ability to deliver.

Yet, at the same time, whether I'm talking to Secretary Gates, or I'm talking to people in the nongovernmental organizational world, very often they will say the same thing. Well, they've turned to USAID to determine how to implement these programs. So, we're going to take a hard look at all of our aid and development efforts.

Additionally, the Congress has given the State Department a very important responsibility with reconstruction and stabilization. If we're going to move authorities and resources back from the Defense Department to the State Department we have to be able to function effectively and demonstrate our efficiency.

We're at a great disadvantage—I'll give you just a quick example. There's a program that I learned about, of course, on my Senate Armed Services Committee work, called CERP—the Commander's Emergency Response Program. I remember the first time I went to Iraq, in 2003, and I met young captains and majors and lieutenant colonels who were literally handed thousands of dollars of cash, and told, "Go get that school opened, go get that road built. Go fix that, you know, sewer problem." And they were doing an incredible job with great flexibility, and very little accountability.

I came back a believer in the CERP program, and advocated for it to continue, but when I contrast that with a development officer, or a State Department expert, who knows the culture, knows the language, unlike, you know, this very well-meaning and well-trained warrior, and that person can't get \$500 to fulfill a development mission that is in service of American security and our national interests, there's a big disconnect.

So, Secretary Gates understands it, so we're going to try to better organize and rationalize what we do, and build confidence with you, and the rest of Congress, that we can take on these responsibilities.

The CHAIRMAN. Thanks.

Thank you very much, Senator Corker.

Senator Feingold.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and of course, my warm congratulations to you on your new position. I look forward to working closely with you, and this committee, and the incoming Obama administration to reverse much of the foreign policies of the last 8 years, and to restore America's leadership abroad, and security at home, and I just ask that my full statement be placed in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

[The prepared statement of Senator Feingold follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. RUSSELL FEINGOLD, U.S. SENATOR FROM WISCONSIN

Thank you, Mr. Chairman—and congratulations on your new position. I look forward to working closely with you, this committee, and the incoming Obama administration to reverse the disastrous foreign policies of the last 8 years and restore America's leadership abroad and security at home. I am very pleased that Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton has been nominated to be Secretary of State. She is an excellent choice for our most senior diplomat, has a demonstrated record of thinking creatively about the challenges our country faces, and has already indicated a willingness to consult with Congress that is refreshing and very welcome.

Mr. Chairman, the negative impact of the Bush administration's foreign policies reverberates loudly and will continue to do so long after January 20. One of the challenges the new administration will face is dealing with that negative impact while refocusing attention on our top national security priority—going after al-Qaeda and its affiliates. Our deficit is astronomical, anti-Americanism around the world has reached an all-time high, and we still have not developed many of the capabilities we need to gather intelligence, pursue strategic objectives, and build sustainable partnerships abroad in the 21st century.

I am optimistic that, with President-elect Obama's victory and the nomination of Senator Clinton, we will finally have the smart, focused foreign policies we need. With Senator Clinton at the helm of the State Department, I expect we will see thoughtful decisionmaking that reflects careful consideration of diverse opinions and of the consequences of our actions. I expect she will stand strong in the face of difficult challenges as she supports our embassies in-country and reasserts the primacy of her agency to lead our foreign policy—whether here in Washington or in the remote desert regions of Africa. I look forward to working with Senator Clinton

and her team to ensure we properly allocate our resources and choose the appropriate tools to fight al-Qaeda globally.

I will continue to advocate for a more comprehensive and effective approach to counterterrorism that supports efforts to strengthen the rule of law and maintain respect for human rights. I am confident there will be many partners in this administration with whom I can work to achieve those objectives, and that together we can undo the many missteps of the current administration and set a wiser course for our foreign policy and our Nation's security.

Senator FEINGOLD. I am very pleased that Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton has been nominated to be Secretary of State. She's an excellent choice for our most senior diplomat, has a demonstrated record of thinking creatively about the challenges our country faces, and I want to say that she's already shown, not only the indication, but in fact, has shown a willingness on a regular basis to consult with Congress, that is refreshing and very welcome as she sets up the operation she's going to have as Secretary of State. I'm very, very pleased with that process.

And I'd just note before I get into my questions that some of my colleagues have asked about the Clinton Foundation, I have some questions on that topic, Mr. Chairman, that I will simply submit for the record.

But, what I'd like to do is to start off with what I think we agree on, and that is that our top national security priority is the global fight against al-Qaeda and its affiliates. I was pleased with your reference in your opening statement to efforts of al-Qaeda in places like Africa.

How we allocate our resources, the tools used in this struggle, is key to winning this fight. And without a more global and comprehensive approach, we will be unable to make our country or the world a safer place.

Now, the current administration's decision to focus so many of our resources on Iraq at the expense of other areas has, and I think, been a tragic mistake in this regard. So, I would ask you—and I know you mentioned this issue first—to please share your vision of how you will follow up on President-elect Obama's pledge to redeploy the bulk of our troops from Iraq in 16 months. What steps do you expect the State Department will take to ensure that this transition occurs as safely and smoothly as possible?

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, thank you very much. And, you know, this is a primary priority, as you know, of the incoming administration. The President-elect, Secretary Gates, and others are working assiduously to try to be able to begin the process of withdrawal safely and responsibly, as soon as possible.

It is being done within the context of the Status of Forces Agreement, which is now clearly set forth the path that both the Iraqi Government and the United States Government intend to follow. There is some differences in timing, but the important aspect of the so-called SOFA, is that United States Government under President Obama, will be withdrawing troops, and the Iraqi Government not only accepts that, but wishes to facilitate it.

So, we look to begin moving our combat brigades out of cities and towns and villages, hopefully by June, and then proceed with the withdrawal, and in some instances, redeployment of some of those troops to Afghanistan.

Now the military details of this are obviously not within the province of the State Department. But there is a companion document that was signed by the United States Government, and the Government of Iraq, which was an agreement of friendship and cooperation. And in it are listed a number of areas that we intend to be very active in pursuing—on rule of law, on education, and health care, technical assistance for the energy industry and the like.

It is my intention that we will—very quickly, in consultation with the Iraqi Government, and other agencies within our own government—put together the teams and activities that we will be offering that will support the withdrawal of our troops, and also fulfill the agreement that we have with the Government of Iraq.

The details are, you know, still to be worked out, as you know, our current Ambassador will be, you know, leaving after a very distinguished and courageous tour in Iraq, for personal and health reasons, as I'm told. But he deserves a great deal of gratitude for the leadership that he's provided on the civilian side. And we will look to move that nomination as quickly as possible, once we can make it, so that we have an ambassador on the ground, and we have the assets deployed so that we are able to fulfill our part of the agreement, as set forth.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Senator.

Let me turn to another topic that we covered. You've been an outspoken advocate of United States action to stop genocide in Darfur and to protect the fragile peace between the north and south, in Sudan.

Now President-elect Obama, Vice-President-elect Biden, and Dr. Susan Rice also have strong records of support for United States action to stop the ongoing violence in Sudan.

Senator, I believe it's crucial that the new administration signal a commitment from day one to this effort. There's been a lot of talk of bold actions that the United States could take, such as expanding sanctions, imposing a no-fly zone over Sudan, bombing Sudanese aircrafts, air fields, and perhaps even the regime's military and intelligence assets.

Would you give me your sense at this point of how viable these options are, what steps the new administration will take to demonstrate a new and bold and comprehensive approach to Sudan?

Senator CLINTON. Senator, again this is an area of great concern to me, as it is to the President-elect. We are putting together the options that we think are available, and workable. It is done in conjunction—as you would assume—with the Department of Defense. There is a great need for us to sound the alarm, again, about Darfur.

It is a terrible humanitarian crisis, compounded by a corrupt and very cruel regime in Khartoum. And it's important that the world know that we intend to address this in the most effective way possible, once we have completed our review, and that we intend to bring along as many people as we can to fulfill the mission of the United Nations/African Union force, which is not yet up to speed and fully deployed, as a very first measure—that's a preexisting policy we agree with. We are going to work to try to effectuate it.

And then, as you rightly point out, the President-elect, the Vice-President-elect, I and others have spoken about other options—no-fly zones, other sanctions and sanctuaries. Looking to deploy the United Nations/African Union force to try to protect the refugees, but also to repel the militia.

So, there is a lot that is under consideration, and I know of your interest in this, along with other colleagues, and we will keep you advised, as we move forward.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you very much.

Obviously you, and the President-elect, recognize the importance of our efforts in Afghanistan. And given the serious national security concerns in that part of the world, we have to address the growing instability there.

But keeping in mind the lessons to be learned from Iraq, we need to address Afghanistan comprehensively. Which I know you realize includes looking more broadly at Pakistan, and in India and Iran and the larger region. And we need to think clearly, rather than simply assuming that more troops is somehow sufficient to turn the tide.

Now, you and I discussed the fact that there is a significant military review underway. But will there also be a policy review, to ensure we define the full scope of our mission in Afghanistan, and explain to the American people how sending more American troops actually fits into a comprehensive regional strategy?

Senator CLINTON. There will certainly be such a policy review, it is the highest priority of the President-elect. He has put forth what he calls the “more for more” strategy that, if there are to be more troops from the United States, there also needs to be more support for that mission from NATO, there needs to be more work done by the Government of Afghanistan and the people.

And I would add that the “more for more” strategy is not just on the military side, it’s on the civilian and development side, as well.

We have to look at Afghanistan and Pakistan together, particularly the border region. As you were telling me when we met, you personally have traveled along that border. You have seen with your own eyes, the elements of resistance and extremism that have taken root there.

And it is imperative that we work with our friends, in both Pakistan and Afghanistan, because this is not only about denying al-Qaeda and other extremist groups’ safe haven. This is about persuading those two countries that their security and their future is also at risk. And I am encouraged that the democratically elected Government of Pakistan seems to be much more aware of how this is their fight, not just ours.

The Government of Afghanistan, as you know, the Vice-President-elect, was just in both countries, is going to be presented with alternatives from the Obama administration that we think are not only in the interest of our overall mission, but in their interests, as well.

So, this will be a collaboration, and the other countries you mentioned are also players, to some extent, that have to be brought in.

So, I anticipate, Senator, having a civilian review, and a civilian presence that will be the counterpart of the military review, and the military presence.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Senator.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Feingold.

Senator Lugar.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Clinton, when the Albanians informed the United States in the summer of 2004 that they saw some suspicious drums above Tirana, and some of us went over there and found nerve gas and MANPAD missiles and sheds and what have you—and we're grateful to the Albanians seeking that assistance—this was the first opportunity for the Nunn-Lugar Act to go outside of Russia and the former states that comprised the former Soviet Union.

I mention this because it created quite a problem bureaucratically. I had to get Secretary Powell's signature on a piece of paper and take another piece to the President himself to eradicate the situation.

But when Senator Obama first came to the committee, we traveled to Russia and the Ukraine, saw additional MANPAD missiles, and in fact a whole acreage of weapons that were very dangerous, although not weapons of mass destruction. And we secured Senate assistance in passing the Proliferation Security Initiative and other bills.

I bring all of this to your attention because, despite all of this legislative effort, there has been no translation of this into increased financial or leadership commitment in the State Department.

Admittedly, there are budget constraints and problems of organization of the Department, but nevertheless, all of this became almost individual diplomacy, rather than a concerted effort by our country. And the problem now is that we have found that there are dangerous pathogens and disease repositories in other countries in need of WMD proliferation prevention assistance.

Can you describe, even in these early days of your study of this, what sort of an effort—under your leadership—the State Department may be able to offer to begin to do those things which are clearly diplomatic. That is, to open up conversations with other countries, to work with the Defense Department, of course, the Department of Energy, others who have interests in this, but in which thus far the State Department has been either reluctant, or an almost nonexistent, partner.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Lugar, I don't think there is a more important issue that confronts the incoming administration. And your leadership and inspiration, with respect to arms control, and especially nonproliferation—the efforts to contain and destroy loose nukes and other material, and now moving into the pathogen area which is particularly dangerous—is a great example, to me, of what we should be doing.

It won't surprise you to know that in my transition review of the Department, it became clear that the arms control and nonproliferation functions had been significantly degraded. There was a difference of opinion within this current administration as to whether such an effort is worthwhile, whether it pays off, whether it's, you know, just spinning wheels. You know, I heard someone in the administration previously say, "Well, you know, we don't

need these agreements, because good people don't need them, and bad people won't follow them."

So the infrastructure for being able to back you up when you went to Albania was severely undermined. We intend to build it even more robustly. I am seeking arms control and nonproliferation experts to come back into the Department. This is one of the passionate concerns of the President-elect who, I think, under your tutelage, understands very much the threats that we face.

So, I believe, Senator, that you will find a very willing and active partner in these efforts. I remember when I met with you, looking at the pictures that you have displayed in your conference rooms of all of the various trips that you've made, looking for this material, seeing it finally destroyed. And you know better than I how much more work lies ahead, and unfortunately, the bad guys are always at it, they're always going to be testing us.

So, to that end, we will have a very strong commitment to the START treaty negotiations. We want to get out of the box early, we want Russia to know we are serious. I take to heart what the chairman said about trying to reduce our numbers even lower.

This incoming President—like all Presidents—has been committed to the end of nuclear weapons, as long as we can be assured that we have adequate deterrence, and that we are protected going forward. So, we're going to enter it with that frame of mind, which is quite a change.

In the nonproliferation area, I want to do everything I can, working with you, working with former Senator Nunn, to see what authorities we need, how we can better beef them up, how we can better fund them. Use this occasion, even, to invite some of the technical experts, and others who have left government over the last 8 years to reenlist, because it is true that you could make the case that bad actors won't follow agreements—you can look at North Korea, you can look at Iran.

But I think those should be the exception, and not the rule. There should be a rules-based framework for arms control, and nonproliferation. That if the United States, once again, leads and constructs that architecture, we will be in a stronger position to isolate the bad actors.

So, I hope, Senator, that you will take my remarks as the invitation they're meant to be—for collaboration, not just consultation—as we rebuild this function, staff it and fund it appropriately.

Senator LUGAR. Well, this is very good news. I had a visit with Foreign Minister Lavrov of Russia and Mr. Kyrienko and RusAtom in mid-December, and I know they will welcome your words today. There have certainly been some doubts on the Russian side as to where we were. And the time is wasting. And so your leadership will be very much appreciated.

Let me pursue a second line of questioning. At the Riga NATO summit in 2006, I gave a speech suggesting that Article V of NATO was violated just as severely when someone cut off natural gas and thus plunged a country either into the cold in the middle of the winter, where people would die, and industry would flounder, as when tanks and aircraft and what have you come across the border.

Behind the scenes, Foreign Ministers said, "Of course you're right, but we don't talk about this publicly. You know, we try to deal behind the barn as best we can with an intractable situation." Now we are still in the process of coming out of another crisis of this variety. The United States has fostered the Nabucco pipeline as a prospect of helping either our NATO partners or our EU partners, if Europeans prefer to deal with the EU in this problem.

But the fact is, Europeans have not dealt with it very positively, the prospects for some grid underneath Europe, in which natural gas or other power might be spread, has been very halting because of nationalistic boundaries. And, on occasion, you have a feeling we are more worried about the Europeans' energy problems than some of them are.

I ask you this, because this is a major diplomatic problem, for our working with the NATO allies, with the EU, with the energy community, and in general. But I also come to ask if you agree that if we do not solve this problem, at some point, our NATO allies are going to be rendered—if not impotent—at least in a position in which the NATO alliance is weakened severely. Perhaps the EU could be affected likewise, with the new members especially feeling acute pain and watching Georgia, and feeling a real problem, in terms of their physical existence. Would you make a comment on this proposition?

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Lugar, I think once again, you're demonstrating your far-sighted, realistic understanding of security threats, because I agree with you. I think we have learned the hard way that the OPEC cartel is not just a commercial enterprise, but a security, geopolitical strategic effort that we have had to contend with, now, for 36 years.

As you know, Russia is attempting to create a gas equivalent of OPEC, that would give it—in addition to the bilateral powers it has—a much greater, multilateral, international reach on gas.

So this whole question of energy security, I think, has enormous implications for our country, for Europe, but indeed for the entire world. I'm also aware that you authored a provision in the last energy bill, to have a coordinator on these energy security issues in the State Department—I intend to fulfill that.

Senator LUGAR. Great.

Senator CLINTON. We've had individual envoys on specific pipeline issues, but we haven't brought it all together in a way that, I think, reflects the elevated seriousness of the challenges that are being posed. Specifically, with respect to Russia, and its interactions with Ukraine, Georgia, other European countries, its recent purchase of the Serbian gas utility—I hope we can make progress with our friends in NATO, and the EU, to understand that we do need a broader framework in which we can talk about energy security issues. It may or may not be Article V, but I think it certainly is a significant security challenge that we ignore at our peril.

So, I will look, again, for advice and consultation ideas you might have. We will be going to Europe in the due course, on Foreign Ministers meetings, on the NATO anniversary meeting—this should be on the agenda. And I hope that we can find willing partners to make it so.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much.



The CHAIRMAN. Thanks very much, Senator Lugar.  
Senator Boxer.

Senator BOXER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Clinton, I'm so excited to see you here today. As you know, I was very much in favor of your saying yes to this opportunity.

You're a dedicated public servant, and I think by nominating you, President-elect Obama has sent a message that world peace and stability trumps politics and ego. And, I think by accepting this position, Senator Clinton, that you are sending the same message, because you are working with your toughest rival, and you have set your ego aside for world peace, world stability, and the good of the country. I mean that sincerely, you know I do.

I wanted to tick off a few of the issues that I care about—I'm going to do it very quickly because there's so many. Just to make my voice heard on those, and then ask you a question on a topic you raised, and we discussed before—the status of women in the world. In particular, violence against women in the world. Nicholas Kristof has written a series of articles on this, and I've spoken with our great new chairman, and I think his concern certainly lies in this direction, along with yours.

So, let me just say you face unbelievable challenges—you and the President-elect. Six years later, we still have 140,000 troops in Iraq. Seven years later, after the brutal attack of 9/11, we're fighting a resurgent Taliban in Afghanistan, and al-Qaeda poses a great threat to us on that safe haven border of the Afghan/Pakistan border.

The outrageous terrorist attack in Mumbai significantly heightened tensions between India and Pakistan, and the outbreak of violence in Gaza reminds us that Israel continues to face grave threats to its very existence, from never-ending rocket attacks. Our leadership is sorely needed there to protect the innocents—not just in the short term, but in the long term, where we hope to see a very good solution for all sides.

In Iran, we face defiance—in North Korea, the same. And due to our own inaction, we continue to be dependent on oil and gas, whose revenues line the pockets of hostile regimes, and this dependence has slowed our fight against global warming. And I'm so proud that you mentioned global warming in your talk, and that Senator Kerry, our chairman, is going to be so dedicated to helping you lead the charge in terms of a solution, internationally. As chairman of the Environment Committee, I will be by his side in that international treaty issue. HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, Africa, Asia, Latin America also need our attention.

So that's the list. And now I want to get to my questions. I have a few pictures to share with all of us, and they're brutal pictures, and I'm not showing them for shock value. I want to show them because I don't think we can look away from the plight of women in the world.

And, as I said, Nicholas Kristof confronts these issues in a series of compelling articles. In one, he tells us about the recent acid attack against young girls in Afghanistan who were going to school with their teachers. We have a photo of one of the victims to show you on that. I'm just going to do these very quickly.

He profiles another story about a Pakistani woman who was viciously burned by her husband with acid, because she dared to divorce him. This is what we're talking about. This is a second picture of Ms. Azar.

Thousands of women have suffered similar attacks throughout Asia—no prosecutions against perpetrators are carried out, Senator.

Kristof tells us the story of a Vietnamese girl named Sina Vann, who was kidnapped at age 13, and sold into sex slavery in Cambodia. When she refused to seek customers, she was tortured brutally with electric shocks, and locked in a coffin full of insects. And Kristof illustrates an act of horrific brutality in a piece called, "If This Isn't Slavery, What Is?" in which a young Cambodian girl had her eye gouged out by her brothel owner after taking time off to recover from a forced abortion. This is a picture of that very beautiful young woman.

So, I'm introducing some legislation. One is a companion to a bill introduced by Representative Carolyn Maloney, another one is the Afghan Women Empowerment Act, which many on this committee have worked with us on. And that's just the beginning. No woman or girl should ever have to live in fear or face persecution for being born female.

And, Senator, I know how deeply you feel about this, and so I wanted you to take a little more time, to talk about your commitment to this particular issue, and obviously I would be so pleased if you would commit to help us work on a legislation to fight this immorality.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, you have been such a leader, and I have been honored to be your colleague and your partner in a number of these efforts that have been undertaken on behalf of women around the world. And I want to pledge to you that, as Secretary of State I view these issues as central to our foreign policy, not as adjunct, or auxiliary or as any way lesser than all of the other issues that we have to confront.

I, too, have followed the stories that are exemplified by the pictures that you held up. I mean, it is heartbreaking beyond words that, you know, young girls are attacked on their way to school by Taliban sympathizers and members who do not want young women to be educated. It's not complicated. They want to maintain an attitude that keeps women, as I said in my testimony, unhealthy, unfed, uneducated, and this is something that results all too often in violence against these young women, both within their families, and from the outside.

This is not culture, this is not custom—this is criminal. And it will be my hope to persuade more governments—as I have attempted to do since I spoke at Beijing on these issues, you know, 13 and some years ago—that we cannot have a free, prosperous, peaceful, progressive world if women are treated in a such a discriminatory and violent way.

I have also read, closely, Nick Kristof's articles over the last many months, but in particular, the last weeks on the young women that he has both rescued from prostitution, and met, who have been enslaved and abused, tortured in every way—physically, emotionally, morally—and I take very seriously the function of the

State Department to lead our government through the Office on Human Trafficking, to do all that we can to end this modern form of slavery. We have sex slavery, we have wage slavery, and it is primarily a slavery of girls and women.

So, I look also forward, Senator, to reviewing your legislation, and working with you as a continuing partnership on behalf of these issues we care so much about.

And finally, the work that the women of the Senate did in connection with First Lady Laura Bush on behalf of the women of Afghanistan has been extremely important. That program was started in the State Department, it was mid-wifed by a group that I helped to start back in the Clinton administration, called Vital Voices. Mrs. Bush has been outspoken on behalf of the plight of Afghan women, on behalf of Aung San-Suu Kyi in Burma, and other women facing oppression around the world. And I'm very pleased that that project will be spun off to Georgetown, where it will continue under Mrs. Bush's sponsorship.

So, we're going to have a very active Women's Office, a very active Office on Trafficking. We're going to be speaking out consistently and strongly against discrimination and oppression of women, and slavery, in particular. Because I think that is in keeping—not only with American values, as we all recognize, but American national security interests, as well.

Senator BOXER. Well, I couldn't have asked for a better answer.

I wanted to note, Mr. Chairman, that even the most conservative historians have said that if women in the world were allowed to live up to their potential, it would bring the whole world forward. A lot of the problems we face really come from this mindset that half of the population doesn't matter, and can be abused and ignored, or hurt and can't contribute.

So, I think it's a key matter. So, I'll stop there, and just say how much I appreciate your comments, not only on this subject, but everything you've spoken about. It shows your breadth of understanding, and I feel the same way as my chairman. I think we have a team that's just extraordinary, and I'm proud—I hope to play a small role in that team, thank you.

Senator CLINTON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Boxer, thank you. Thanks for that important line of inquiry.

And let me just say, Senator Boxer has talked to me, personally, about how the committee might focus on this, and I'm determined that the committee will. We obviously have—with Lisa Murkowski, and Jean Shaheen who will be joining the committee—an important nucleus, but I think that all of the other members of the committee share a concern and passion about this.

So, we will find a way to appropriately work with the Secretary and see if we can't augment our international efforts on this.

Let me just say as I introduce Senator Voinovich, speaking for the members of the committee, myself, I know we are saddened by your decision. We're going to work the hell out of you over the course of the next 2 years and get the most we can. We're delighted that you are a member of this committee and we appreciate enormously the many contributions that you make. So, prepare for—you're not going to cruise these next 2 years.

Senator Voinovich.

Senator VOINOVICH. One of the reasons I'm not running is that I wanted to devote my full time to——

The CHAIRMAN. There you go.

Senator VOINOVICH [continuing]. These historic problems that we have. And how we handle them over the next 2 years will have a great impact on the future of our country and the world.

First of all, I want to thank you for the time we spent on the telephone, and also for your receiving a very lengthy letter from me. And for the record, I'd like to just give the categories—management of the State Department, visa waiver, fighting global anti-Semitism, Israel, United Nations management, Security Council, anti-Israel bias, enforcement of 1701, which we're both familiar with, stability and security in Europe, United States-Serbia relationships, Kosovo, NATO expansion, Russia, Canada, and United States relations.

The thing I'd like to spend some time on is management, and I think Senator Corker did a pretty good job of outlining his concern about management of the Department. But I think from a big picture point of view, we have—if we can all work together on a bipartisan basis—an absolutely wonderful opportunity to really change the image of the United States of America. And we all know that our public diplomacy is at a low ebb, I think Secretary Rice has tried to do a good job in the last couple of years in terms of multilateralism, but you know, once the water goes over the dam, it's hard to bring it back up.

And I think the Obama policy—smart power—I was in Europe this last month, and they're all excited about our new President. And I think, we all ought to be excited about the new national security team.

Jim Jones, I had him wax about what he thinks we should do a couple of years ago in Brussels at the German Marshall Fund meeting that we had. And I said, "Why can't we get this guy into this administration? He's got the right idea." And then you've got Gates who has the right idea; you have the idea. And so this smart power is something that we really need to focus on.

I would be interested in your reaction to the recommendations of Joe Nye and Dick Armitage in terms of smart power.

The other issue, of course, is when you get into the management of the Department, I think your getting Jack Lew in there, and Steinberg doing the policy, and the fact that you recognized that you're going to be putting out a lot of fires, and somebody's going to have to be working on this stuff on a day-to-day basis, is important.

But I think your recognition also of priorities—prioritizing your time, where you're going to spend your time, who's going to do that, and the management here, is extremely important, and I sent to you—and I don't know whether you read it or not, but the American Academy of Public Diplomacy has come out with a foreign affairs budget for the future. And for the record it finds that the Secretary lacks the tools, people, competencies, authorities, programs and funding to meet U.S. foreign policy demands effectively, and talks about hiring another 4,000 people from 2010 to 2014.

Again, I'd be interested either hearing from you about if you've read it, or what you think about it. I haven't met personally, yet, with Jack Lew, but I definitely intend to do it.

And I want the chairman to know that, whether I'm on this committee or not, I'm going to stay on this management thing, as a ranking member of the oversight of government management and the Federal workforce, and on appropriations, and on foreign policy—this is a big deal, and I think it really needs to get done. So, what are your thoughts on that?

Senator CLINTON. Well, first, Senator I thank you for your emphasis on workforce issues, management issues, better utilization of resource issues—that's been a hallmark of your service. First in Ohio, and now, of course, in the Senate. So, I welcome your involvement and your ideas as we go forward.

I want to say a word about your reference to smart power, because clearly that is what the Obama administration and I will try to do. It is a recognition that it shouldn't be an either/or debate. Either we use military force, and all of the strength and power that we have, or we use diplomacy and development. We want to marry those, because we think that will give us a more effective foreign policy for our country.

And, you know, General Jones is a perfect example. You know that he was asked by President Bush and Secretary Rice to work in the Middle East, and starting in December 2007, that's exactly what he did—working with the Palestinian authority and the Israeli Defense Force to build up security in the West Bank. And I think the results were very promising, with sustained bottoms' up effort, day in and day out, working to bridge gaps of understanding and trust. There was a turnover of security from the Israelis to the Palestinians, which is still—as of this moment—holding. And that is the work that General Jones, and General Dayton, and others that he was involved with, have been done, and we're going to continue that kind of approach.

So, smart power is the combined tools that we have.

Senator VOINOVICH. One of the things that I'm concerned about is the turf—and you've got Susan Rice going to the United Nations, she's going to become a part of the Cabinet, and I hope that there's a lot of discussion given about who's responsible for what, and a recognition that there will be times when you'll all be stepping on each others' toes, but that you're doing it for the best interest of the team. I think that that's very, very important. The worst thing that we can have would be—something come out, say that we've got a conflict there.

I'd like to switch to another issue that I'm very interested in, and that is—and you haven't really mentioned it—is the issue of energy independence, and its impact on our foreign policy.

And, as you know, for years we were on the Environment and Public Works Committee, and I talked about harmonizing the environment, and our energy, our economy and national security. And on this trip to Europe, I was frightened when I found out the influence that Russia is having in terms of natural gas, including Great Britain.

And I thought to myself, this threat of being cut off is going to have an influence on their decisionmaking, and it's extremely

important that we not be, you know, in the hands of somebody else in terms of our energy.

And I'm wondering—have you thought about that aspect of it? And climate change is very much a part of this.

Senator CLINTON. Right.

Senator VOINOVICH. But it seems to me that we ought to really raise the issue of energy independence in terms of our national security, and also being able to make the right decisions in the world when some of our allies may not be able to because they're frightened that somebody's going to shut off their gas.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, the President-elect and I could not agree more with your point of view. It's one of the reasons why the President-elect has talked about an energy partnership for Latin America—looking to find ways, through technology and other activities, we can work together to become more energy independent in this hemisphere. And of course, we have problems in our own hemisphere with some of the providers of energy, like Hugo Chavez, and you know, President Morales—we have problems even in this hemisphere, with countries feeling, you know, somewhat worried about what will happen with their energy supplies.

As you and Senator Lugar have pointed out, that becomes even more acute in Europe. So, I think this deserves a lot of attention—it is part of the climate change agenda, but it also deserves separate attention. And to that end, I will follow the recommendation of the legislation that Senator Lugar passed, which says we should have someone coordinating energy security issues in the State Department, to work with the Europeans, to work with others to try to come up with ways that we can both promote energy independence, so they're not so vulnerable, but also try to help equip them with ways of dealing with their current vulnerability, particularly to Russia.

Because I see this as a big security challenge, and, you know, I know of your longstanding interest in Serbia, and you know, with the purchase of the gas company in Serbia by Gazprom, there is some concern on the part of the Serbians. Well, what's going to happen to their gas supply? Are they going to be kind of a pawn in whatever the larger Russian ambitions are about energy?

So, this is a very timely issue, and it should go hand in hand with our climate change work.

Senator VOINOVICH. Well, I hope that because the cost of gasoline has gone down that we're all going to just sit back like we did in 1973 and just say, "Everything's going to be fine," because it's not going to be fine. And I would really hope that you and your team would give a great deal of consideration to how do we become energy independent—meaning, I'd like to say, find more—

Senator CLINTON. Right.

Senator VOINOVICH [continuing]. Use less. And then the international dimension of this that then—in terms of public diplomacy, to get the other folks in the world that are emitting greenhouse gases to come together in a unique way to say, "We're going to do this as a team," rather than us coming up with the technology and then forcing it down their throat.

Senator CLINTON. Well, I think that the chairman, who's had a longstanding interest in this, knows that as we move toward

Copenhagen and attempt to craft a climate change agreement, all of the major nations must be part of it. You know, China, India, Russia and others, they have to be part of whatever agreement we put forth. And I think—as I say, this can be both included in, but also independently given attention to by emphasizing energy security, which I intend to do.

Senator VOINOVICH. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator Nelson.

Senator NELSON. Senator Clinton, I have just a couple of questions. But I want to say at the outset that this Senator thinks that your husband's Clinton Global Initiative is an extremely positive thing to have in a relationship with the future Secretary of State.

The fact that that Global Initiative has done such good things all over the world—the dispensing of antiretroviral drugs, the working on poverty and hunger, the promotion of development in the Third World—I think is a significant accomplishment. That work can only lend additional credibility to your coming to the table as the foreign policy representative of the United States Government. I want that on the record.

Now, I want to pick up on something that Senator Boxer said. I had the privilege in our subcommittee on this committee of chairing the hearings about rapes of American contractor women in Iraq and Afghanistan. And what we found, in dramatic testimony from very courageous women that came forth and testified to the committee, was that there was always an attempt among State Department contractor personnel—and that, of course, was the jurisdictional hook, through our Foreign Relations Committee, but the same applied to contractor personnel in the Department of Defense—always the attempt to sweep it under the rug, not have it conveyed to the United States attorneys for the proper prosecution.

When we got this out in the open, we have tried to encourage the cooperation and collaboration between those three Departments—Justice, Defense, and State. I bring it out for your consideration.

Now, let me just raise just a couple of questions.

Because of the beneficence of this committee in allowing me to travel, I have seen a good part of the Third World, of this planet, where there is such poverty and disease. But we come right back to the Western Hemisphere, and the poorest nation in this hemisphere is Haiti. Please keep your eye on Haiti.

Senator Clinton, you've already been briefed on this, but one of the things that you're going to face is, there is an American that is missing in Iran. Because he is a Floridian, and because he has left behind a wife and seven children, I have gone to the Iranian Ambassador at the United Nations, who will see me even though his government will not allow him to talk to our U.N. Ambassador. He operates under the fiction that he will see me because I'm a representative of the people of the State of Florida.

But the door has been closed at every turn. What I have said to him, and I speak through the lens of this committee hearing, that out of human compassion, this is a great opportunity for the country of Iran to crack the door because we think he is being held by the Government of Iran in a secret prison in Iran. And if we want to have some renewed relations, this is a good first opportunity.

Then I would just ask you—we've basically had a lack of a vigorous policy toward Latin America. And what a great opportunity for the Obama administration. In the memory of President Kennedy's vigorous Latin America policy, the Alliance for Progress. Do you have any thoughts on that?

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Nelson, you've covered a number of important issues. And let me start with your question about Latin America. I have a lot of thoughts about that, and I think you're right—it is a tremendous opportunity, and I look forward—on behalf of the President-elect—and working with Members of Congress who have a particular concern and interest in Latin America to making it abundantly clear that the Obama administration is seeking partnerships and friendships across Latin America.

We're looking forward, with great anticipation, to the Summit of the Americas, that will be held in April. We want to, you know, not only respond to the issues that are in the headlines, as the President-elect did yesterday with President Calderon—issues of security, issues of criminality, and narcotrafficking and the like, but we want to seize the opportunities in Latin America, which is why the energy partnership that the President-elect has suggested has so much potential.

The countries of Latin America are really our closest allies. That, if you look at trade, if you look at familial relationships, you can see all of these connections. And I think that we're going to put a new face on American diplomacy, as we reach out to Latin America.

That is particularly a mission of mine, and I share your concern about Haiti. It is, as you say, one of the poorest nations in the world—the poorest in our hemisphere. I hope that we can have a comprehensive approach that could alleviate the suffering of the people of Haiti. And I look forward to working with you on that.

With respect to the Floridian who is in prison, it would be an extraordinary opportunity for the Government of Iran to make such a gesture. To permit contact, to release him, to make it clear that there is a new attitude in Iran, as we believe there will be with the Obama administration toward engagement, carefully constructed, and with very clear outcomes attempted.

Senator NELSON. His name is Bob Levinson.

Senator CLINTON. That's right.

And, you know, Senator, on contractors—this is going to be a big issue for this committee. We have seen the abuses by contractors, but even when they are not headline-grabbing abuses, there has been a steady transfer of authority and resources from government employees, and a chain of accountability to contractors. And we have reaped the very difficult consequences of that. We know, obviously, of the security contractors, and some of the difficulties that they have presented, but it's been contractors across the board. We've used so many of them—particularly in Iraq, but not exclusively.

And I think we have to take a hard look at whether we want the U.S. Government to turn into a contracting agency, or whether we're going to be smart about using our resources, because in most instances, contracting out a job costs more than keeping it in-



house, and building up expertise and experience, and imposing accountability.

So, I look forward to working with you and your subcommittee to determine what we can do about contractors, but I would just end on this cautionary note: The chairman asked me about the role of the State Department in Iraq. We're going to try to fulfill any of the pledges that we've made in the agreement of friendship and cooperation—our civilian employees need to be protected. As we withdraw our troops, we have to be absolutely assured that they will be protected by the Iraqis, or we have to use contracts, or we have to wonder whether we can send them out to the countryside, if there is still the threat of violence.

So, this has direct effects on how we're going to perform our diplomatic responsibilities inside Iraq and other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Nelson.

Senator Murkowski.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And welcome to you, Senator Clinton. Thank you for your leadership, for your willingness to step forward and assume this very, very important position for our country, for the nation. I truly appreciate all that you are poised to do, and what you have done in the past.

We had an opportunity in my office last week to discuss an issue that is, I think, vitally important to this country. And that is our role as an Arctic nation. And I know oftentimes, my colleagues don't view the United States as an Arctic nation, but we are, by virtue of Alaska, and we have opportunities, when it comes to a leadership role, in collaboration on research, on environmental issues, on issues as they relate to commerce.

And we're seeing more of those issues present themselves, as we see a world up there that is more and more free of sea ice—the loss of summer sea ice from climate change is having a truly dramatic effect on the Arctic. And the Bush administration saw this unfolding, we've been working with them for about the past 18 months, to advance a new Arctic policy. Our Arctic policy is about 15 years stale. That was just released on Friday, I don't know if you've had an opportunity to fully review it.

But I'd like your comment here this morning on the evolving role of the Arctic, on the role that we can play, as an Arctic nation, in dealing with our neighbors. We discussed the issue of Russia, and oftentimes we've got some very difficult relationships with them, but the opportunity on issues as they relate to research and an evolving world up north, how that might play out.

And if you could just speak to that issue this morning. I have missed most of your comments this morning and I apologize for that. I have been in two other confirmation hearings. But, I'm pretty certain that you haven't fielded, yet, a question on the Arctic.

Senator CLINTON. And, Senator, it's very timely that one has been raised, because as I have said to you before, and even when you and your husband hosted Senator McCain's CODEL when we were in Alaska, and saw for ourselves some of the changes that are going on, in the Arctic, both on land and in the sea—you have been a leader on this issue, and I hope your time has come, Senator.

Because I believe that the issues of the Arctic are one of those long-term matters that will dramatically affect our commercial, our environmental, our energy futures, that we have got to start attending to now.

So, to that end, I agree with you completely, that the issues that are posed by the recent Bush administration report that did come out just a few days ago, the work of the Arctic Council that has been an attempt to try to summon the best thinking of the government and outside experts, will find a very receptive ear in the State Department.

I think President-elect Obama and I see that this is one of those areas that offers a chance for cooperation that might lead not only to positive actions with respect to the Arctic, but deepen our partnerships with Russia and others across the board.

So, to that end, we will be working to try to sort through the recommendations and the ideas in the recent report, to see how we fit that into already existing frameworks, and consider what additional actions and positions might be necessary, but I agree with you completely. You know, maybe because the change has been relatively rapid, with the melting of the sea ice—people haven't kept up with what is going on now in the Arctic. And when I was in your office, and you were telling me about how cruise ships now are going to Point Barrow, I was shocked.

Senator MURKOWSKI. So were the people of Point Barrow.

Senator CLINTON. So were the people of Point Barrow. I mean, look at the map—it's the northernmost place in the United States, and it's not a place that one would have thought, previously, was on the tour for cruise ships. We know that there is going to be a necessity to map out our Continental Shelf. We know that there will be disputes over energy resources, and minerals, and other natural resources in the Arctic.

To go along with that, I know that hand in hand with concerns about the Arctic is, you know, the Oceans Convention, the Law of the Sea, which would clarify a lot of the problems that you're going to face in Alaska, if we don't have a national Arctic policy that also includes what our international position is on the oceans.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Will ratification of the Law of the Sea Treaty be a priority for you?

Senator CLINTON. Yes; it will be. And it will be because it is long overdue, Senator. The Law of the Seas Treaty is supported by the Joint Chiefs of Staff's environmental, energy, and business interests. I have spoken with some of our naval leaders, and they consider themselves to be somewhat disadvantaged by our not having become a party to the Law of the Seas.

Our industrial interests—particularly with seabed mining—just shut up. There's nothing that they can do, because there's no protocol that they can feel comfortable that gives them the opportunity to pursue commercial interests.

So, for all of those reasons—and I mention it in conjunction with the Arctic because I think they go hand in hand—we've got to figure out where our boundaries are, you know, people start drilling in areas that are now ice-free most of the year, and we don't know where they can and can't drill, or whether we can—we're going to be disadvantaged.

So, I think that you will have a very receptive audience in our State Department and in our administration.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, I'm very pleased, very encouraged to hear that, and truly look forward to the opportunity to be working with you to advance these very important issues. And as we look to some of the basics that we're lacking up in the Arctic, whether it's the capacity for search and rescue, you know what we need to be prepared for in this ever-evolving world without borders, it's quite a concept to think.

One more question, another that Alaskans look to with great interest, because of our proximity to North Korea. As we look to the hot spots of the world, we certainly appreciate all of the other threats that you will be dealing with as Secretary of State, but you kind of get most nervous about those that are more proximate to you, and North Korea is certainly to us.

In that vein, what do you see the future of the six-party talks under your tenure? How do you anticipate that you'll be able to—whether it's jump-start the process, or—how do you see that moving forward?

Senator CLINTON. Senator, I've had several lengthy conversations with Secretary Rice, who has brought me up to date on the status of the six-party talks, it is a framework that the President-elect and I believe has merit, but it also provides an opportunity, as Secretary Rice has testified before this committee, for bilateral contact, as well, between North Korea and the United States.

Again, this is under review, we're looking at all of the record of the negotiation up to this date. Our goal is to end the North Korean nuclear programs—both the plutonium reprocessing program, and the highly enriched uranium program, which there is reason to believe exists, although never quite verified.

And it is our strong belief that the six-party talks, particularly the role that China is currently playing, along with our close allies, South Korea and Japan, is a vehicle for us to exert pressure on North Korea in a way that is more likely to alter their behavior.

Again, I have no illusions about that. I think it takes tough, reality-based diplomacy to determine what is doable. We've got to end North Korea as a proliferator, there is certainly reason to believe that North Korea has been involved with Syrian efforts, we know that it was involved with Libyan efforts. So, it's not only preventing the threat from North Korea, which is of particular interest to Hawaii, Alaska, and the west coast of the United States—but it is their role as a proliferator.

So, we will embark on a very progressive effort to try to determine the best way forward to achieve our objectives with them.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you for your, again, willingness and your great capacity in the ice effort. Appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Murkowski. Let me just say to you, and others interested, that we are already—I've talked to Senator Lugar about this, and I've talked to Senator Clinton about it—we are now laying the groundwork for, and expect to try to take up the Law of the Sea Treaty, so that will be one of the priorities of the committee, and the key here is just timing, how we proceed.

Senator Cardin.

Senator CARDIN. Well, first, Senator Kerry, let me tell you how proud all of us are to serve on this committee, particularly with you as our chairman. We're looking forward to this time, and while you know the challenges are great, we thank you for stepping forward as chairman of the committee.

And to Senator Clinton, thank you. Thank you for being willing to do this and to your entire family. I know it was a difficult decision. I know how much you love being a Senator from New York and I just thank you for stepping forward. The issues are so difficult in this country and there couldn't be a better person to represent our Nation, and we thank you for doing that.

We had a chance to talk about several issues when you were in my office over the weekend. Your opening statement and your responses to questions have covered much of the area. I particularly want to just underscore the challenge you're going to have in the Middle East between the Israelis and the Palestinians, and I think you have covered that in your statement and in your responses.

I want to deal first, with another void that you've created in the U.S. Senate because of your selection as Secretary of State. And obviously there's going to be a void for the people of New York as you leave that Senate seat, but also the Helsinki Commission, which you serve as an active member. You've been a very valuable member of the Commission and I will have the honor of chairing the Commission during these next 2 years. And you know, it was established as the United States arm to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, created in 1976 with President Ford as a way to engage Europe on security issues, on economic issues, and on human rights.

It's perhaps best known for its work in the former Soviet Union. When it spoke up against the human rights violations, it led to changes within the Soviet Union. In recent years, it's been very helpful on creating a strategy in Europe to deal with anti-Semitism, and other forms of discrimination.

The Helsinki Commission is very actively involved on the human trafficking issues, and we've had discussions here today about necessity to monitor, not only the activities from those countries where the women—and they're usually women and children—come from, but also the receiving countries, and to deal with the problems. We now have an annual report from the State Department to see how well countries are doing on trafficking and a lot of that work came out of the Helsinki Commission. The list goes on and on and on.

My point is that I think the OSCE, and United States involvement through the Helsinki Commission can be a valuable tool in your game plan on dealing with the foreign policy objectives of the United States, and whether it is engaging Russia—Russia, as you know, is an active member of OSCE—dealing with global climate change or dealing with refugee issues. And I would just urge you to challenge us as to how the OSCE can be more effective in dealing with your game plan for this country's foreign policy.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Cardin, it's been an honor to serve on the Helsinki Commission, and I know you have, not only

a longstanding interest, but involvement going back to your days in the House, with respect to OSCE, and the Helsinki Accords.

And when you and I were talking, we briefly discussed how history sometimes plays out. Because at the time of the Helsinki Accords, then-President Ford was urged by both the right and the left not to go and negotiate those, that they would not be a good idea, and he—very courageously—said that he was going to go forward, because any opportunity to negotiate, to try to set up a framework for human rights, was in America's interest.

And we now can look back and see how President Ford's vision, which led to the Helsinki Accords, which obviously the former Soviet Union was a party to, actually contributed to the eventual breakup of the Soviet Union, because it gave legitimacy and voice to people who were dissidents and had human rights complaints.

So, I think this work must continue. I look forward to figuring out ways that we can work together. And I also would appreciate any advice you would have about how the framework of OSCE and the Helsinki Accords could be, perhaps, modernized, and transported into the 21st century with some of the problems that we see around the world today. Because the problems are certainly different, but human nature isn't. And how we take advantage of diplomacy and agreements and setting goals on human rights will be a priority, and doing that in service of outcomes like what we saw with the Helsinki Accords, is what I'm interested in.

Senator CARDIN. And we will. That's one of the highest priorities for us, to evaluate how we can modernize the Helsinki Commission and the OSCE process. We are fortunate to have representatives from the executive branch that serve on the Commission with us, so we will do this in conjunction with your own views as to how you think we can best carry out the objectives of this country.

Let me mention one or two issues that are relevant to the human rights issues, but also relevant to the broader issues: the refugee problem, particularly as it relates to Iraq. We hear a lot about how we're going to ultimately resolve the circumstances in Iraq, but when you have 5 million displaced individuals, many of whom are in other countries, it makes it extremely challenging to see a lasting solution in that region. Several Senators have sent a letter to President-elect Obama, urging the creation of a White House office on refugee issues, just so we can get the type of visibility we need on refugees.

Clearly, this is a high area of concern within foreign policy in the State Department, and I would welcome your involvement as to how we come to grips with the refugee crisis in that region.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, as you know there is an office in the State Department, Population, Migration, and Refugees, it's our intention to staff that with effective and creative professionals, because we agree that the refugee problem is growing worse in many places around the world.

You referenced Iraq—one of the challenges of the Iraqi Government and in so far as we are involved, our Government, in you know, sort of balancing how we're going to support the stability of the Iraqi Government and help them deal with the repatriation and return—both externally and internally—of Iraqis is a big challenge to the Iraqi Government that we're conscious of.

But we have refugee populations, some of decades-long standing, some of a few days standing, in so many places—I will do my very best to elevate this issue, to give you the kind of expertise within the State Department that will give you comfort that we’re going to make this a high priority, and to come up with solutions to some of our longstanding refugee challenges.

This is a very complex issue, because everywhere we look in the world, conflict, famine, disease, the economy—we have refugees. And so our hope is that we can get a more comprehensive strategy to deal with refugees, come to the Congress to get the funding for refugees, a problem which is compounded by the point that Senator Lugar made at the beginning of the hearing, about the food crisis.

So, I would welcome working with you and those who are concerned as you are, to come up with an effective strategy for the United States to deploy, with respect to refugees.

Senator CARDIN. Well, thank you very much for that answer.

Many of us have been asking you questions on energy. Energy is a huge international issue and the State Department is going to have to play a critical role. We talked about the global climate change issues and we’ve talked about some of the conduct of other countries trying to stop energy from flowing between different countries.

I want to talk about one other issue. We have a lot of mineral-rich countries, in which citizens are very poor. We think that many of those revenues are going against U.S. security interests, funding activities that are against our country’s interests. There is an effort made for transparency in extraction, so that we set up the model system for how a nation should handle its mineral wealth, used for the benefit of the people of their own country.

The United States is participating in that discussion. I think we could be more aggressive in trying to move forward. We’ve talked about foreign assistance. Many of these countries that have mineral wealth are receiving foreign aid from the United States and we don’t know where their mineral wealth is going. So, I just want to bring that to your attention, and I think this is an area that we can make much further advancements in trying to help deal with the poverty around the world.

Senator CLINTON. Very creative suggestion, Senator, and we should look at the models of countries that have handled their mineral wealth to the advantage of their people. Botswana comes to mind—they’ve been very good stewards of their diamonds, and have invested in roads and schools and infrastructure in Botswana. So, we should be looking for best practices, and see if there is a way to create a regulatory framework that would give both protection and incentives to mineral-rich countries, so that they would be able to stand up for their rights, and then use the revenues in a very positive way to enhance the well-being of their people.

Senator CARDIN. Thank you very much.

Senator CLINTON. Thank you.

Senator CARDIN. I look forward to working with you.

Senator CLINTON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thanks a lot, Senator Cardin.

And let me just say that given the time, here, we're going to have two more rounds—two more questioners—before we do the mandatory break at quarter of.

And just for the knowledge of the press and others—and many of them are already aware of this—we have a very extensive questioning process that takes place, prior even to our convening here, called Questions For the Record. And the committee has already submitted—just through the Chair, over 138 questions, and there were additional questions by other Senators, all of which have been answered by Senator Clinton, and we're very appreciative for the in-depth answers. We know it's an enormous take, and a lot of people have, you know, ground away on it. But we're very, very appreciative.

What it does do is facilitate the hearings considerably, and help us to sort of narrow the areas of inquiry that we need to do here, now.

With that said, let me turn now to Senator DeMint.

Senator DEMINT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Lugar.

And, Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit for the record, a longer list of questions that I will not have time to ask today.

The CHAIRMAN. Fine. But we are going to try to proceed forward, so we'll try to get those answered in the next 24 hours for you, Senator.

Senator DEMINT. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Because we do have a business meeting scheduled for Thursday.

Senator DEMINT. Thank you.

Senator Clinton, congratulations on your nomination. I appreciate your call, it's amazing what a little communication can do, so I feel a lot better about you already.

I am optimistic and hopeful about your role as Secretary of State, and despite the news accounts that say that I'm the one that's going to ask you the hard questions about potential conflicts of interest, I have no questions about your integrity.

I would support Senator Corker and others who support your nomination, in appealing to you to do whatever is necessary to silence any critics before you take office. Enough said, as far as I'm concerned.

The State Department, over several administrations, has a mixed reputation, at best. And in private, talking to military leaders, business people, international adoption agencies, independent aid workers, even foreign officials, I often hear that the State Department is more of an obstacle than a help, or mixed reviews, again, at best.

We even have foreign governments calling our office, and coming in and meet with us to want to bypass the State Department to develop better relations with our country. And I'm sure other members have experienced the same thing. So, the challenge is tremendous.

You mentioned in your opening statement the many challenges all around the world—economic and human rights, and there's so much to do that it's mind-boggling. And with our economy, and our debt, and the domestic needs that we have and incredible levels of spending that we're experiencing now, it's very difficult to see an

expanded role for America around the world—certainly one that has to be prioritized.

And I would join with Senator Isakson, who paraphrased, but we need to be that city on the hill, I'm not sure that we can afford to build cities on the hill all around the country, although I hope we can play a role.

With so much to do, I just wanted to ask you to comment about other ways that we might accomplish our goals. I've seen—as I've traveled and talked to people from around the world—that very often business, trade, commerce is our best ambassador. And even in difficult political times, when Germany and France were squabbling with the United States, I have Michelin headquarters and BMW headquarters in my district—business goes on and everybody gets along just fine, despite the political wrangling.

And we also see private charities, aid workers, missionaries doing so much good. How do you see the role of the State Department in facilitating the good private sector things that are there, without trying to replace them and maybe without trying to manage them?

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, I appreciate very much your posing this question because I think it's a real opportunity for us if we can figure out how best to better coordinate and facilitate the private sector, and the not-for-profit and religious community of the United States on behalf of humanitarian and commercial efforts.

I think that the State Department has been, you know, reviewed in a mixed way for a number of years. In part, it's because the work of the State Department both in diplomacy and development, is not as well understood, and sometimes appears to be frustrating. I mean, trying to argue over where a comma goes, or what the appropriate language would be, and how to actually get to that treaty—it does raise, in the eyes of the American people—questions about, well, what is it we do?

And I think we have a bigger job, which I will assume, of trying to explain to the American people why our national security depends on defense, diplomacy, and development.

Now, defense is primarily a government mission, as we know. And thank goodness for these young men and women and their commanders who wear the uniform of our country.

Diplomacy is primarily a government mission, but there are lots of ways that nongovernment actors, like corporations, like religious organizations, like charities and foundations, are actually building relationships with foreign governments and foreign people, all the time. Which, if done in the right way, are really value-added to who we are as a nation, and what we can achieve.

You know, right now in Rwanda, a number of foundations, a number of churches, a number of private sector actors are all working to try to build that country back up.

So, I would hope that when we look at the State Department, we think of the role of foreign policy, diplomacy, and development as involving not just those who are the Foreign Service officers and the civil service professionals and the development experts, but really it's all hands on deck. We have a lot of work to, in my view, kind of repair damage, and get out there, and present America as we know we are. But I don't think in this complex and dangerous



world, there is any substitute for the role of the State Department and USAID professionals.

So, it will be my undertaking to make this Department as efficient as possible, so that you know you're getting your money's worth. To streamline it, as much as possible. I mean, I will be frustrated—as you will be—if all we do is pile up paper. I want strategies, I want specific ideas, I want more partnerships.

That's how I see the role of the State Department in the 21st century, that's how I hope that USAID will be revitalized, to perform that role, as well. But the disparity of resources is such that when you've got more than 10 times the resources going to the Defense Department, than you have going to the State Department and foreign aid, the Defense Department has been, in effect, recreating mini State Departments.

You know, they're out doing development assistance, and rule of law and other things. Why? Because as I said earlier, they have a presumption of being able to move much more quickly, the money we give them is, in many respects, more flexible.

So, I think we have to see, how do we get what we want, and what we're paying for, out of our State Department and USAID. And I want to work closely with you and others on this committee. I want new ideas, I want best practices. But I don't think there's any substitute for having seasoned, experienced professionals and experts, sort of leading our efforts on diplomacy and development. And working, where possible, in partnership and coordination with the private sector, and the not-for-profit sector.

Senator DEMINT. Thank you.

I can see I'm not going to get to too many of my questions, but just a couple of concerns, and on a last question.

Just as you're concerned about the disadvantaged difficulty of women and children around the world, much the same can be said for religious persecution. Even in countries like Iraq, that we're doing so much sacrifice to free, Iraqi Christians can't come home. I would hope that you would be sensitive to that.

And also, you've spoken about Israel, and I think there's widespread agreement of our support there, but it appears to be naive and illogical to continue diplomacy and calls for peace with governments that are publicly opposed to the existence of Israel. How we reconcile that is very difficult.

One last concern, I think, one difficulty that you will have is balancing protecting our sovereignty as a nation with international cooperation. I've seen some of our agreements with the United Nations, the United States is going to bear the brunt of the expense, and often the execution of what the U.N. promises. They don't back up their own resolutions, as in Iraq, or now in Iran, North Korea—we submit, and we comply and yield, in many ways, our decisionmaking to organizations like the United Nations, but then we're left holding the bag with what they don't do.

And maybe in just the minute or so that I have left, how can we do a better job of being cooperative, at the same time, protecting our sovereignty?

Senator CLINTON. Well, I think the absolute bottom line for any agreement or undertaking by the U.S. Government is that it has to be, in our view, in the best interest of the United States. That

it furthers our national security, advances our interests, and both protects and reflects our values. That's how I see my responsibility.

I think there are ways that we can cooperate more than we have, without—in any way—impinging upon our sovereignty, our identity or our security interests or values. But I will remain very conscious of that, Senator.

Because two issues that you mentioned—religious persecution—you know, that is anathema to Americans. I mean, we believe in the freedom to worship. And there is an office in the State Department that is committed to religious freedom, but I believe that that is an area that we want to talk more about, that we want to raise, because of the significance.

You point out, rightly, that, you know, we've given a lot of aid, and we've given a lot of blood on behalf of certain countries that persecute—not just Christians—but people of other religious beliefs, even interfaith beliefs within the same denomination, or a particular view of religion.

I think on Israel, you cannot negotiate with Hamas until it renounces violence, recognizes Israel, and agrees to abide by past agreements. That is just, for me, an absolute. That is the U.S. Government's position; that is the President-elect's position.

And finally, on the questions—we will turn those around in the next 24 hours, Senator. I know that the chairman and Senator Lugar submitted very thoughtful, extensive questions, and we responded to those—more than 300 of them. We will take whatever other questions for the record, any member has, and turn those around within 24 hours, because I want you to have as comprehensive a record as possible, for you to consider my nomination.

Senator DEMINT. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just shock your troops by telling you that, unfortunately, we have to—in order to move forward—close the record by 12 noon tomorrow.

Senator CLINTON. OK.

The CHAIRMAN. So, we'll get the Starbucks out tonight. Look at those smiles over there.

Senator CLINTON. Don't look too closely, because they haven't had a lot of sleep, they're not looking too alert today.

The CHAIRMAN. What we're going to do is, Senator Menendez will close out the morning questioning, and then we'll come back, Senator Isakson, you'll lead off as close to 2 o'clock as possible. It's slightly dependent on someone else's schedule, but we'll figure that out.

We'll go through the rest of the questioning, and then we'll have another round. We'll probably shorten the second round, but I think Senator Clinton and I have discussed this, we are both prepared to stay here as late as necessary to try to get through it.

There are other areas of inquiry that I know a lot of us have, and there are some important subjects that we haven't yet touched on, so we need to expedite that, if we can.

Senator Menendez.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to start off by saying, Senator Clinton, I appreciate the significant voluntary steps that go above and beyond the require-

ments of the law and ethics regulations that you have been willing to put forth. I think that they are exemplary, and should answer a lot of people's concerns. And, as I say, they are above and beyond the law and the ethics requirements, and I appreciate that.

Particularly, I appreciate that even pledges and proposed contributions to the Clinton Foundation will be eligible for review by the Deputy Legal Advisor and designated agency ethics official at the State Department. That, again, is above and beyond. And I think that that's the type and tone of tenor to set and I want to salute you for doing that.

You and I have had the conversation to talk about something I care about a great deal, which is foreign assistance. We've held and I have had the privilege in the last Congress, to chair the Subcommittee on Foreign Assistance, and we've held a series of hearings on it.

You know, it's interesting to note that nearly a half a century ago, President Kennedy sent a letter to the Congress, in which he said some things that if we were to hear today would largely be the same.

He said, "The economic collapse of those free, but less developed nations, which now stand poised between sustained growth and economic chaos would be disastrous to our national security, harmful to our comparative prosperity, and offensive to our conscience." He said, "No objective supporter of foreign aid can be satisfied with the existing program, actually a multiplicity of programs. Bureaucratically fragmented, awkward, slow, administration is diffused over a haphazard and irrational structure, covering at least four departments, and several other agencies."

And he went to talk about the morale of those employees trying to pursue that. That was nearly a half a century ago, and in some respects, I could say that that is a large degree of what we face today.

So, as one of the most powerful tools of soft diplomacy, I'd like to hear—you know, some of us are concerned. I've heard about the designation of Mr. Lew as the Deputy Secretary of State for Resources and Management; that he will be the advocate. That's a broad title, a lot of resources, and a lot of management.

The question is, How do we ensure that we elevate foreign assistance? How do we ensure that we appoint a high-profile manager to lead that agency? A strong, independent voice for foreign assistance, building up the staff at AID, making sure that a lot of what's gone to the Defense Department by—simply by the lack of having the appropriate structure and effort at State, comes back to State where it really should be done, in cooperation with the Defense Department. Give me a sense of confidence that, under your leadership, this is something that we're going to see pursued vigorously.

Senator CLINTON. Well, you have my commitment that it will be pursued vigorously. It is an area that I care deeply about, it is where much of my, you know, early public voluntary efforts were directed, and I am hopeful, Senator, that we're going to put in place a system that will, No. 1, rationalize what we have there now. And not only within the State Department and USAID, but as you know, there are pockets of foreign aid programs across the

government that are technically under the coordination of the Secretary, but are not really working together as they should.

And when we look at USAID, we've got to get a handle on the contracting out of functions, and personnel. It leaves us without the capacity to respond to the many needs that we know are there.

When we look at what's called "the G function" in the State Department, that's where you see Population, Migration, and Refugees. And, you know, having served very happily in this body, I know how, how it seems that if an issue of such importance as refugees is not getting attention, then let's put a coordinator in the White House, and maybe that will get people's attention.

But, of course, what we ought to be doing is making the existing State Department programs work effectively. We have PEPFAR, which has been very successful, and is a great tribute to the Bush administration. But it is within the State Department, but not within USAID, but it utilizes many of the development and health experts in USAID—both on the government payroll and on contracts—to actually do the work.

We have the Millennium Challenge Corporation, which is a very creative, and innovative approach to foreign aid, which is an independent entity, which again looks to USAID for advice and expertise. So, we've got to get our arms around what you could think of as traditional foreign aid—health, education, economic empowerment, and the like—plus what is now becoming increasingly important, that's the reconstruction, stability, conflict resolution, peace-keeping challenges that we face.

And, Senator, I am determined that we're going to present to you a plan and a system that will try to maximize coordination, minimize redundancy, and make the case for the increased resources that are so desperately needed if we intend to meet the missions that we've been given.

And that is why I think Jack Lew, who will fill the Deputy position on Budget and Resources, is the point of accountability, because so much of what we're going to have to straighten out and fix, are resource decisions.

And we've got to make the case—I think Secretary Gates is open to the case—I know the President-elect is very committed, he wants a—actually an increase in foreign aid, because he believes so strongly in its efficacy as part of our foreign policy. They're committed to transferring assets and functions back to the State Department, but we have to prove that we're ready to take them on. That we're going to handle them, that we can instill confidence in you and Senator Cardin and others about these core functions, and you know, answer Senator DeMint's concerns about, you know, are we really doing what we need to do, here.

So, that is my pledge to you, and I'm going to work as hard as I know how to make it happen.

Senator MENENDEZ. We look forward to working with you on that. Let me just touch on specific areas, and then I hope not to give you any questions at the end of the day so you can move through the process—written questions.

But, in 100 days, the new administration will inherit the Summit of the Americas. And it will be either the President-elect's imprint, or it will be that which existed before.

We have challenge in Latin America, and our challenge is our lack of engagement in a way that makes a difference.

We need to care less about what Chavez does, and more about what we do at the end of the day. And so I hope that we can work with you, and I also hope the administration will focus very quickly on what that summit is going to look like. And I hope that we have an America's Initiative soon, obviously not by the summit, but at least talking about the outlines of what that will be.

The hemisphere is incredibly important to us, it is in turmoil and challenge in many parts of it, and I hope that that is something that we will look at very quickly.

I know you supported the legislation we had that came to the committee in a bipartisan, unanimous on creating a Social and Economic Development Fund for the Americas. We call it to your attention.

Two last areas of the world. There are many, but—I hope that the support you gave while you were a Senator to the question of the Armenian genocide, that the President-elect has himself supported. The recognition of that. And if we are to say, never again, part of that is ultimately the recognition of what has happened, so that we can move forward.

And I hope that you will be an advocate of having us get off of where we have been, and move forward to a recognition of that part of history that is universally recognized, and we can move forward in that respect.

And I also hope in the part of the world that's very important to me, the question of the reunification of Cyprus, that we have honest brokers at the State Department at the end of the day. One that recognizes that if Greek and Turkish Cypriots could work with each other, they would seek a bizonal, bicomunal federation that could move forward and reunify the island and end the incredible militarization of that island—the most militarized part of the world, per capita.

So, I hope that you will look at those issues. I know the positions you've taken as a Senator, and I applaud them. I hope that they won't change drastically as you move to the Secretary of State.

Senator CLINTON. Senator, we will be looking very closely at those, and other challenging issues, with the eye of moving forward and being effective and responding to these very legitimate concerns.

Senator MENENDEZ. I look forward to supporting your nomination.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Menendez.

Thank you, Senator Clinton, for a good morning of testimony. You displayed one of the assets necessary for the job, you sat there for 3 hours and 15 minutes. And we look forward to the afternoon session—and I should say that to everybody here, it's been a remarkably attentive and quiet audience. So we appreciate that very much.

So we will recess until no sooner than 2 o'clock, and we will try to make it as absolutely close to two as possible. We stand in recess.

[Whereupon, at 12:47 p.m., the committee recessed to reconvene at 2 p.m.]

## AFTERNOON SESSION

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:19 p.m., in room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, Hon. John F. Kerry (chairman of the committee) presiding.

The CHAIRMAN. The hearing will come back into order and I apologize to everybody, particularly to our colleagues who were on time, Senator Isakson, I'm sorry about that.

We had the President-elect meeting with us at our caucus on the minor topic of the monster of TARP and also the stimulus. So I'm sure you can all understand it was spirited and important and that's why we are late and I apologize for that.

I said that we would pick up. We're going to complete the first round of 10-minute questions and I think for the second round we'll probably go with 7 minutes and see how we proceed, but Senator Isakson, you're up next and we appreciate your patience.

Senator ISAKSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and Chelsea; Chelsea, you should know that your mother and I had a conversation in my office. She's very proud of you and very proud of the support you give to her and I got to show her all my grandchildren, so she'll have plans for you in the future, I guarantee you. [Laughter.]

Senator Clinton, it's a pleasure. I want to commend you. This is not really a question, just a statement, but I have the highest regard for Senator Lugar. I think the remarks, prehearing questions he sent to you with regard to the Clinton Foundation were very important, and I think his insights are very important because in your answers to those questions on a couple of occasions, you made the statement, "The goal was to protect against even the appearance of a conflict of interest between his work," meaning the Foundation's, "and the duties of the Secretary of State," and we all know that in this world of politics, perception becomes a reality. So appearance is everything, and I commend Senator Lugar's recommendations to you.

Also, twice in your opening remarks, which were extensive and really appreciated because you really covered some very important topics, you refer to what I call the three Ds: diplomacy, development, and defense, and two different occasions, once vis-a-vis al-Qaeda and then another just based on overall policy, I believe that the better your diplomacy the better your ability to defend yourself and a strong military is a great foundation for good diplomacy and then if you add the development, which I think is soft power or smart power, you have a great trilogy.

Do you agree with that?

Senator CLINTON. Senator Isakson, I couldn't say it any better. I certainly do agree.

In order to protect and defend the United States of America, to advance our interests and to further our values, we have to have all three of those elements of our power working in concert, but clearly, as I said, as you pointed out, in my opening statement, a strong military is essential for the ultimate protection of our country and our interests.

It is my hope that through more vigorous and effective diplomacy we would be able to resolve both problems that we have with indi-

vidual countries and the transnational problems, like proliferation, that threaten us.

So I think that the State Department has a very big responsibility to improve its capacity with respect to both diplomacy and development because without those two elements of our power projection and our policy being as effective as they can be, we're not going to have the agile comprehensive foreign policy we should look forward to.

Senator ISAKSON. In the Presidential debate, I watched both sides, ours and yours, and there was a significant debate over foreign policy and over the issue of precondition.

I really appreciated your responses throughout and I think you added a great deal of strength to that debate and now that we're looking at suggestions of talking to Hamas or maybe Hezbollah or maybe Iran, preconditions are absolutely essential, I think, to good strong diplomacy.

I hope you still feel that way.

Senator CLINTON. Well, I certainly do, as does the President-elect. I think that his commitment to vigorous and effective diplomacy is in context of his understanding that there are different ways for us to engage.

When it comes to nonstate actors, like Hamas, as I said at the very end of the morning session, there are conditions. Hamas must renounce violence, they must recognize Israel, and they must agree to abide by all previous agreements. There are conditions that are usually part of the preliminary discussion that would lead to any kind of negotiation.

The President-elect believes that he has the right to claim the opportunity to speak with anybody at any time, if it's in furtherance of our country's national interests and security, but he fully appreciates the preliminary work that has to be done in order to tee up any such discussion.

So I think we're in vigorous agreement, Senator, that we want to be smart about how we engage in diplomacy. We want to make sure that when the President of the United States or the Secretary of State is engaged in any diplomatic effort that all of the necessary preliminary work, including conditions, if appropriate, have been met before doing so.

Senator ISAKSON. You quoted George Marshall at the end of your remarks in saying that "sometimes our enemies are not the nations or doctrines but they're in fact hunger, poverty, desperation and chaos."

I'm the ranking member on the Africa Subcommittee, and if you talk about desperation, chaos, hunger and poverty, certainly you can talk about the continent of Africa and in particular North Africa and the Horn of Africa where al-Qaeda is attempting to do what it did in Afghanistan effectively a decade and a half ago.

And you talked about smart power. I think AFRICOM was a smart move on behalf of our country and although a lot of people don't realize what AFRICOM is doing, they are military personnel doing a lot of soft power. They're drilling wells. They're building bridges. They're doing the things—I hate to say this, but Hamas and Hezbollah figured it out. They got political strength by giving

people housing and clothing. A lot of times that use of soft power can win over people's attitudes toward you.

So I hope, as the couple years go by—the next 4 years go by—we can work together on the continent of Africa and on those issues because I think it's the next place we are vulnerable if we aren't proactive in dealing with the governments, the people, the poverty, and obviously also continuing the Bush PETFAR Program which has been so successful, that and the malaria eradication.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, I appreciated, when I spoke with you, your commitment to Africa and your making it a priority of the service you've performed here on the committee and I look forward to working with you.

It is a serious concern that we could see safe havens created again, the chaos that flows from failed states, like Somalia at this moment, the aftermath of autocratic regimes that have so mistreated their people, like Zimbabwe, the anarchy and terrible violence in Eastern Congo.

I mean, those are breeding grounds not only for the worst abuses of human beings, from mass murders to rapes to indifference toward disease and other terrible calamities, but they are invitations to terrorists to find refuge amidst the chaos and anyone who thinks that our interest in Africa is only humanitarian, I think, misses the strategic import of the comments you have made and I do look forward to working with you.

Senator ISAKSON. My last question. If you ask the average Georgian what's the one thing they have the most consternation about, it's how much money we spend in foreign aid and although as a percentage of the budget it's a small number, a lot of the stories that get published raise questions about it.

Talking about preconditions for a second, I am one that feels like foreign aid invested, especially with preconditions for results, is beneficial to the United States of America and I shared with you the issue on women's education in Muslim countries and Africa who, prior to 2001, we weren't really aware that we had money going to NGOs, then going to education, that was only teaching Muslim men, not Muslim women, and we put a precondition post-9/11 and built schools for women in Egypt and Ethiopia and other places and the payback has been a renaissance in those countries at least in raising the educational level of all.

I'd appreciate your comments on the extent to which preconditions can be used in foreign aid, not preconditions to agree with us but preconditions to see that the result brings about a benefit like in this case the education of women.

Senator CLINTON. Well, I think that has been an important contribution to the foreign aid debate by this administration, most manifest with the Millennium Challenge Corporation.

I think we're still finding our way, trying to figure out the best practices to use to encourage governments to act in certain ways, conditioning our aid, but I really believe this holds tremendous promise, and again it's an area that I would like to work with this committee on because there's a lot of expertise here.

When you look at foreign aid, we want to be able to justify the investment to the American people and we want to get measurable results. Those are two goals that really go hand in hand and so I



believe strongly that as we try to shore up foreign aid, as we try to make the case for more development assistance, as we try to, you know, get back some of the authority and the resources that have drifted to the Defense Department, that we have to be ready to make that case and I think the, you know, conditional aid approach in certain countries and situations is one we have to look at more closely.

Senator ISAKSON. Well, I appreciate your willingness to serve and wish you the best of luck in your tenure.

Thank you.

Senator CLINTON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Isakson.

Senator Casey.

Senator CASEY. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much, and I want to commend you on the new leadership position that you take and we're grateful for your service.

Senator Clinton, thank you very much for committing yourself to do a difficult job at a difficult time in our Nation's history and for the time you're spending with us today. You're getting close to the end here. When you get down to this end of the table, we're kind of rounding the corner, and I want to stay within my time limits because my friend here needs his time; Jim Webb.

I wanted to read you a statement that I think you're familiar with but I think it bears some emphasis today in light of what you said in your statement and in light of a lot of our concerns about the way foreign policy has been conducted—especially over the last 8 years.

The person who made this statement first made reference to our institutions of diplomacy and development being undermanned and underfunded and then I'll pick up with the quotation, and it starts this way: "When it comes to America's engagement with the rest of the world, it's important that the military is in a supporting role, supporting role to civilian agencies. Our diplomatic leaders must have the resources and political support needed to fully exercise their statutory responsibilities in leading American foreign policy. To truly harness the full strength of America requires having civilian institutions of diplomacy and development that are adequately staffed and properly funded."

The person who made that statement was Secretary Gates this past July, and I wanted, in light of the discussion here today and grateful for the time you spent in your statement on this, but also in light of what you and I have talked about in our meeting and in other conversations, tell us how you're going to work with Secretary Gates to make sure that we can give meaning and integrity to the observation he made in that July speech.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Casey, it's a tremendous honor for me to be working with Secretary Gates. He has a very long history of service in our country and has worked with I don't know how many Presidents, six, maybe seven, but he has a broad comprehensive view about what works for America and what doesn't and he was in the, you know, real vanguard in the CIA and the National Security Council at the height of the cold war. So his experience is especially valuable and I know the President-elect believes that and, as you know, asked him to stay on.

I've had several conversations with him already and what you read is exactly what he believes, that we are going to be stronger if we are better able to promote diplomacy and development, not just rely on our military power.

There's a lot of work to be done between that belief, which he and I and the President-elect share, and actually realizing its promise. We have work to do at the State Department, you know. Part of the reason functions and resources have migrated is because there's just a presumption that the, you know, military can move much quicker and with greater effort, impose development or negotiate agreements, whatever it might be, than the State Department and it's going to be our job to prove that, you know, the State Department is not only substantively strong, which indeed it is, not only experienced in diplomacy and development, which indeed it is, but can in this 21st century move with dispatch, be results-oriented, create an atmosphere of collegiality and cooperation across the State Department and USAID and across the United States Government.

So I am taking this very seriously. I'm working with Secretary Gates. He's very open to cooperative efforts, but we have to prove that we can shoulder this responsibility, like stabilization and reconstruction and the new Civilian Corps, like, you know, really outcomes-oriented development aid that can be done quickly without enormous bureaucracy.

So we're going to take that challenge on because I don't think we have a choice. I think that our foreign policy has gotten way out of balance. Secretary Gates knows it. The President-elect certainly knows it. So it's going to be up to us to try to get back into more equilibrium which will be good for our government and for the image of our country around the world.

Senator CASEY. Well, we want to support you in meeting that objective, and I do want to commend you. We had a discussion the other day about the mechanics of running such a massive agency, and I know we don't have a lot of time today, but I wanted to commend you on appointing Jack Lew as Deputy Secretary of Management. I think it's important that when someone is assuming the responsibility as you are that you've spent the kind of time you have to put together a team that can help you run the Department.

I wanted to move to one or two more issues before my time expires. One is on an issue that I've worked with Senator Lugar on, the ranking member, as well as other members of this committee have worked for years. Senator Biden worked hard on this as well as others and that's the challenge posed by nuclear terrorism.

As great as the challenge and the threat is, we know from our history and from our research that it's a preventable catastrophe if we take the right steps not just here but around the world, and I just want to get your thoughts on the steps we need to take which will involve a number of departments of our Federal Government and State Department under your leadership will play a significant role in working with other countries to identify fissile material and to prevent it from getting in the hands of the wrong people.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Casey, I know you expressed to me your deep concern about this and your desire to get very

involved in helping us craft an effective approach to protecting our country and our allies, indeed humanity, from weapons of mass destruction in the hands of terrorists.

The recent Commission on WMD chaired by former-Senators Graham and Tallent, was very sobering. Basically, they concluded that the evidence points to our seeing a terrorist attack using nuclear or biological material some time in the next 4 years.

You add to that the growing threat of cyber terrorism which has the potential of disrupting the networks we rely on for all kinds of things, like traffic signals and electric grids and the like which would be incredibly disruptive and dangerous. I mean, this is the No. 1 threat we face. There's no doubt in my mind.

So we're going to start calling it such. We're going to reorganize the Department to be better prepared to deal with nonproliferation arms control and these new threats. I look forward to working closely with this committee to get the best people we can into the State Department, to work with our partners across the United States Government, and to send out a message loudly and clearly that the United States wants to be a leader once again, to control arms, particularly with Russia, and that's what the START talks will be aimed at doing, and to be much more aggressive in going after nonproliferation.

So this is our very highest priority because the consequences are so devastating.

Senator CASEY. One more question in the time I have. We spoke a little bit the other day about the challenge that Pakistan presents to all of us, to the American people, but also to the world and for a lot of reasons, we know, not only because of the threat in the border region between Pakistan and Afghanistan, the concern about the rivalry—and that's an understatement—with India, and the question of whether this government will really make it a priority to root out the extremist elements that are throughout different parts Pakistan and the region, and finally, the concern about the stability of their nuclear command and control.

Coming into the office, and I realize you're just starting, but from the State Department's point of view, how do you think we need to approach meeting or being focused on those various concerns that I just outlined?

Senator CLINTON. Well, as I stated in my opening remarks, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, the Middle East, remain in the forefront of the challenges that the new administration will face.

Pakistan has a particular complexity because of its nuclear weapons capacity, but the democratically elected government has been saying a lot of the right things with respect to the threat posed by the extremists, terrorists, particularly along the border and in the Fatah region in Pakistan.

So I'm hopeful that we will have a very active positive relationship with the new Pakistan Government. I know that there's a lot of work being done even by the outgoing administration to deepen ties between our country and various institutions in Pakistan, but this is a tough problem, Senator. I mean, this is a very complicated problem. It has many dimensions to it, as you pointed out, the relationship with India, the relationship with Afghanistan, the role that Iran and others are playing in that region.

We have to approach this with the same level of attention and comprehensive understanding that our military is attempting to do as it ramps up our troop commitments in Afghanistan and works more closely with the Government of Pakistan to protect them from violent extremists as well as to root out al-Qaeda and other remnants of the terrorist networks so that they don't find safe haven in Pakistan to plan attacks against us or any other country.

Senator CASEY. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Casey.

Senator VITTER.

Senator VITTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and congratulations on your new chairmanship.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator VITTER. And thank you, Senator Clinton, for all of your public service, including being open to this very challenging position.

Like a lot of folks, I have some concerns about these conflict issues, particularly with regard to the Clinton Foundation, and so I wanted to spend my first round exploring those concerns.

Let me say a couple things. First, that I think a lot of folks legitimately share these concerns across the spectrum, from the New York Times to Senator Lugar, who submitted some questions about it to me. That perhaps defines the entire political spectrum, I'm not sure, and also they arise because of very extraordinary circumstances, your husband being a former President, his very unique work in terms of the Foundation and in terms of that work, and I applaud that, but they nevertheless arise because of that, and I think it really requires an extraordinary response.

Obviously you all have put forward this Memorandum of Understanding to suggest that such a response and so I wanted to go into that and some of the details about it and some of my concerns and these posters just sort of briefly outline the situation before the MOU with the Foundation and all those abbreviations are the ones used in the MOU and then the situation after.

One thing that sort of leaped out at me is with regard to the Clinton Global Initiative which in many ways is the most public and perhaps significant of these initiatives. Under the MOU, there's no disclosure of contributions, contributors going forward and that seems to be a big omission because again that's one of the most significant activities here, probably the most widely followed and recognized in terms of the annual conference, et cetera.

Would you support and help produce an amended MOU that would bring the same disclosure to future contributions to the Clinton Global Initiative?

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, I appreciate your concern and your question and I recognize that these are unique circumstances, to say the least.

I'm very proud to be the President-elect's nominee for Secretary of State and I am very proud of what my husband and the Clinton Foundation and the associated efforts he's undertaken have accomplished as well.

It is not unique, however, for spouses of government officials to work and there are very well-established rules for what is expected when that occurs. In this particular case, the Office of Government

Ethics and the Career Ethics officials at the State Department have looked at the rules and concluded there is not an inherent conflict of interest in any of my husband's work at all.

However, the Foundation and the President-elect decided to go beyond what the law and the ethics rules call for to address even the appearance of conflict and that is why they signed a Memorandum of Understanding which outlines the voluntary steps that the Foundation is taking to address potential concerns that might come up down the road.

The Memorandum of Understanding is, as you know, public and the President-elect and the Foundation and I have all worked to be very transparent. My team has stayed in close touch with the committee and we've addressed the committee's questions on these issues in a broad range of written answers which are part of the so-called QFRs—the Questions for the Record.

But I want to speak for a minute, if I can, about the work that is done because I think it's important—

Senator VITTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection listening to this, but I'd like it not to come out of my time because I'd like to pursue these questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I guess, I mean, it's fair to say that if you ask a question, you deserve an answer and the answer traditionally comes out of the time of the Senator.

Senator VITTER. Well, I'm still waiting for the answer. I'd love an answer, but if there's an answer to my question—

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think you need to give the Senator an opportunity to give you the answer and if you need additional time—

Senator VITTER. Well, let me repeat the question, which is, Would you support and help produce a new MOU that requires the same sort of disclosure for contributions for the Clinton Global Initiative?

Under this, there's no disclosure moving forward for contributions of the Clinton Global Initiative. So it's a yes or no. Would you support expanding that disclosure? Admittedly, this is voluntary. It's not required by law, but it seems to be a big exception to the rule of the MOU in terms of disclosure.

Senator CLINTON. Well, I think that the MOU and the other undertakings that have been worked out between the President-elect and the Transition and the Foundation and my husband have looked very broadly at all of the questions that you're raising and there are answers to many of these questions in the collection of answers that we have provided, and I will be happy to provide additional material and answers to you in response to that question.

Senator VITTER. OK. Well, if you could consider that suggestion, I think that's a big gap in the MOU, that moving forward, the Clinton Global Initiative is separated from the Foundation and then there's no disclosure whatsoever about contributors to the Clinton Global Initiative.

The other big gap, it seems to me, is that the disclosure in the MOU is for new contributors and so old contributors who regive or who even substantially increase their contributions, if it's to certain initiatives, aren't disclosed.

Would you consider amending that so that all contributions, whether from new contributors or old contributors, would be disclosed?

Senator CLINTON. All contributors will be disclosed and all contributors to the Clinton Global Initiative are disclosed in public as of now anyway.

Senator VITTER. OK. But that changes under the MOU.

Senator CLINTON. No.

The CHAIRMAN. No. I think, if I could just interrupt, Senator, I think if you look at the MOU and you look at the subsequent questions that were answered by the Senator to the committee because we followed up on this issue, I believe that we asked the question, will all future contributions to the Foundation be disclosed, and—

Senator VITTER. To the Foundation?

The CHAIRMAN. That's the Foundation, but, in addition, it's my understanding that the—under the MOU, the CGI additionally, if there are contributions, they would be disclosed at the end of the year.

Senator CLINTON. That's right.

Senator VITTER. OK. I'm very happy to hear that. That's not what's in the MOU. So if I could simply request before our vote a document or an amendment from the Transition and the Foundation that clarify that because under the MOU, moving forward, the Clinton Global Initiative is separated from the Foundation and then there's disclosure under the Foundation.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, I believe that all the answers that are relevant to these inquiries are in the record. There is no intention to amend the MOU. It has been worked out between the Transition and the Foundation, but the Clinton Global Initiative is a pass-through.

Now, the money of any donors to put on the Clinton Global Initiative are public and there is no ongoing, you know, Foundation is a yearly event, it's unlike the Foundation. So we will clarify, we will definitely clarify that for you.

Senator VITTER. That would be great, if you can clarify it. Again, I don't want to beat a dead horse, but under the MOU, as it stands, there's no required disclosure going forward for Clinton Global Initiative contributions and there's no necessary required disclosure for new contributions of old contributors, just new contributors.

There's also been the suggestion from a lot of folks to disclose the date and amount or at least amount within ranges of new contributions and to do that at least quarterly rather than annually. Would you be open to that?

Senator CLINTON. Well, again, you know, this is an agreement that has been worked out between all of the parties and the fact is that the concerns that were raised in the discussions between the Foundation and the President-elect's team were thoroughly discussed and they believe, and I agree, that the transparency and disclosure that is needed which, as you said yourself, it goes beyond any kind of legal or ethical consideration and not only that, there will be ongoing reviews by anything that is brought to the attention of the career professionals.

But I just have to go back, Senator, and try to set the record straight. CGI is not in the Memorandum of Understanding because they already have a practice of disclosing all of their contributions. There is no need to require it. I will certainly, you know, state here that they're going to continue the practice which they've already done. No President has ever disclosed the contributions to his foundation.

So when my husband agreed to disclose the contributions to his foundation, that was a very unprecedented event which he was happy to do, but the Clinton Global Initiative, which is separate from the Foundation, has always disclosed the contributions.

Senator VITTER. Well, again, I'd love for that to be embodied in any agreement that's at issue, so I'll look forward to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, Senator, can I just—this won't come out of your time, but let me make sure the record is clear here.

As I understand it, I think Senator Lugar has raised a couple points and we're going to address them perhaps a little bit later, but I don't think this one, frankly, is on target for the following reason.

On page 4, paragraph 2, it specifically says that "CGI, President Clinton personally will not solicit funds. President Clinton will continue to send invitation letters to potential invitees; however, he will no longer send sponsorship letters which seek contributions. Apart from attendance fees, CGI will not accept contributions from foreign governments." So there is no solicitation and no acceptance of a foreign government.

Senator VITTER. But, for instance, there could be foreign national contributions which, within the four corners of this agreement, are not disclosed, not necessarily disclosed.

I mean, my question is in that same paragraph, why isn't there a disclosure?

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think the Senator has appropriately said that they'll answer that in the addendum.

Senator VITTER. Well, I'd look forward to that as well as the old contributor issue because it just talks about new contributors.

Again, let me back up and underscore the central concern, which is, I really do think this poses a lot of real and perceived conflict issues and you just need to look at some of the contributors from the past, particularly from the Middle East, to get a sense of what I'm talking about.

For instance, the Alavi Foundation supports Iranian causes. Just this past December 19, they made a substantial contribution to the foundation and that same day, the president of the foundation was indicted for obstruction of justice related to terrorist financing, and 2 days earlier Treasury had named a partner of the foundation as a "terrorist entity." Another partner of the foundation, Bank Melli, has long been thought to be a procurement front for the Iranian Nuclear Program. That's the sort of big issue/conflict issue that I think this poses which could obviously complicate your job and be an impediment to your effectiveness.

Another similar example, Assam Fares, former Deputy Prime Minister of Lebanon. He's a big supporter of Hezbollah. It says it's not in any way a terrorist organization, doesn't target the United States. I'm sure the widows and family members of the victims of

the 1983 Beirut bombing that killed 241 Americans are comforted by that. Obviously they are terrorists. They do target the United States. This poses serious issues.

So I look forward to following up and getting that clarification and also I think it would round out this agreement immeasurably to include the date and amount of contributions, to include pledges made, not simply have disclosures when a payment is made, and to at least do quarterly reports versus annual reports.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Vitter.  
Senator Webb.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Clinton, I've had the pleasure of having sat through this entire hearing today—I'm not sure you have found it very pleasurable—partly because I'm really interested in these issues and partly because I'm so far down the food chain that I had to wait until 3 o'clock this afternoon to ask my questions. But it's nice to have Senator Shaheen to my left, you know, and I'm very impressed by the range that you have shown here on a wide variety of issues that have been thrown at you.

I've had the pleasure of working with you and discussing these issues over the past years, but I think you've done a marvelous job today.

I guess the phrase of the week is "smart power." You know, I've been doing this a long time, in and out of government. People come up with different phrases. I think the most important thing that you have said is in your opening statement, when you mentioned that the "goal of this administration is going to be more partners and fewer adversaries and to do so in a realistic way that still protects the interests of the United States," and I think that is a major demarcation for our government as we relate to the rest of the world.

You and I have had many conversations over the years. This is a time that the context of these conversations are going to be shaped into what I believe will be achievable policies. I would like to list very quickly for the record six or seven areas where I believe that these conversations will need to continue and in some cases there will probably be debates, but I think that it's important to outline these.

The first is the nature of the residual force in Iraq or even whether there should be a residual force in Iraq and how that situation would assist us in increasing stability in the region.

You mentioned the SOFA and the Strategic Framework Agreement as national policy. As you know, I had a great deal of heartburn over the way that those agreements were signed here. They were approved by the Iraqi Parliament. We in the Congress did not even have an opportunity to vote on whether this was the way to proceed forward. I don't anticipate that situation coming up again.

The second is the need for a clearly articulated strategy with respect to Afghanistan and Pakistan, and we don't have a strategy unless we can articulate the endpoint. I look forward to working with you toward not only being able to define that but also being able to define some sort of an achievable endpoint to our presence in Afghanistan.



The third is a reexamination of the way that we have proceeded with NATO expansion. I did a lot of work in NATO when I was Assistant Secretary of Defense and, quite frankly, this isn't the NATO that I was working with and I'm very concerned about the transition from essentially alliances into a number of protectorates in these newer countries and it's a situation that makes our country, I believe, very vulnerable.

The fourth is a need for us to adjust our strategic relationship with China. There have been a lot of comments made today about China that were fairly benign, and it's my hope—in fact, I was meeting with the Chinese Ambassador a couple days ago.

It's my hope that both of our countries can understand how vulnerable we are to each other right now after this economic downturn, but there are serious points of contention in our relationship that are going to have to be addressed over the next 4 to 8 years.

The next is the need for us to reexamine the failure, quite frankly, of the past administration to engage not only potential adversaries but also hostile regimes with which we have some disagreement.

You had, I think, a great exchange with the chairman with respect to Iran and I certainly would identify myself with the chairman's position on that, but also Burma, as you and I had discussed earlier. I think we made some real mistakes in terms of how we have approached the relationship with Burma and I hope we can start some new ground there.

The next is an urgent need, in my view, for the United States to focus on reconnecting in East Asia and Southeast Asia, not simply with respect to the China and sometimes the China-Japan relationship, but I would hope that you would lead the charge in terms of a much-invigorated relationship with ASEAN and some of these other countries.

The next is our need, and you addressed it, I think, in a very clear way in your statement to show clear leadership in the complex and difficult situations with respect to the Israeli and the Palestinian conundrum. There's no other word for it really at this point, but I think with the right kind of leadership that we can mitigate a lot of the tensions in that area and work toward a different situation.

And the final one is, and I want to actually spend what little time I have here to get your thoughts on this because it's been talked about in many different ways here, the need for us to rebalance the tasks being performed by the Department of Defense and the Department of State as they relate to our involvement around the world.

I would like to emphasize here that the implications for this are beyond the notion of turf wars. They're beyond this discussion of simply who can do it better. They really go to how our country is being perceived around the world. It's one of the most graphic things that I have been seeing over the past couple of years since I came to the Senate versus the time when I was in the Pentagon years ago where even when I was traveling as a journalist very heavily in Asia before 9/11 and that is, that we are increasingly being seen as a military guarantor and in many cases a desirable military guarantor in these other countries, as opposed to being an

economic partner or a cultural partner or growing our interdependence with these countries with respect to educational programs and reciprocal trade and these sorts of things.

I think it's vitally important that the State Department invigorate these policies, to put a civilian face on them, and to push these cultural, economic and issues of interdependence, and I would appreciate your thoughts on that.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Webb, as always, you are not only eloquent but extremely useful in your quick summary of all these issues because every one that you mentioned is one that I think is going to be on our agenda.

With respect to this rebalancing of the tasks being performed by State and Defense, you're absolutely right. I mean, it is a much larger issue than just intergovernmental relations and, you know, line items in a budget. It has to do with how we see ourselves and therefore how others see us and it is one of my hopes that during my time, if I am so fortunate as to be confirmed, that I am Secretary of State, we will begin to get that balance, you know, more in the direction of putting a civilian face on our power and sending the message that, you know, yes, we have this huge military that we spend nearly \$600 billion on, but we are much more than that. We are, you know, a country with all kinds of political, cultural, economic and other assets that we can offer the rest of the world.

It is not going to be easy because you serve on the two committees, having served with you on Armed Services, where, on one committee you can get practically anything you want, and on the other committee you can't keep up with the demands that are being put on diplomacy and development. There are more members in military bands than there are Foreign Service officers serving overseas.

So, I mean, when you think about that, it puts it into perspective. We have so underresourced our diplomacy and our development and it kind of becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. You know, the less resourced we are when we're given a task, the harder it is to perform. So the military understandably says, well, come on, get out of the way, we'll take care of this, but, you know, you guys come along, you know the languages, you've got some expertise, be our advisers. So that just further enhances the military face.

You know, with the new AFRICOM, which I support, we have to be very careful that it doesn't appear that our only real government engagement throughout Africa is our new military presence.

So I could not agree more with you, Senator, and I look forward to getting your advice which I know will be unvarnished and candid and well-informed about how we're going to do this because that's one of the biggest items on my agenda.

Senator WEBB. Well, thank you. Our military does great things, and I think you and I both feel strongly about that. We just want to make sure that it does the right things, and when I look at the NATO situation right now, the United States increasingly is viewed as the military guarantor to these new protectorates, essentially in historical terms, that we brought into the fold while the older countries of NATO are reestablishing their traditional historic relationships with Central and Eastern Europe. And there's

nothing wrong with that, but it is troublesome when we are simply viewed as the military side of it.

I just came back, as you know, from an extensive trip in Southeast Asia. It's the same thing. If you're talking with the people in Singapore, if you're talking with people in Thailand, they're very happy that the United States is there as a military balance as they invigorate their relationships economically with countries like China, but it's not to our advantage that this occur and the best way to have sort of a catalyst to bring the United States back in a stronger way culturally and economically is through the State Department.

So I wish you well and I'm at your disposal, and I think you're going to be a great Secretary of State.

Thank you.

Senator CLINTON. Thank you, Senator.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Webb.

Senator Lugar. We're going to start the second round now for Senator Lugar, the first round for Senator Shaheen, and since the crowd is not clamoring for the second round, we may be able to make some good progress here.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Clinton, in my statement this morning, I said the core of the problem that I perceive with regard to the Clinton Foundation is that it "may be perceived as a means to gain favor with the Secretary of State," and I stated the "Foundation exists as a temptation to any foreign entity or government that believes it could curry favor through a donation. It sets up potential perception problems."

Now, the bottom line is that even well-intentioned foreign donations carry risk for United States foreign policy. The only certain way to eliminate this risk going forward is for the Clinton Foundation to forswear new foreign contributions when you become Secretary of State.

Now, my purpose in stating it this candidly is simply that being Secretary of State and directing the foreign policy of our country involving all the countries in the world is an awesome responsibility which you perceive and have testified, as we all do.

The Foundation is very important to you and to President Clinton and to many recipients who have benefited from this, but this was bound to be a dilemma from the moment that the President-elect asked you to become Secretary of State. You have been the First Lady. You are married to a former President of the United States. You've established a foundation that has already received gifts.

There have been press accounts, fairly or unfairly, of people who have given gifts in other countries, and clearly the best solution to this would be during your tenure as Secretary of State for the Foundation, which still exists there and can receive gifts from everywhere else in the world, not to receive gifts from people abroad, even though that would deny it some revenues and the benefits that would come from those revenues.

Now, having said that, I indicated that I support your nomination and plan to vote for your nomination in the Senate business

meeting and any floor vote we have on this because your qualifications are remarkable and that is why reluctantly I dwell, however, on this problem that will still follow you.

Now, the staffs have dealt with your people as well as with perhaps President Clinton, or at least officials of the Foundation, to try to think through the situations. So I've suggested as a backup to that four conditions that were in an attachment that was with the press release that I issued along with my statement this morning, and I indicated that the answer you have given as a part of the responses to questions satisfied item 4 of those qualifications.

But at the same time, why, there remain the first three and essentially we've asked that you have the Clinton Foundation include information in its annual report that we have—let me—if I can find the release now for a second.

Specifically, all donations of \$50,000 or more should be disclosed immediately upon receipt rather than waiting up to 12 months to list the annual disclosure and; second, pledges from foreign entities to donate more than \$50,000 in the future should be disclosed at the time the pledge is made and when the donation eventually occurs and; third, gifts of \$50,000 or more from any foreign source, including individuals, should be submitted to the State Department-designated agency for the same ethics review that would be applied to donations from foreign governments.

In essence, the most timely reporting of gifts of \$50,000 or more so that at least this is not something that waits for an annual review or in any way could be accused of being less transparent. If there's to be a dispute, somebody makes a gift, let's have an upfront argument about it presently as opposed to lingering and then somebody coming at you and saying clearly something was happening throughout the months, not disclosed, and you would respond, well, the agreement is an annual report, and so forth. That really is less satisfying than the first idea, no gifts, but, second, the most rapid response on the part of the Foundation whenever a gift comes in.

So if we're going to have an argument, it happens right then, and, therefore, if it's not a good idea, that it's stopped and a compromise for the State Department, for foreign policy, for you, is prevented as rapidly as possible, within days, rather than in months or in years.

So I ask you to comment on this because it appears to me that the press coverage of this hearing will be favorable to the remarkable responses you have made, very fluent testimony, obviously well prepared and touching the bases to the questions we had, but it's less likely to be satisfying with regard to the Clinton Foundation, and this is why I ask you to at least give some further comment, assurance, if not pledge, to be sensitive to this and to try to respond to the thoughts that I've expressed.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Lugar, I know that you come at this issue in good faith, as I do, and I agree that these are matters that have to be handled with the greatest of care and transparency.

I think it's important to give just a little context, if I can. You know, the purpose of the agreement was to avoid even the appearance of a conflict because all of the independent professionals who

do this for our government said there was no conflict. So it's a kind of catch-as-catch-can problem.

I mean, when it was all submitted to the Office of Government Ethics, they said there was no inherent conflict. My husband doesn't take a salary. He has no financial interests in any of this. I don't take a salary. I have no financial interests.

So out of that abundance of caution and a desire to avoid even the appearance, the President-elect's Transition Team began working with the Foundation to try to craft an agreement that would avoid the appearance of a conflict but would also ensure that the Foundation can continue its work.

You know, I'm very proud of the work that the Foundation did and when you look at why it received, for example, foreign government money, it's because early on there wasn't the support from our government until, frankly, the leadership of President Bush and Members of this Congress created PEPFAR and there was also a tremendous financial burden on poor states to try to afford the pharmaceuticals, the antiretrovirals.

So my husband's Foundation worked with generic drug manufacturers to help improve their systems of manufacturing and get the costs down so that it would be affordable. So the governments of countries, like Canada, Norway, and Ireland, the U.N., said, well, this is the best deal ever. So this is all pass-through money. None of this goes to or stays in the Foundation.

This is used for the purchasing contracts in order to buy the drugs to keep, you know, many people alive and particularly 1.4 million people, including many children. So the work of the Foundation, the confidence that it has created with donors who know that it has an extremely low percentage that goes to any overhead, it has a very transparent way that it uses the money, were very persuasive to the Transition Team, that we had to work out something to keep the Foundation in business while I did what I needed to do to be as transparent as possible.

So the kinds of concerns that were put forth were very carefully considered and, you know, I do believe that the agreement provides the kind of transparency. Under the Memorandum of Understanding, foreign government pledges will be submitted to the State Department for review. I don't know who will be giving money. That will not influence. It will not be in the atmosphere.

When the disclosure occurs, obviously it will be after the fact, so it would be hard to make an argument that it influenced anybody because we didn't know about it. So I think that in the way that the President-elect's Transition Team saw it, the agreement that has been worked out is actually in the best interests of avoiding the appearance of conflict.

Now, I hasten to say that my career in public service is hardly free of conflict, Senator. So I have no illusions about the fact that no matter what we do, there will be those who will raise conflicts, but I can absolutely guarantee you that I will keep a very close look on how this is being implemented. I will certainly do everything in my power to make sure that the good work of the Foundation continues without there being any untoward effects on me and my service and be very conscious of any questions that are raised, but I think that the way that this has been hammered out is prob-

ably as close as we can get to doing something that is so unprecedented, that there is no formula for it and we've tried to do the very best we could.

Senator LUGAR. Well, my time has concluded. Let me just say that the situation is unprecedented in which a First Lady and her distinguished husband and a foundation come together with a State Department hearing of this sort.

I am hopeful that, as we go through the history of this, that people will not say, well, Senator Lugar and Senator Kerry and others were prescient. They saw the problems and we'll get full credit but that will not be helpful to our foreign policy, to you, to your husband, to the Foundation, and this is why I plea for you, plea to give even more consideration. It need not be a decision made today because I appreciate the negotiations have been sizable and you are a good negotiator, so is your husband, so are those who have worked for you. I admire that; it is a good thing for a State Department official and particularly the Secretary of State, but this seems to me to be so important at the outset, that this is why I've dwelled upon it, trying your patience and that of the committee, because I think it is very important, and I think you understand that.

Senator CLINTON. I do, and I respect you so much, Senator, and I can, you know, certainly guarantee to you that I will remain very sensitive to this and I will work with you and the chairman as we go forward.

Senator LUGAR. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Lugar.

Let me take a moment to welcome Senator Shaheen. This is her first official formal appearance with the committee. We just ratified the assignments at lunch today and so we're delighted to have you here. I'm personally delighted because you're a great friend and a good neighbor and we're really happy to have you as a member of this committee.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I am very honored to be able to serve on this prestigious committee with you and Senator Lugar and as I'm sure you know, I have been a big fan of your public service to the country for a very long time as well as your broad knowledge and expertise in this area and just as this country faces unprecedented economic challenges, we also face the most complicated foreign relations and national security challenges since the end of the cold war and I know that under your leadership and the leadership of Senator Lugar, that this committee will address these vital issues in a bipartisan way, and I'm delighted to be able to serve with you as we do that.

Senator Clinton, congratulations on your terrific nomination. Your testimony this morning, I thought, reinforced the fact that you have a breadth of knowledge and experience to be an outstanding Secretary of State and I commend President-elect Obama for choosing you. The two of you working in a partnership will truly have the opportunity to change the world and I have no doubt that you will do that.

On a personal note, I have to say that I am disappointed that I won't be able to serve with you in the Senate but look forward to working with you as a member of this committee.

I have two questions, since you have covered many of the issues that I would have asked. One is a broader question and the other is a little more parochial relative to New Hampshire.

The first has to do with the international economy and I know that you and Senator Dodd discussed this a little bit earlier today, but over one-fifth of the manufacturing workers in my State of New Hampshire depend on exports for their jobs.

I was interested to see recent reports that you would like to see the State Department take a more active role on questions of international economics and I thought that would certainly be a change from the Bush administration which has placed the international economic agenda primarily in the Department of Treasury.

So I wondered if you could speak a little bit to the role that you see for the State Department in addressing these economic—international economic issues.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator Shaheen, welcome to the Senate and welcome to this committee. I think your joining this body will be an incredible addition and I look forward to working with you in this new capacity.

I, too, regret that we won't serve together as Senators but I'm glad you're on this committee so that we can continue our friendship.

I think that's a really timely question and it is one of the concerns that I have explored since being asked to take this position.

How do we get our economic international agenda better integrated into the State Department? Obviously, Treasury has a huge role to play but so does the State Department and we're going to be responsible for the climate change negotiations. Well, you know, that has economic, environmental and energy-related implications.

The questions earlier from Senator Lugar about energy security, huge economic implications, and then the meltdown of the international economic regulatory system means that our foreign policy is impacted in so many ways in so many parts of the world.

So there is a lot that we have to pay attention to and we have a National Security Council but we also have a National Economic Council and it will be part of the Obama administration's plans that the State Department will participate in both, not just one, that we will be very much involved in the crafting of international economic efforts. The G20, which will be coming up in April, hosted by Prime Minister Gordon Brown in London, we're going to be playing a role in helping to design the agenda for that.

So on all of these issues, I think it is important to have a broader approach than just, you know, one agency because our economic standing affects everything we're doing. You know, dealing with Russia on START, some of that will be influenced by the economic situation that we're confronting, trying to deal with the modernization of the military in China. We've got to have a strategic relationship, as Senator Webb said, but we also have to make sure that they continue buying our debt.

I mean, we have a lot of very complicated international economic issues that directly impact our foreign policy. So we're going to be working on those and I welcome any and all advice that you might have.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you. The second question is related somewhat and it deals with trade.

We have a company in New Hampshire, and forgive me for being parochial, called Goss International that makes large printing presses. They had Japan come in and dump imports into the market. They went to court and sued under our trade laws and got a judgment in U.S. District Court and Japan retaliated by passing a recovery provision or claw back that allowed the company that was doing the dumping to actually appropriate Goss's investments in Japan and the State Department really has done very little to address this issue despite the court judgment on behalf of the American company.

So what role do you see the State Department playing as companies like Goss are dealing with this violation of U.S. trade laws?

Senator CLINTON. Well, I don't know anything about that specific case. We will look into that and educate ourselves about it, but more generally, I think this has to be part of our broader trade discussion.

The President-elect is in favor of free and fair trade. He wants to figure out how trade becomes more of a win-win for our manufacturers, our businesses, you know, our citizens and that's going to be part of what we look at. What are the rules that we want to enforce in our country, and what do we expect through reciprocal relations with other countries?

So I'm well familiar with the general nature of the problem because I faced much of this in New York over the last 8 years, but we're going to try to be more creative and substantive in addressing what we can do to create a more favorable positive atmosphere, so that if there are violations they can immediately be taken care of within the global trading framework and you don't face retaliation and you don't have to worry about unfair competition.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator Barrasso.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and congratulations, Senator Clinton. We've worked together on the Super Fund Committee you chaired and I was the ranking Republican and I always found you to be very prepared, very thorough, very thoughtful, and I'm sure you're going to bring all of those same things to the State Department.

Senator CLINTON. Thank you very much, Senator.

Senator BARRASSO. Senator Shaheen was apologizing for being parochial. I'll be a little parochial because the people of Wyoming, as I travel around, want to make sure that the foreign aid we spend, especially in light of the U.S. economy today, is being used so that people are really getting value for their money and that we are safeguarding U.S. taxpayer dollars.

Could you talk a little bit about how to balance allocating foreign aid and making sure that American taxpayers are getting value for their money?

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, I appreciate very much your interest in these issues and I have enjoyed my relationship with you since you arrived in the Senate and look forward to working with you.



I want to be able to go to Wyoming or go to New York or Massachusetts or Indiana or New Hampshire, anywhere in America, and explain why the relatively small but important amount of money we do spend on foreign aid is in the best interests of the American people, that it promotes our national security and advances our interests and reflects our values.

To be able to do that, I have to make sure the State Department and I in particular tell the story about what we do and why. I mean, you and other members of this committee often travel and see the results of the work, but it's very difficult to convey that to the rest of our country and I will look for better ways through public diplomacy in telling our story overseas and better ways here at home through my own efforts to explain what we do to our fellow Americans.

But I think it also has to be part of an overall review of how we conduct foreign aid, how we fund it, who's responsible for it, which is why I decided to have the second deputy, Jack Lew, that will be responsible for resources and management, because I want somebody to be able to come up and talk with you about very specific ideas we have about how to make foreign aid more effective.

It's pretty divided and I think we have degraded the capacity of USAID over the last years to be our premier aid development organization and a lot of what's been drifting toward the Defense Department, as Senator Webb said, is foreign aid in a traditional way.

When a young Army captain gets cash to go build a school that's foreign aid. That's not war-fighting. That's something that we always thought of as development assistance. So we've just got to do a better job of trying to explain and justify and rationalize and make efficient what we do, so that, you know, if I'm fortunate enough to come to Wyoming and I can go to some townhall or forum with you, you know, in a year or two, I'll be able to explain what we're doing, why we're doing it, and why it makes a difference to the people who are there.

Senator BARRASSO. Well, consider yourself invited.

Senator CLINTON. Thank you.

Senator BARRASSO. Another issue people in Wyoming will ask about when you come visit is management reform at the United Nations and the money that American taxpayers are spending there. Do you have some thoughts on that?

Senator CLINTON. Well, this is another priority of the President-elect and I know you'll be speaking with the Permanent Representative to the U.N.-designee in a day or two.

The U.N. must reform. It has to be more transparent, more efficient, and we are going to press for those kinds of changes. At the same time, the United States has to be a good partner with the U.N. so that if we use the U.N., as we do, for peacekeeping or other actions that we believe are in the best interests of the United States as well as the United Nations, we're going to have to bear our burden.

So this is really a two-track commitment. We've got to work with our partners at the United Nations as well as the permanent bureaucracy there to do everything we can to try to streamline the operations, modernize the systems, make them more transparent,

and then we have to be sure we do our part so we don't lose credibility as we push that reform agenda.

Senator BARRASSO. Moving on to Iran, and I know you've addressed it earlier. In your article, "Security and Opportunity for the Twenty-First Century" you said, "If Iran is in fact willing to end its nuclear program, renounce sponsorship of terrorism, support Middle East peace, and play a constructive role in stabilizing Iraq, the United States should be prepared to offer Iran a carefully calibrated package of incentives."

Do you have a clear path in your mind of how to get from where we are today, where Iran appears to be continuing toward the development of nuclear weapons, and continues to spew forth hatred of Israel, to get to a point where these things would apply?

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, there's a policy review that is being undertaken by the incoming administration. We are still being briefed by the outgoing administration. We don't yet have a full picture of all of the information that the current administration has within its control. So we will be working together across government lines through the National Security team to devise a new approach.

The President-elect called for such a new approach just over the weekend in some interviews that he did and we are very open to, you know, looking to find a positive, effective way of engaging Iran.

However, as I said to the chairman, a nuclear-armed Iran is not acceptable to the United States. It is our job to persuade other countries that it should not be acceptable to them either, to consult with our friends and allies in the gulf who have as much or more at stake than anyone and certainly with Israel that views a nuclear-armed Iran as a grave threat, so that as we move forward with any new approach or effort at engagement we are bringing our friends and allies along with us.

We're not surprising anybody because Iran, with its litany of terrorist sponsorship and interference with other countries' internal affairs and certainly the role that it's played destructively from our view in Iraq and so much else, as you know, is a concern not just to the United States and Israel. It's a deep concern to many other nations and so we want as broad a base as possible as we try to devise a way forward.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you. I would like to shift to discussing policy with Cuba.

As you know right now, we have strict laws and regulations limiting economic transactions with Cuba, with relatives of folks who are here. Any thought on lifting restrictions on family visits and remittances to Cuba?

Senator CLINTON. Well, Senator, the President-elect is committed to lifting the family travel restrictions and the remittance restrictions. He believes, and I think it's a very wise insight, that Cuban Americans are the best ambassadors for democracy, freedom, and a free market economy, and as they are able to travel back to see their families that further makes the case as to the failures of the Castro regime, the repression, the political denial of freedom, the political prisoners, all of the very unfortunate actions that have been taken to hold the Cuban people back.

You know, our policy is, first and foremost, about the freedom of the Cuban people and the bringing of democracy to the island of Cuba. We hope that the regime in Cuba, both Fidel and Raul Castro, will see this new administration as an opportunity to change some of their typical approaches, let those political prisoners out, be willing to, you know, open up the economy and lift some of the oppressive strictures on the people of Cuba, and I think they would see that there would be an opportunity that could be perhaps exploited, but that's in the future whether or not they decide to make those changes.

Senator BARRASSO. I appreciated some of the comments you made earlier about the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. I know you're working with Senator Lugar and others on the committee. You spoke strongly about verification and ongoing monitoring provisions to make sure that these policies continue.

I wonder about differentials in terms of the negotiated outcome regarding what the United States concedes and what other countries give up in order for us to agree on signing these treaties.

Could you talk a little bit about that and what standards we will hold other countries to? Could you also address, How do we make sure that one country's understanding of the terms and conditions of a treaty is the same as our understanding?

Senator CLINTON. Well, I think that's a very good point.

You know, the history of arms control with first the Soviet Union and then Russia, I think it's fair to say and, of course, Senator Lugar is the expert on this, has been a history of success, by and large. Even in the midst of the cold war, there were negotiations that led to arms control agreements and certainly it is our hope that the United States can once again be a leader using the number of warheads and the threat of or making sure that we have no remnants of cold war command and control issues and the like.

We are very serious about negotiating and are willing to go lower, so long as the Russians are as well, and that the deterrent that we have we always believe is adequate. We won't really know, Senator, until we get into these negotiations, but they're going to be on a fast track because the START Agreement, as you know, expires at the end of this year. So we've got to get serious and get involved and we will have a negotiator named so that we can start almost immediately.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you, Senator Clinton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator.

I'll take a round now and then I see Senator Feingold is here. I don't know if there are any other folks who are going to look for a second round. If there aren't, then maybe I'll let Senator Feingold go and then we'll just stay focused and wrap up on a series of questions.

Senator FEINGOLD. Well, thanks so much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your patience, Senator Clinton. Just a couple other topics.

You and I discussed Somalia and I've been long concerned about the deepening crisis there, particularly its implications for our national security.

Just this last month, several senior officials, including CIA Director Hayden and Joint Chiefs Chairman Mullen said that al-Qaeda

is extending its reach in Somalia and engaging extremists there to revitalize its operations.

As I told you, I met with many leading figures in Somalia during a recent December trip to Djibouti. Those meetings reinforced my belief that, while Somalis are a moderate people, the situation is now far worse than it was 2 years ago and the current administration's approach to Somalia is at least partly to blame.

What's your view on what's gone wrong with that and how we can fix it? Give me a little sense of what you think some of the key components are, understanding you haven't had a chance to get into all of this at this point.

Senator CLINTON. Senator, as you and I discussed, Somalia is strategically located. I think it was you who asked me if I knew how far Yemen was from Somalia. If it wasn't you, it was some smart person who asked me that.

Senator FEINGOLD. I didn't know. I had asked my staff and I was quite surprised to learn it was 20 miles.

Senator CLINTON. Twenty miles, and so the idea that Somalia is just a failed state somewhere over there where people are fighting with one another over heaven knows what is a construct that we adopt at our peril.

I don't know the most effective way forward. I have no wisdom on this, Senator. I know you met in Djibouti over a period of a couple of days with a number of the actors. As you know, the Ethiopian troops are leaving. The African Union commitment is questionable as to whether they will or will not stay and what their mission description would be.

The internal conflict within the groups in Somalia is just as intense as it's ever been, only now we have the added ingredient of al-Qaeda and terrorists who are looking to take advantage of the chaos and the failure of Somalia. There's a lot of history here and I think we have to be very thoughtful as we look at Somalia.

This is obviously an issue that will have to be worked across the national security apparatus and I would welcome your advice. You probably have as much firsthand knowledge of the players and what they intend and who they are and what they're really looking for as anyone, you know, in this body and so we're going to seek your advice and counsel.

I mean, as the chairman well remembers, at the beginning of the last Democratic administration there was a humanitarian mission in Somalia that was handed off and the beginning of this Democratic administration here we are once again with the remnants of a humanitarian mission and certainly the humanitarian crisis growing that is going to put this problem in the lap of the new President.

Senator FEINGOLD. Exactly.

Senator CLINTON. So I think that this is going to require an enormous amount of thought.

Now, complicating it, as you well know, is the piracy issue.

Senator FEINGOLD. Right.

Senator CLINTON. There's been a number of consultations about piracy. The current thinking is that pirates will be intercepted and defended against as a kind of joint responsibility between the private shippers who have to do more, frankly, for their own—the

security of their own vessels, but also various navies that are, you know, coming together, including China and India, who are willing to patrol the waters.

There's also some talk about going ashore, this is a problem Thomas Jefferson dealt with, along the Barbary Coast, you know, just kind of going to prove that the more things change the more they stay the same. There's some who advocate going ashore on Somalia.

We have to give a lot of thought to this and there's an enormous number of bad options that have to be sorted through. So I am not at all able to give you the new administration's policy because we're sorting it out ourselves.

Senator FEINGOLD. I can tell you're eager and very ready to take this on.

Senator CLINTON. Yes, indeed.

Senator FEINGOLD. I look forward to working with you. Let me switch to something completely different.

There's widespread recognition of the need to build a more robust and effective Diplomatic Development Corps and as a part of that effort, of course, it makes sense to consider ways to address challenges faced by the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgendered employees, particularly relating to domestic partner benefits and State Department policies that make it difficult for the partners of Foreign Service officers to travel and live in overseas posts.

What would you do as Secretary of State to address these concerns? Will you support changes to existing personnel policies in order to ensure that LGBT staff at State and USAID receive equal benefits and support?

Senator CLINTON. Senator, this issue was brought to my attention during the transition. I've asked to have more briefing on it because I think that we should take a hard look at the existing policy.

As I understand it, but don't hold me to it because I don't have the full briefing material, but my understanding is other nations have moved to extend that partnership benefit and we will come back to you to inform you of decisions we make going forward.

Senator FEINGOLD. Thank you, Senator. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. Thanks, Senator.

Well, we're sort of getting to that point now where I think we can address some loose ends and maybe even, you know, sort of have some fun and dig into things a little bit here in ways that we can't otherwise, but we promise not to prolong it and we'll try and remain focused on those things that are really salient here.

Let me begin with Afghanistan, if I may. I am deeply concerned that at least thus far, our policy in Afghanistan has kind of been on automatic and I made a promise to myself a long time ago that I would not see all of our conflicts, ground operations in the context of Vietnam. I really try hard. I have an automatic check that says not everything is that.

But I have to tell you in the several visits I have now made, escape it as I might, the parallels just really keep leaping out in so many different ways. We are struggling to fight with and for people of a different culture, different language, different custom,

different history, different religion, if any, and all of those similarities exist.

We don't live there. We don't live in the community, in a hamlet, in a small town—pocket—whatever you want to call it, and so we're not there often at night, they are, and the night often rules with insurgencies.

The complications are profound in both Pakistan and Afghanistan and I went to both and to India immediately after Mumbai and was really struck by the extraordinary distance we have to travel in both places, Senator. That is the center of the war on—I've got to check myself. I hope this administration and all of us will begin to think differently in this terminology of war on terror and think in terms of the global counterinsurgency and the difference between counterinsurgency and counterterrorism and the challenges that we face in addressing both and understanding them both.

One person made a very interesting comment to me while I was over there and said, "You know, Pakistan is a government without a country and Afghanistan is a country without a government," and if you stop and think about sort of the real application and no insult meant to anybody, President Karzai is a friend, we've all met with him, we want his success, but there are inherent contradictions in the structure that we have been trying to impose in Afghanistan and more and more as I travel that part of the world, I served most recently as chair of the Subcommittee on Mideast, Southeast Asia, so I was frequently there, it kept leaping out at me in ways that over a number of years here I really, frankly, hadn't given enough consideration to, but recently reading a wonderful book which I commend to you by Rory Stewart, "The Places In Between," and another book, "The Forever War," and there are a whole host of them that really give you the flavor of this, if you really wanted—I mean, Gertrude Bell, "The Desert Queen" is a fascinating study of sort of the region and of tribalism and that's really what I want to point to.

We have not—I think we honored tribalism when we dealt with the Northern Alliance and initially went in to Afghanistan. We really haven't adequately since and it strikes me that if we just put troops, plunk them down, another 20–30,000 in Afghanistan, without a very limited view of what they can achieve and need to do, and the comprehensive view of other things we need to do to build the successful structures of governance, the police, the judiciary, which may be a pipe dream, the construction programs, the ability of Hamid Karzai's government, as well-intentioned as he may be and as much as we like him, the ability to even get out of Kabul and be able to do anything in the countryside, I think, Madam Secretary-designate, we're on the wrong track and I think, unless we rethink this very, very carefully, we could raise the stakes, invest America's reputation in a greater way as well as our Treasury and wind up pursuing the policy that is, frankly, unpursuable, unachievable.

So I'd like to sort of elicit your thoughts on this. I was in Peshawar a few weeks ago. I learned that, and some in Pakistan would disagree with this and I'll probably hear from some of my friends there, but many people believe that it would not be hard for the

Taliban to move in there if that's the decision they decided to make.

It was so dangerous that we were not able to move into downtown and other areas and we just saw last week 600 Taliban cross the border from Afghanistan and came in and directly attacked a frontier core military outpost.

I think anybody who has really traveled on the ground, listened in the right ways and not just accepted the sort of briefing culture will suggest to you, respectfully, Madam Secretary, this really has to be rethought very, very carefully.

Our original goal was to go in there and take on al-Qaeda. It was to capture or kill Osama bin Laden. It was not to adopt the 51 States of the United States. It was not to try to impose a form of government, no matter how much we believe in it and support it, but that is the mission, at least as it is being defined today.

So I'd like to ask for your thoughts on this as you engage in what will obviously be a very hasty and important critical review and some judgments that we need to make about our policy.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, I think that your cautions are extremely well taken.

There is, as you know, a review going on right now under the direction of General Petraeus through CENTCOM. As I understand it, he has approximately 300 people, some of them detailees from the State Department, who are criss-crossing Afghanistan trying to determine, as I understand it, what is and isn't feasible.

We are in close communication with General Petraeus. We intend to, when it's appropriate, on January 20, to begin our own immediate review because I share your concern, as I know the President-elect does. You know, his approach toward Afghanistan, which has been more for more, you know, more troops would go in but there would have to be more from NATO and there'd have to be more from Afghanistan, you know, presupposes that we have a set of discreet goals that we are trying to achieve and that is in the process of being assessed and analyzed right now.

As you're aware, President Bush had inside the White House General Lute who was largely responsible for coordinating policy with respect to both Iraq and Afghanistan.

So the Bush administration has put a lot of assets to work on trying to determine what is the best way forward with Afghanistan and how do we effect the future of Pakistan, the decisions that they make, but I think that asking the hard questions and raising the red flags is exactly what this committee I know will do and should do.

Sitting here today, when I think about my trips to Afghanistan, my flying over that terrain, my awareness of the history going back to Alexander The Great and certainly the Imperial British Military and Rudyard Kipling's memorable poems about Afghanistan, the Soviet Union which put in more troops than we're thinking about putting in, I mean, it calls for a large dose of humility about what it is we are trying to accomplish.

Having said that, I think that we will keep you informed as we move forward and on the civilian side, I hope that we will have the opportunity for more indepth conversations. I mean, I've been both on both sides now of the table here and there is so much to discuss

and there's so much expertise on this committee, people who have traveled widely, thought deeply, know a lot of the players, and I hope that, you know, if I'm confirmed, that I'll be able to have you and others literally sitting down and talking with the people that we're going to be tasking to come up with the civilian side of this strategy so that we go in with our eyes open, whatever it is we're trying to achieve.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I really appreciate that. I don't expect you to be able to lay out that strategy now.

I would say that I think it's important perhaps for the administration, the incoming administration, to not just have the review process that's been put in place be the only standard for a baseline, and I think we need to make certain that there's a subsequent expectation with regard to that. I think it would be a mistake to just do that. I think you'd probably agree with that.

Second, with respect to the current military operations, I spent a lot of time in a couple of briefings that we're not allowed to discuss in public here, but trying to really get at this question of the targeting with respect to the Pakistan, the Fatah, and our efforts to take out terrorists in that area.

There has been a considerable blow-back and, I think, counter-productivity in the collateral damage that has been occurring there and I hope that you would also agree to really dig into that and take a look at whether or not all of that targeting is in fact as purported to be and as important as suggested because I think we're creating some terrorists and losing some ground in the effort to win hearts and minds, as they say.

Senator CLINTON. Yes, sir. We will.

The CHAIRMAN. On the situation with Pakistan, they not only face the challenge of the insurgency in the country, they have a dire economic crisis, also, and in many ways the economic crisis may be just as challenging.

After I went over with Senator Biden and Senator Hagel last year, we came back and proposed a tripling of the aid to \$1.5 billion a year over the course of a number of years, and I wonder, can you say today that the administration remains absolutely committed to that because we want to try to move that as rapidly as we can?

Senator CLINTON. Yes, the President-elect does support the legislation that you were part of and Vice President-elect Biden and I think Senator Lugar was, as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Correct.

Senator CLINTON. And we want to try to begin to some extent to separate our military aid from our non-military aid.

The tripling of the nonmilitary aid is intended to provide resources that will both support the Pakistani people but also give some tools to the democratically elected government to try to start producing results for the people of Pakistan.

The military aid. We want to, you know, really look hard at seeing whether we can condition some of that on the commitment for the counterinsurgency/counterterrorism missions. So we certainly are inclined to support, when appropriate, the legislation that you are referring to.



The CHAIRMAN. And this is going to take a very significant hands-on effort, as I think you know. We've been obviously reading about, hearing about the potential of special envoys, a series of them.

Do you want to address that at all today?

Senator CLINTON. Well, no final decisions have been made. That is a tool that I think you'll see more use of. I believe that special envoys, particularly vis-a-vis military commands, have a lot to recommend in order to make sure that we've got the civilian presence well represented and in other areas that are hot spots that will demand so much time that we need to put someone well experienced and expert to work on it.

So we are working through that and again this is an area that we will be coming back to you with.

The CHAIRMAN. You know, I just noticed Senator Vitter is back. I don't want to—I've gone over my time a little bit because we were sort of in a wrap-up. Did you—

[No response.]

The CHAIRMAN. OK. Fine. I was stunned in India, Pakistan, and Afghanistan to learn that our principal diplomats in that region do not get together to compare notes.

I was also shocked to learn that our Intel folks likewise don't do the same. That is just to me absolutely mind-boggling.

Senator CLINTON. Right, right. Well, Mr. Chairman, these are among the challenges that we intend to take on. Trying to create more of a regional perspective and a functional approach, instead of being caught in the boxes that people unfortunately too often feel imprisoned by, so that there are certain lines preventing you from actually communicating with your fellow American diplomat across that line or Intel or whatever.

You know, I don't have the experience that you have over the years on this committee and even before, but in my travels, I did see the results of that kind of compartmentalization and we're going to try to break that down. We're going to try to use the bureaus more effectively.

The CHAIRMAN. Wonderful.

Senator CLINTON. So that they can be encouraging that. I've been—you know, George Marshall, who made it clear he didn't ever want a memo longer than two pages, and others who have advised me to begin to break down the kind of paper culture that exists and try to get people more focused on action items and one of those is more communication back and forth among those who are American representatives in regions of interest and concern to us.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I'm delighted to hear you say that and I think that's exactly—doing it through the bureaus is precisely an easy way to do it and that way you'll know ultimately what is happening, I think.

Senator Isakson raised a question about the Hamas political strategy and compared it to Africa and I just—I want to flag something for you because the history of the last years in the Middle East and what's going on in Gaza today and the divisions between Hamas and Fatah, the division in the West Bank, in my judgment, reflects again a stunning consequence of a lack of engagement and a lack of thinking about sort of common sense of how things work.

I had the privilege of being in the West Bank the day, the morning after President Abbas was elected in 2005 and I met with him in Ramallah in that old headquarters and we spent some time together and he looked at me and he said, "You know, Senator, I know exactly what you expect of me. I have to disarm Hamas. Now you tell me how I'm supposed to do that. I have no radios. I have no cars. I have no police and Hamas has the ability to walk up to a door and deliver \$20,000 value to somebody who's blown up the widows or orphans of a family of a suicide bomber." They delivered the services and we for years have talked about the creation of a legitimate partner for peace and yet we've done almost nothing to fundamentally help them deliver that capacity.

So my hope is—I mean, I don't—I fear—I mean, Israel has all the right in the world and we are totally supportive of the patience they've shown, the forbearance over 10,500 rockets, the fact that Hamas broke the cease-fire. We understand the need to deal with Hamas, but we also have to recognize the threat here that Hamas may in fact wind up being more powerful than Fatah as a consequence, and the question is, Has this further set back the ability to create that legitimate partner for peace?

Would you comment perhaps on—you did a little bit in your opening, but I think it would be worthwhile getting a better sense of how you see the play there and the endgame, if you will, with respect to Hamas.

Senator CLINTON. Well, you know, we are at a point where the current administration is working very hard behind the scenes and in front of the scenes and we don't want to say or do anything that might interrupt or undermine what they are doing.

I think your point, though, is incredibly important and that's why earlier I mentioned the work that General Jones had done in which he was part of a bottoms-up approach, working with Abbas, Fayed, and others in the West Bank, and there were results. That's what's so tragic, is that more effort earlier, more sustained, more targeted. It got to the point where the Israeli Defense Force was willing to turn over security to members of the Palestinian Force that had been under the training of this team that General Jones put together.

The CHAIRMAN. General Dayton.

Senator CLINTON. Yes, General Dayton was on the ground. There's so much more we have to do and obviously we do support Israel's right to defend itself and we do understand and appreciate what it must be like to be subjected to rocket attacks and Hamas did break the cease-fire and they have no intention, at least so far as we can tell, of entering into another cease-fire at this moment and the rockets are still being launched.

So I think that working toward a durable cease-fire is going to be an initial challenge, if it's not achieved by the time that the President-elect takes office, but that's not the answer. The answer is how do we begin to rebuild some sense of cooperation and, dare I say, even trust and confidence-building measures so we can get back to this work of the slow but steady building of the capacity of the Palestinian Authority?

So I know that General Jones is very committed to that. I share that commitment and we intend to look into that as soon as we are able.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I know that's going to be a high priority. I know you've already been meeting on it and I don't think we need to belabor it here now, but we wish you well with that and obviously want to try to be as helpful as we can.

Just two quick last issues. Again, are there any other questions? [No response.]

The CHAIRMAN. No. Senator, one thing I do want to ask, if I may, and I don't want to belabor it, but it's coming at us enormously and that is the question of what we're really going to be able to do here with respect to global climate change.

I was in the Pasdan meeting and I met with all of the delegations that I met with in Kyoto and Rio in various years and it is stunning to see the transformation in those meetings, particularly with the Chinese and with the Low Islands, the small islands representatives and with the Indonesians and others, with Brazilians with respect to forests and so forth.

They are scared. They are serious, and what struck me is the degree to which everybody is waiting for us to take the lead. Now, I say that in one particular context. Recently, a group of our top scientists have run computer models and it shows that we are well ahead in terms of the effects of global climate change of all of the IPC studies today.

Every single study shows that today our rate of increase of emissions is way beyond what is supportable. In the last 10 years, we are increasing emissions, not decreasing them, four times as fast as we were in the 1990s. More chilling is the computer modeling they did against the current plans of every single country that is planning to do anything and it's not that big a group.

The European Community has a 2020 date of reductions. The Chinese have a reduction of intensity, not a specific reduction of emissions. The other countries individually have either set a loose 2020 goal. Some, like us, have set a 2050 goal, but 80 percent reduction under the Obama plan but not yet implemented, not yet real.

They took all of these current projections and ran the computer models against what is currently happening in the science and in every single case it showed that we are not just marginally above a catastrophic tipping-point level, we are hugely, significantly above it.

Scientists have now revised the levels of supportable greenhouse gas emissions from 550 parts per million to 450 to now 350. This had emissions at over 600. This had a temperature increase of in the range of 3 to 5-6 degrees if we do business as usual over the next few years.

The results, and I'm not going to go through them all now, but the results are on every single level of sea ice, species, forest migration, drought, storms, disease, refugees, I mean you start adding it up, the consequences in terms of national security, human condition on this planet, are simply catastrophic. They're devastating.

So our challenge is going to be even greater than it was 5 months ago, Senator, or 2 months ago. The perception that we can kind of

creep at this and perhaps do something this year, notwithstanding our economy, is foolhardy and so I hope, I just flag it for you, I know that the President-elect has said he's going to focus on it, but I'm not sure that everybody in the coming administration is completely aware of what a big lift this is going to be and how imperative it is that we make Copenhagen a success and I simply want to ask your undivided focus and leadership on this issue because it is that critical.

Senator CLINTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, you will have it because I share your deep concern. You are eloquent in describing it and you've been a leader in trying to sound the alarm on it for many years.

As I said, we will have a climate change envoy negotiator because we want to elevate it and we want to have one person who will lead our international efforts, but I agree completely that our credibility leading internationally will depend in large measure on what we're able to accomplish here at home, and as we heard the President-elect earlier at lunch, he will be putting forth a stimulus package that will have some energy, renewable energy provisions. So I think that's a good start and we have a lot of work to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Menendez, did you have any additional questions? You did.

Senator MENENDEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was listening to some of the previous questions and I just want to make sure, since I made a statement earlier today, that I'm right, and if I'm not, I'm happy to be corrected for the record.

It is my understanding that participants and contributors to the Clinton Global Initiative have been publicly disclosed since its inception and that that will continue to be disclosed. Is that a factual statement or am I wrong?

Senator CLINTON. That is correct, Senator.

Senator MENENDEZ. And those contributors have been listed at all times, from press releases to event materials to a whole host of other ways in which the public has clearly been informed, is that correct?

Senator CLINTON. That is correct.

Senator MENENDEZ. Now, it's my understanding, too, when I looked at this, which is why I didn't dwell upon it in my first round of questioning, that the determination has been made that there is no conflict of interest, but notwithstanding that, that you and President Clinton have been willing to go above and beyond in voluntary actions, as relates to both law and ethics, to make sure that there is no question. Is that a statement of fact?

Senator CLINTON. That is also correct.

Senator MENENDEZ. Well, Mr. Chairman, what I would hate to see is some who would put in doubt what I think it is an incredibly important opportunity here and that is to have two extraordinary public servants be able to meet the challenges our country has in this world.

The Clinton Initiative has made a difference for people, millions of people in this world—1.4 million people, Mr. Chairman, now are living a safer life and living lives longer and having their lives saved as a result of the HIV/AIDS efforts that that Initiative created.

The cost of medicine to treat children with HIV/AIDS has dropped by 89 percent over the last 2 years. Forty of the world's largest cities are working with the Clinton Initiative to eliminate and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, something that the chairman is such a powerful advocate of. Nearly 3,000 schools are promoting healthier educational environments.

I would hate for what Nelson Mandela has said is a "global movement where every word spoken, where every partnership discovered, where every promise made can have a direct impact on the lives of millions of people across our planet for generations to come," something President-elect, Barack Obama, has said is that "these initiatives help create a model for individual responsibility and collective action to the Clinton Global Initiative, bringing people together to take on tough global challenges." In 4 years, you have made concrete commitments that have affected over 200 million people in 150 countries.

I would hate for that incredible record and opportunity not just of what was done in the past moving forward to be blemished by some simply for purposes that are far less substantive and, in my view, a lot more political, but I think it's incredibly important.

I know that there are legitimate questions and I think that those questions have been very well answered, but I can't sit in my office watching what is going on and feel with myself knowing what this Initiative has done for millions of people in this country on things that I critically care about and so many members of this committee have and let it go at that.

So I appreciate your willingness to go above and beyond what is both the law and the ethics. I am sure you will continue to do so. I have expectations as one member of this committee that you will do so and I certainly hope that President Clinton's works, while obviously conditioned by the agreements that you have all set out, can still be able to move forward in a way that those people will be able throughout the world to know that America is great because it is good and one of its goodnesses is in fact what we do through initiatives of President Clinton, like President Carter, and others, as well.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Menendez.

Let me just say, I wasn't planning to comment on it, but in light of your comment, I'd just close out pointing out, Senator Lugar and I and all of us who've looked at this could not have more respect for CGI, the Clinton Global Initiative and what it does, has accomplished, and I couldn't agree with you more with respect to the distinction between that and the questions asked it by the Senator from Wyoming.

That initiative, I think we adequately set forward here, is not at issue because there will not be fundraising, there will be no foreign donors, and it really doesn't properly fit under the questions asked by Senator Lugar.

In fairness to Senator Lugar and to the thinking of the committee, and I think Senator Clinton understands this full well, and I'm confident from her answers that she's articulated a sensitivity to this which is going to have to be judged by the practice and we're going to have to go forward and see, but there is a legitimate

question and I think, Senator, you'd agree that it's hard to distinguish between a donation currently made and an acknowledged publicly and a donation to be made in the future, a commitment made to but not acknowledged publicly and so the effort here is not to cast any aspersion on anybody or to suggest any lack of integrity or anything like that.

It is simply to deal with the complicated legal concept of an appearance of a conflict of interest. If you are traveling to some country and you meet with the foreign leadership and a week later or 2 weeks later or 3 weeks later the President travels there and solicits a donation and they pledge to give at some point in the future but nobody knows, is there an appearance of a conflict? Could there be an appearance of a conflict?

That is what I think Senator Lugar is trying to get at. He has determined that it is simpler simply to adopt one of the options that he's articulated. For reasons you obviously feel are important and we understand it, you feel otherwise. You have gone beyond the law. You have done things to set up a process and really we're going to have to make the process work and we're confident that you have put yourself on the line today to make that happen. So that's really where we are.

Senator MENENDEZ. Mr. Chairman, if I may just very briefly, my concerns, since you couched them in the context of Senator Lugar's questions, is not so much with Senator Lugar. I think he did it, as he always does, in a very balanced way. My concern is other questions that were raised by other members here.

The CHAIRMAN. That's what I was referring to.

Senator MENENDEZ. Oh, OK.

The CHAIRMAN. Oh, no, no, no. I'm referring to that, but I'm simply, as Chair, I want to share in the perceptions, as I have from the beginning, that those are things that we make judgments about and we honor that and we respect that.

So let me say that I think this has been a very positive and constructive hearing. I think you have acquitted yourself with great distinction today. I think people are impressed by the versatility and the breadth that you have shown, both in the preparation as well as in your own knowledge.

We really do anticipate trying to move this as rapidly as we can and much more importantly, Senator Clinton, we really—you know, this is an unbelievably important moment for our country, for the world, that's waiting for this leadership.

President-elect Obama, you, the administration, all of us are staring at a magnificent opportunity to be able to make America what we believe it can be and should be and to bring it back in a sense in terms of these global efforts and we are excited about the prospect of working with you to make that happen.

So thank you for your time today and good luck to you. We look forward to working with you in the days ahead.

Senator CLINTON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Senator Lugar.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. We stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:28 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

## APPENDIX

RESPONSES OF SENATOR HILLARY RODHAM CLINTON TO ADDITIONAL  
QUESTIONS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOHN KERRY

## ROLE OF SECRETARY OF STATE

*Question 1.* The new administration will take over at a time of extraordinary challenges and opportunities for the country. What do you see as the most significant challenges facing the United States, immediately and over the longer term? What do you view as the most urgent international priorities for the new administration? What do you see as the most significant opportunities? What role will the Secretary of State play in formulating and advancing U.S. policy objectives? What would you seek to accomplish during your first 100 days and your first year as Secretary of State?

Answer. I appreciate these vitally important questions, and I have given them a great deal of thought. I have worked to address them in the testimony that I will submit to the committee under a separate cover. If you believe that submission does not address these issues sufficiently, I would be happy to follow up.

## AFGHANISTAN

*Question 2.* What is your assessment of the security situation in Afghanistan? Has the Taliban gained or lost ground over the past year? Has our strategy to date been effective? How can we strengthen our efforts?

Answer. The security situation in Afghanistan is deteriorating and the Taliban is gaining ground. President-elect Obama has proposed a new strategy for Afghanistan with several elements: First, end the war in Iraq responsibly and send additional troops to help complete the mission in Afghanistan. Second, provide a major increase in nonmilitary aid to Afghanistan. Afghanistan needs a government more able to take care of its people's needs—something the President-elect has communicated directly to President Karzai. We should help—and we should demand accountability. Third, take on the drug trade, which is funding al-Qaeda and the Taliban, including the development of alternative livelihoods for poppy farmers. Afghanistan has turned into a narcostate. Fourth, develop a coherent Pakistan policy. First, that means conditioning U.S. military aid on their efforts to close down training camps, evict foreign fighters, and prevent the Taliban from using Pakistan as a sanctuary. Second, it means tripling nonmilitary aid to Pakistan, with a focus on the border regions, and improving the lives of the Pakistani people, so that over the long term we are reducing the pull of the extremists.

*Question 3.* Last February, Defense Secretary Gates acknowledged that some NATO members tend to group the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan together, and do not share our views on the necessity of European participation in ISAF. How does the administration plan to make a case for renewed and reinvigorated commitments to Afghanistan, including at NATO's 60th anniversary summit scheduled for this April?

Answer. President-elect Obama and I believe that Afghanistan and the Pakistani border are the central front in the war on terror and we will make the case to our allies that we must not let Afghanistan return to a safe haven for al-Qaeda and the Taliban. The Obama administration will seek greater contributions from our NATO allies in Afghanistan. We will ask our NATO allies to eliminate national restrictions on NATO forces. The NATO force is short-staffed and some countries contributing forces are imposing restrictions on where their troops can operate, tying the hands of commanders on the ground. The Obama administration will work with European allies to end these burdensome restrictions and strengthen NATO as a fighting force.

*Question 4.* Should we be prepared to participate in negotiations with reconcilable elements of the Taliban that are willing to renounce al-Qaeda and join the political process?

Answer. The President-elect and I believe that it is worth exploring whether we can create opportunities for progress in Afghanistan as we did in Iraq—as does General Petraeus. In Iraq, we engaged with tribal leaders and regional leaders, which helped lead to the Sunni Awakening that changed the dynamic in Iraq fundamentally. We should certainly explore whether similar opportunities exist for engage-

ment and collaboration with tribal and regional leaders in Afghanistan, including leaders who at one time or another may have been affiliated with, or joined forces with, the Taliban. Afghanistan and Iraq are very different countries, though. We cannot expect to simply export the Awakening strategy used with the tribes of al-Anbar to Afghanistan. Any effort to separate moderate Afghans from radical elements will have to begin—and be deeply rooted in—the efforts of Afghans themselves.

*Question 5.* How effective have U.S. development efforts been in Afghanistan? Do we need to increase United States economic assistance? To what extent are internationally funded projects helping or hindering the ability of the Afghan Government to realize an expanded role in Afghanistan's development?

Answer. In December 2001, the Bonn Agreement between Afghans and donors established an interim government, and donors were identified as lead nations to accomplish specific objectives. Subsequent conferences in Tokyo in 2002 and Berlin in 2004 saw donors pledge \$4.5 billion and \$8.2 billion, respectively. Due to uneven commitment among the donors, the 2006 London Conference discarded the lead-nation approach and adopted the Afghanistan Compact, a contract between the international community and the Afghan Government to support a comprehensive approach to development. Donors pledged a total of \$10.4 billion.

Since fiscal year 2001, the international community has pledged approximately \$60 billion in assistance to Afghanistan. The U.S. Government has provided approximately \$32.7 billion, or 57 percent, of the international total.

We need to improve our development efforts in Afghanistan. The President-elect has proposed a policy of “more for more”—more troops and assistance from the U.S. as we seek more from NATO allies, and more from an Afghan Government that needs to focus on improving the lives of its people. We will request additional non-military aid each year—above and beyond what is given now. That money will be focused on initiatives dealing with education, infrastructure, human services, and alternative livelihoods for poppy farmers and will be accompanied by tougher anti-corruption measures. We will make sure investments are made—not just in Kabul—but out in Afghanistan's provinces. We will tie aid to better performance by the Afghan national government, including anticorruption initiatives and efforts to extend the rule of law across the country.

*Question 6.* Versions of the Afghan Freedom Support Act passed the House in the 110th Congress, but did not pass the Senate. Do you support its passage?

Answer. The President-elect and I support the goal of providing additional assistance to Afghanistan and if the legislation is reintroduced in the 111th Congress, we look forward to reviewing the legislative language and consulting on it with Congress.

*Question 7.* What are your expectations for the scheduled Presidential and provincial elections in Afghanistan in 2009? What can the United States do to help ensure those elections are free and fair?

Answer. The incoming administration hopes that the upcoming elections go forth smoothly. The U.S. can assist the Afghan military and security forces in efforts to prevent violence or disrupt the elections.

*Question 8.* How do you assess the effectiveness of President Hamid Karzai's government? What more should the United States do to try to curb the widespread corruption in the Afghan Government?

Answer. Despite achievements such as the expansion of educational opportunities, increased access to health care and improved subnational governance, government effectiveness remains low. The Afghan Government is plagued by limited capacity and widespread corruption. Efforts to improve the effectiveness of the Government of Afghanistan, particularly at the subnational level, are a key element of Afghan and international efforts to stabilize the country. We need to ensure that investments are made not just in Kabul but in all of Afghanistan's provinces. We will tie aid to better performance by the Afghan national government, including anti-corruption initiatives and efforts to extend the rule of law across the country. A new strategy in Afghanistan will enable us to take the initiative back from the Taliban.

*Question 9.* The Afghan National Police (ANP) are still widely acknowledged to be plagued by problems that hinder Afghanistan's capacity to improve security and development. What is your understanding of the current goal for the ANP's end-strength? Do you believe that is sufficient? What needs to be done to improve their effectiveness, and how can we strengthen efforts to train and equip them?



Answer. The President-elect has said that we must focus more attention and resources on training Afghan Security Forces, including more incentives for Americans who carry out this mission.

The end-strength for the Afghan National Police is 82,000, and as of December 2008, there were fewer than 76,000 personnel. While it may be necessary eventually to raise the ceiling to provide wider law enforcement coverage, the immediate goal remains to staff fully the police to the level of 82,000 with vetted, qualified, trained, and equipped personnel. Once that benchmark has been reached and the quality of the police has improved, the Government of Afghanistan and the international community will be better able to assess whether to increase the ceiling.

The development and professionalism of the Afghan police have lagged behind the army's. Many police operate in extremely dangerous environments on the front line of the war against the Taliban, conducting missions that are not traditional policing. The Afghan National Police has suffered a casualty rate three times that of the Afghan National Army. There is no single or easy answer on how to improve police effectiveness. Certainly, greater success in the core military effort will help create a more permissive environment and increase their chances for continued successful development. The Afghan National Police are key players in the counterinsurgency equation and their development and effectiveness are critically important to Afghanistan's future.

As for specific programs, the Focused District Development and In District Reform have shown positive results. These already in-place programs provide training and mentoring by international police advisers and U.S. military personnel in the police units' home districts. Given competing missions, however, we alone cannot meet the needs of the police. We must find increased roles for the European Police Mission to Afghanistan, which recently announced it would increase its staff to 400, and our NATO allies, especially, to act as police mentors.

These initiatives have improved Afghan National Police effectiveness and professionalism and I am hopeful that we have a dedicated partner in Minister of Interior Atmar.

*Question 10.* How do you assess U.S. and Afghan counternarcotics efforts to date? What can be done to improve these efforts?

Answer. The United States, Afghanistan, and other allies have made limited progress in reducing opium cultivation, but overall the counternarcotics strategy cannot be called a success by any measure. In 2008, the CIA Crime and Narcotics Center estimated that Afghanistan cultivated approximately 116,365 hectares of opium poppy, down from 140,600 hectares in 2007. This quantity is believed to be enough to produce over 1,100 tons of heroin, far exceeding the world demand of approximately 400 tons per year. The glut of narcotics has fueled increasing addiction rates in Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iran, and it serves to fund the insurgency in Afghanistan. The narcotics trade thrives in the anarchic conditions created by insurgents and warlords. In return for a portion of the profits, either paid in cash by drug lab operators and smugglers or paid in opium by farmers, the warlords provide protection for the labs, trucks, and drug markets. Exact figures for the black market economy are difficult to obtain, but the U.N. estimates that over \$100 million will flow from the narcotics trade to warlords, drug lords, and insurgents during 2008.

*Question 11.* It will be difficult for U.S.-led efforts to stabilize Afghanistan to succeed without the full commitment and support of Pakistan's Government and security services, but such a high level of cooperation may not be attainable as long as Pakistan's relations with India reflect a significant element of tension and mistrust. What new steps could the United States take to forward regionwide efforts at conflict resolution, and which countries would that involve? Would you favor the appointment of a special U.S. envoy to South Asia?

Answer. As the President-elect and I have stated, Afghanistan and the Pakistani border are the central front in the war on terror. We cannot succeed in Afghanistan without a new and comprehensive strategy to deal with al-Qaeda and Taliban militants across the border, and a Pakistan policy that conditions assistance to the government while increasing direct support for the Pakistani people. Addressing the border means implementing a sensible policy toward Pakistan. First, that means conditioning U.S. military aid on their efforts to close down training camps, evict foreign fighters, and preventing the Taliban and al-Qaeda from using Pakistan as a sanctuary. Second, it means tripling nonmilitary aid to Pakistan, with a focus on the border regions, and improving the lives of the Pakistani people, so that over the long term we are reducing the pull of the extremists. The President-elect and I have consistently supported bilateral dialogue between India and Pakistan that seeks to resolve their longstanding differences.

The United States should encourage India and Pakistan to work toward a peaceful settlement of their differences. No final decisions have been made on special envoys for South Asia.

## PAKISTAN

*Question 12.* There has been considerable discussion in the United States and other Western governments about the ability of Pakistan's new civilian government to crack down on extremism. How would you characterize the efforts of the Zardari government to crack down on extremists? Do you believe that Pakistan's intelligence services have severed ties with extremists in the aftermath of this November's attacks in Mumbai? To what extent do you believe that Pakistan's security concerns vis-a-vis India color their government's policies toward militancy in the tribal areas near Afghanistan?

Answer. President Zardari needs the support of the military to improve relations with neighboring Pakistan and India—to include addressing historical military ties to extremist groups—and the military has sought politicians' support in defending military operations in the tribal areas.

*Question 13.* It is a delicate balancing act between voicing our concerns about the Pakistan Government's counterterrorism strategy, while recognizing the many other challenges it faces and working to ensure this democratically elected government has every chance to succeed. What is our strategy for balancing these interests? How do ongoing Predator strikes in the tribal areas figure into this equation? Are current U.S. policies aimed at improving security and development in Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas succeeding? How would you strengthen our efforts to combat the grave terrorist threat from the FATA?

Answer. We need a stronger and sustained partnership between Afghanistan, Pakistan, and NATO to secure the border, take out terrorist camps, and crack down on cross-border insurgents. We cannot tolerate a safe haven for al-Qaeda terrorists who threaten the American people. Pakistan and the international community must commit to a more comprehensive approach along the border—one that involves robust economic investment and development, good governance and government accountability, and enhanced security and law enforcement capacity. If Pakistan is willing to go after high-level terrorist targets like Osama bin Laden, we must give Pakistan all of the support it needs. The United States must also provide more assistance to benefit the Pakistani people directly, so that our nations forge a deeper and more sustainable partnership.

*Question 14.* In September, the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2008 was reported out of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a unanimous vote. The bill calls for building a long-term relationship with Pakistan, in part by tripling nonmilitary U.S. assistance to \$1.5 billion per year. It also would condition certain further military assistance and arms transfers to Pakistan on annual certifications by the Secretary of State related to Pakistan's performance in combating terrorism and strengthening democratic institutions. Do you favor such an approach to dealing with Pakistan? What can be done to assist Pakistan in dealing with its present economic crisis?

Answer. The President-elect, the Vice-President-elect and I supported the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2008 as Senators. But this is not a blank check. We should condition some military aid on ensuring that Pakistan is taking on the extremists. Should the 111th Congress choose to reintroduce a new version of the legislation, we look forward to working with this committee and the Congress on legislation to help build a long-term relationship with Pakistan that combats extremism and supports Pakistan's people and democratically elected government.

*Question 15.* The congressionally appointed Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism recently issued a report in which Pakistan was singled out as a potential source of a terrorist attack on the United States involving weapons of mass destruction. What is your assessment of the safety and security of Pakistan's nuclear weapons materials and technologies? Do you feel confident that the A.Q. Khan proliferation case is closed, as Pakistani officials claim?

Answer. As Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral Mullen has indicated, we "don't see any indication right now that security of those weapons is in jeopardy, but clearly we are very watchful as we should be." Pakistan's security forces are professional and highly motivated. They understand the importance of nuclear security and we understand that they have taken significant steps to enhance it. But given the political situation in Pakistan, this is clearly something that we must

closely monitor as is the commitment of Pakistan to nonproliferation efforts. I have not yet been briefed on the A.Q. Khan issue that you raise.

## INDIA

*Question 16.* Supporters of the civil nuclear cooperation agreement with India saw the potential to leverage this deal into broader cooperation with India. How might the United States make best use of its strategic partnership with India to address global and regional problems of shared concern, such as international terrorism, poverty, and environmental degradation? Is United States-India counterterrorism cooperation an urgent and potentially fruitful priority, as many suggest?

Answer. India is our friend and our relations with it are deepening. As the world's oldest democracy, we have much in common with the world's largest democracy. While the civil nuclear agreement is important to both countries, our relationship is and must be bigger than one deal. If confirmed, as Secretary of State, I will work to fulfill the commitment of the President-elect to establish a true strategic partnership with India, increasing our military cooperation, trade, and support for democracies around the world. As our relationship deepens, the United States and India can work together to address global and regional problems of shared concern including counterterrorism, poverty, and environmental degradation.

*Question 17.* Advocates of the civil nuclear cooperation agreement with India frequently argued that it would bring New Delhi into the "mainstream" of the international nuclear nonproliferation regime. Does the new administration intend to strengthen nonproliferation cooperation with the Indian Government, including by encouraging India to sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty? Are there other nonproliferation initiatives in South Asia that you might have in mind?

Answer. The U.S. and India should look ahead to working together to meet global proliferation challenges. Although exempting India from existing nonproliferation rules carries some risks, we can minimize those risks by intensifying our cooperation on nonproliferation efforts. The Obama administration will seek ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and encourage India to become a party as well.

*Question 18.* To what extent do you perceive the disputed territory of Jammu and Kashmir to be a central cause of regionwide insecurity? Taking into account Indian sensitivities, would you favor a more active U.S. Government role in helping find solutions to this issue?

Answer. President-elect Obama and I are very concerned about rising tensions in Kashmir: The situation is dangerous for India, for Pakistan, for the people of Kashmir, and the peace and stability of the world. We must encourage all parties to work toward peaceful settlement. The U.S. role in this administration is the same as in previous ones: Facilitate settlement, but do not mediate. India and Pakistan must work harder to establish greater economic and social cooperation in Kashmir. Kashmiris themselves should be the linchpin. Kashmir tensions must not divert Pakistan from focus on fighting terrorism and rising insurgency along Afghan border.

## IRAQ

*Question 19.* Most experts agree that while the level of violence in Iraq has declined dramatically in the last 18–24 months, the political situation remains far more tenuous. Please provide the committee with information on the status of the following reconciliation issues: Negotiations over Iraq's petrochemical laws, the implementation of the amnesty and de-Baathification laws, U.N. efforts to resolve the status of Kirkuk and other disputed territories, and the integration of the Sons of Iraq into the Iraqi Security Forces.

Answer. The President-elect has made it clear that Iraq must do more to reconcile its political differences. National hydrocarbons legislation continues to languish for numerous reasons, one of which remains the differences between Baghdad and the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) over the development and management of oil and gas resources. Prior to enactment of national oil laws, the United States has discouraged companies from signing oil contracts with the KRG without Iraqi central government approval.

The Amnesty Law provides for the release of detainees who did not commit violent crimes. Review committees have granted approximately 20,000 detainees amnesty, but only 6,000–7,000 have been released. Iraq has enacted, but not implemented, legislation on de-Baathification reform. Disagreement between Sunni and Shia continues on whether this legislation adequately addresses de-Baathification reform.

The United States supports the role the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) is playing in the process to resolve Disputed Internal Boundaries, including Kirkuk. UNAMI is expected to release its proposals in February.

The Sons of Iraq (SOI) program remains an important element of security efforts in Iraq. Successfully transitioning the SOI into the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) and other employment remains critically important to sustaining recent security gains. In late summer 2008, the GOI agreed to transition 20 percent of the approximately 95,000 active SOI into the ISF and to facilitate alternative employment for the remainder. Prior to this, approximately 20,000 SOI had already transitioned into the ISF, other ministries, or other nonsecurity education, training, and jobs programs. Of the 95,000, the GOI has transitioned over 3,000 into the Iraqi police and over 1,600 into private employment.

*Question 20.* As the United States changes our mission in Iraq to bring our troops home in meaningful numbers and allow for the redeployment of additional combat brigades to Afghanistan, renewed diplomatic efforts will be crucial to ensuring this transition occurs with the least disruption to stability in Iraq as possible. What diplomatic initiatives are you considering to help ensure a peaceful transition? Do you support the creation of a Standing Conference that includes all of Iraq's neighbors?

Answer. The Obama administration will pursue a diplomatic initiative with all of Iraq's neighbors—including Iran and Syria—and the U.N. to secure Iraq's borders, isolate al-Qaeda, address Iraqi refugee flows, and support national reconciliation within Iraq. It is in the interest of Iraq's neighbors and the international community to have a stable Iraq that does not become a battleground for sectarian tensions and animosities. And we will communicate that. More broadly, we have a range of diplomatic tools at our disposal that we can deploy to persuade and press Iraq's neighbors to play a constructive role. We have let these tools languish in recent years, but they have served us well in advancing our interests in other difficult conflicts. They can serve us well in Iraq.

*Question 21.* Since 2003, it is well known that American efforts in Iraq have been hampered by coordination gaps between civilian and military efforts, though these gaps have been significantly reduced under the leadership of Secretary Bob Gates, Ambassador Ryan Crocker, and Generals David Petraeus and Ray Odierno. Please describe the steps you and Secretary Gates will take to ensure that the efforts of the State and Defense Departments will be as closely integrated as possible.

Answer. The President-elect has repeatedly asserted that we must more effectively integrate our military and civilian tools of national power in order to have a successful and sustainable national security strategy. If confirmed as Secretary of State, I am committed to coordinating efforts closely with the Department of Defense in Iraq and elsewhere and to instill that culture of cooperation in the Department. Secretary Gates and I worked well together during my service on the Senate Armed Services Committee and I am confident that we can work together to ensure that we continue to close coordination gaps between the Department of State and the Department of Defense. In order to facilitate that coordination, we must strengthen our civilian capacity to operate alongside our military.

*Question 22.* Article 24 of the recently approved United States-Iraqi Status of Force Agreement (SOFA) stipulates that all U.S. combat forces shall withdraw from Iraqi cities and towns by June 30, 2009, and that all U.S. forces shall withdraw from Iraq by December 31, 2011. There are about 30 Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) and Embedded Provincial Reconstruction Teams (ePRTs) in Iraq. How will the removal of U.S. combat troops from Iraqi towns and cities later this year affect the location and functionality of these PRTs and ePRTs, as well as the ability of the U.S. military to provide for their security? How viable is the PRT model after December 2011, or even June 30, 2009? By what other means can our diplomats engage in provincial and regional issues in Iraq?

Answer. The civilians who are serving in Iraq are making great sacrifices for the country and often serve in harm's way. The President-elect and I are very mindful of the challenges that will come with a drawdown of U.S. troops, and the President-elect has consistently said that protection for our civilians in Iraq will continue to be a mission for a residual force after a drawdown of our combat brigades. But there are no easy solutions to the security issues you are describing. Right now, much of the rebuilding is taking place under a security umbrella provided by the brave young men and women of our Armed Forces. Their departure from critical areas in Iraq will certainly change the security calculus. How we deal with this challenge—both generally and specifically with respect to PRTs—has been and will continue to be the subject of discussions among the national security team and with the President-elect.

The incoming administration will proceed with the following overall strategy and core principles, which we will bring to this set of security challenges. First, as we all know, Iraq is a sovereign country, and the steps we take on security matters moving forward will have to be taken in consultation with the Iraqis. We will certainly do our best to press the Iraqi Government to combat sectarianism in their security forces—and we will tie future training and equipping resources to progress on this front. Improved Iraqi security forces cannot fully replace U.S. forces in protecting reconstruction personnel, but they can certainly help, if the Iraqis step up. And our residual force will play a continued force protection role. Second, we will take additional steps to help the Iraqi Government consolidate the security gains that have been made in the past 2 years—gains that have facilitated more intensive and effective rebuilding and aid efforts. That will include an intensive diplomatic and political strategy, including an effort to forge a comprehensive compact with Iraq's neighbors. Third, we will pay particular attention to the humanitarian crisis in Iraq, which risks destabilizing parts of the country, including an aggressive effort to assist displaced Iraqis. But these are serious challenges, and much of this turns on the capacity and willingness of the Iraqis themselves.

*Question 23.* Article 12 of the SOFA gives Iraq primary jurisdiction over U.S. contractors. However, Article 5 of the SOFA defines U.S. contractors as persons who “are citizens of the United States or a third country and who are in Iraq to supply goods, services, and security in Iraq to or on behalf of the United States Forces.” Are State Department contractors covered by the United States-Iraqi SOFA? What impact do you expect the SOFA to have on your Department’s use of private security contractors?

Answer. I have forwarded your question to the SOFA negotiators so as to be certain that we have the exact right answer.

*Question 24.* As a result of the war in Iraq, at least 4 million Iraqis have been displaced from their homes as refugees in neighboring countries or internally displaced persons (IDPs) within Iraq. President-elect Obama has committed to provide \$2 billion in humanitarian assistance for these refugees and IDPs. Please provide the committee information on how the State Department will support Iraqi refugees and IDPs under your leadership.

Answer. America has both a moral obligation and a responsibility for security that demands we confront Iraq’s humanitarian crisis—there may be more than 5 million Iraqis who are refugees or are displaced inside their own country. The new administration will seek to form an international working group to address this crisis. We will also make it a top priority to secure greater regional contributions to humanitarian relief, refugee care and integration, and economic assistance, and we will make this an important subject on the agenda for regional diplomacy with all of Iraq’s neighbors. Further, we will also fill all of the pledged slots for admission of Iraqi refugees to the United States, and we will be open to accept additional Iraqis, who took risks to support American efforts in Iraq.

*Question 25.* During the three post-Saddam elections, the U.S. military was instrumental in providing both security and logistical support. What is your assessment of the Iraqi election commissions’ related capacity at the national and provincial levels? What role will the U.S. military play in providing security and logistical support for the provincial elections scheduled for the end of January?

Answer. Unlike prior elections in post-Saddam Iraq, logistics and security for the January 31 Provincial Council elections will be Iraqi-planned, managed, and led. Iraq’s Independent High Electoral Commission (IHEC), with significant technical support from the United Nations Assistance Mission to Iraq (UNAMI), manages elections planning and logistics. This includes voter, candidate, and coalition registration; ballot design and printing; election center and polling place staffing; observer certification; and voter education.

The IHEC is on schedule to carry out elections on January 31. The IHEC’s ability to meet its announced February 23 deadline for certifying elections results will depend in part on the number of elections-related complaints that it must review. The seat allocation formula that IHEC has devised, with UNAMI assistance, is complex. Ballots are also complicated, with nearly 2,500 candidates appearing on the Baghdad Governorate ballot for the 57 council seats there. According to State Department reporting from Iraq, despite these challenges, the mechanics for a credible election appear to be moving ahead reasonably well.

Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) will provide the lead for all security measures required for elections, and the U.S. military will provide “outer ring” and emergency support as needed, as well as any necessary support to the ISF for the transportation and security of voting materials. The elections High Security Committee, comprising

senior security officials from the Iraqi Ministries of Interior and Defense, the office of the Iraqi National Security Advisor, and the U.S. military, has been planning for and advising the IHEC Board of Commissioners on security measures.

*Question 26.* The Embassy of the United States in Baghdad is, by a considerable margin, the largest in the world. About how many Americans—diplomats and non-diplomats—are currently working in the New Embassy Compound (NEC)? How many diplomats of ambassadorial rank are currently assigned there? Are these staffing levels appropriate, given the declining military presence in Iraq and the plethora of foreign policy challenges facing the United States in the region and beyond?

Answer. There are approximately 12,500 U.S. diplomats, staff, contractors, and grant implementers from State and other civilian agencies serving under Chief of Mission authority in Iraq. Approximately 1,300 of these individuals are direct-hire USG employees.

One U.S. Ambassador, Ryan Crocker, is accredited in Iraq. Some of the senior mission staff have formerly held ambassadorial appointments at other posts. One member of the mission on temporary duty until May is accredited as Ambassador to Bahrain.

If confirmed as Secretary of State, I will work with the President-elect and other administration officials to determine what the appropriate staffing levels should be to pursue the President-elect's policies and priorities.

#### IRAN

*Question 27.* There is deep concern among the United States and its key allies about Iran's nuclear program. Some have argued that Iran will soon have, if it does not already, the capability to enrich enough uranium to create a nuclear weapon. The Bush administration's approach has not worked to date. What would the new administration do differently? What role do you envision for yourself in this process? Under what circumstances would it be appropriate for you or President-elect Obama to engage in related talks?

Answer. The new administration will present the Iranian regime with a clear choice: Abandon your nuclear weapons program and support for terror and threats to Israel and there will be meaningful incentives—refuse, and we will ratchet up the pressure with stronger unilateral sanctions; stronger multilateral sanctions in the Security Council; and sustained action outside the U.N. to isolate the Iranian regime. A nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable, and all elements of American power are on the table to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon—that must begin with the power of aggressive and direct American diplomacy.

The Obama administration will support tough, aggressive, and direct diplomacy, without preconditions, with our adversaries. Note that there is a distinction between preparations and preconditions. For possible negotiations with Iran, there must be careful preparation—including low-level talks, coordination with allies, the establishment of an agenda, and an evaluation of the potential for progress. The President-elect has said that he is willing to engage in diplomacy with any leader, at a time and place of his choosing, if he believes that it can advance America's interests.

*Question 28.* The U.S. should support and participate in ongoing efforts with our European allies and assemble an international coalition that will exert a collective will on Iran so that it is in their own interest to verifiably abandon their nuclear weapons efforts. We will carefully prepare for any negotiations—open up lines of communication, build an agenda, coordinate closely with our allies, and evaluate the potential for progress.

- Does the administration intend to push for a new round of P5+1 negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program early on? What factors will inform the timing of these negotiations? When these talks occur, how would you seek to structure them to ensure Iran does not use them to stall for time as it continues its uranium enrichment activities? Would you seek to expand negotiations to include other issues of mutual interest, including Iraq and Afghanistan?

Answer. We will not sit down with Iran just for the sake of talking. But we are willing to lead tough and principled diplomacy with the appropriate Iranian leader at a time and place of our choosing—if, and only if—it can advance the interests of the United States. No decisions have been made regarding the timing, configuration, and scope of any discussions with Iran, but we will certainly coordinate closely with our allies as we move forward.

Through aggressive diplomacy, we can create new opportunities for progress. Even if diplomacy is unsuccessful, we will be better able to rally the world to our side,

strengthen multilateral sanctions, and to convince the Iranian people that their own government is the author of its isolation.

*Question 29.* In 2007, the U.S. and Iranian Ambassadors to Iraq met for three rounds of talks; they have not met since. Would you be supportive of continuing these talks? If so, should the dialogue focus on Iraq security issues, or be expanded to include other topics, as well?

Answer. As noted above, the incoming administration will support tough negotiations with Iran and will be evaluating the best forums and interlocutors for that engagement. We have also supported direct engagement with Iran as a part of a diplomatic initiative involving all of Iraq's neighbors.

No decision has yet been made on the continuation of the specific talks that you identify.

*Question 30.* Earlier this year, I and six of my colleagues wrote to President Bush, to encourage the establishment of a U.S. interests section in Iran. In November, Secretary Rice announced that although President Bush had made a decision "in principle" last summer to open an interests section, the decision would be left to the incoming administration. Have you made a decision regarding whether to open a U.S. interests section in Tehran?

Answer. The decision regarding whether to open a U.S. interests section in Tehran is under review and no decision has been made yet.

#### ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN PEACE PROCESS

*Question 31.* The November 2007 Annapolis peace conference did not meet its stated goal of concluding a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by the end of 2008. How do you assess the prospects for the Israeli-Palestinian peace process in light of recent, ongoing, and future events? Do you think hopes for quick progress on the peace process have been dashed, as some suggest, by the recent crisis in Gaza? What has been achieved by the Annapolis process and how do you see your role in pushing those efforts forward? Does the April 2003 Road Map remain the operative mechanism for a two-state outcome?

Answer. President-elect Obama has pledged to work actively from the beginning of his administration to help Israel and the Palestinians achieve peace and security through a two-state solution, because this is in both parties' interests and because it is the United States interests. Throughout 2008, he urged Israel and the Palestinian Authority to make as much progress as possible in their negotiations that arose out of the Annapolis conference, so that a functioning process could be continued in 2009. And indeed, the parties report that progress has been made in these talks, which they hope to build upon. Our commitment is to help them build on that progress and achieve their goal of two states living side by side in peace and security. That commitment remains, even in the face of very difficult and challenging events, such as the recent events in Gaza and southern Israel. The roadmap, with the mutual obligations it places on the parties, remains one of the important bases for working toward a two-state solution.

*Question 32.* By most accounts, the American-funded training efforts of Palestinian security forces have borne some fruit, particularly in Jenin and Hebron. Roughly 1,000 Palestinian National Security Force (NSF) and Presidential Guard (PG) members have been trained and several hundred more are currently undergoing training in Jordan. How do you assess the performance of the units that have received American-supported training? What additional resources are required to continue making progress?

Answer. The Palestinian National Security Force and Presidential Guard members who have been trained in Jordan under the auspices of the United States Security Coordinator have performed well in early tests in Jenin and Hebron. This is an important element of strengthening Palestinian capabilities to enable the Palestinian Authority to meet its commitments to combat terrorism and maintain law and order, which are crucial to ensuring security for Israelis and improving daily life for Palestinians. The Congress has provided approximately \$161 million in funding for this successful program in fiscal years 2008 and 2009. If confirmed, I will be consulting with GEN Keith Dayton and others to determine appropriate funding levels for this program to continue to achieve positive results.

*Question 33.* In 2008, there have been a number of high-profile missions in support of the Annapolis Peace Process: GEN Jim Jones, GEN Paul Selva, and GEN Keith Dayton have served respectively as special envoys for Middle East security, roadmap monitoring, and Palestinian security coordination, with separate reporting

channels to the administration. Additionally, former British Prime Minister Tony Blair serves as the Quartet's special envoy. Is the current architecture in support of the Annapolis process appropriately coordinated, or would it make more sense to streamline the various security missions under a single full-time high-level envoy?

Answer. General Jones, General Selva, and General Dayton have each played important and constructive roles in advancing U.S. efforts to promote peace between Israel and the Palestinians. Former Prime Minister Blair has also made an excellent contribution as the Quartet's special envoy, promoting economic development and institution-building in the Palestinian areas. No decisions have been made about the personnel structure we will use to implement our Middle East peace efforts, but each of the important functions carried forward by the generals and Prime Minister Blair will need to be continued in whatever structure we ultimately decide upon.

#### ARAB PEACE INITIATIVE

*Question 34.* Many believe that real progress on the peace process will require greater participation and the support of Arab countries in the region, many of which attended the Annapolis conference. What role do you envision for the Arab states in Israeli-Palestinian diplomacy going forward? Do you believe that the Arab Peace Initiative can provide a framework for future negotiations?

Answer. I believe the Arab states have an important role to play in advancing efforts to achieve peace between Israelis and Palestinians. Their chief means to do so are providing political and economic support to the Palestinian Authority, and taking steps toward normalization with Israel. The Arab Peace Initiative contains some constructive elements which could be important bases for negotiations and for proactive steps to give the initiative a more operational character. I look forward to discussing these opportunities with Israeli, Palestinian, and Arab leaders and encouraging progress in these efforts.

#### SYRIA

*Question 35.* Until September, Israel and Syria were talking indirectly through Turkish mediation. Many observers believe that the talks proceeded as far as they could without direct American engagement. Do you believe that a U.S. role in facilitating Israeli-Syrian negotiations could move those talks forward? Do you support direct U.S. engagement if that would facilitate further progress? What is the likelihood that the parties will reach an agreement?

Answer. The United States and Syria have profound differences on important issues, and the President-elect and I believe that engaging directly with Syria increases the possibility of making progress on changing Syrian behavior. In these talks, we should insist on our core demands: Cooperation in stabilizing Iraq; ending support for terrorist groups; stopping the flow of weapons to Hezbollah, and respect for Lebanon's sovereignty and independence.

The President-elect believes that we must never force Israel to the negotiating table with Syria, but neither should we ever block negotiations when Israel's leaders decide that they may serve Israeli interests. We should engage directly to help Israel and Syria succeed in their peace efforts, which both parties have indicated could help advance the talks. The prospects of success in these talks are unknown, but we are committed to making every effort to help them succeed.

*Question 36.* The last U.S. Ambassador to Syria was recalled for "urgent consultations" in the aftermath of the February 2005 assassination of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri. Since that time, the United States has not had an ambassador to Syria. Do you support sending an American ambassador to Damascus?

Answer. The President-elect and I believe strongly that direct U.S. engagement with Syria will advance United States interests. At this time, no decisions have been made regarding returning a U.S. ambassador to Damascus.

*Question 37.* Although the U.S. Embassy in Damascus remains open, American diplomats have been heavily restricted since February 2005 in their ability to interact with Syrian Government officials, except on a narrow range of issues, such as Iraqi refugees. Do you support allowing U.S. diplomats more latitude in engaging with Syrian officials unless/until an ambassador is appointed?

Answer. We believe that direct U.S. engagement with Syria will advance United States interests. I plan to consult with our Chief of Mission in Damascus to determine how best to carry out this principle in the context of the Embassy's current structure.



*Question 38.* The Secretary General of the United Nations, Ban Ki-moon, announced recently that the Special Tribunal for Lebanon, established by the United Nations to try suspects in the assassinations of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and other Lebanese politicians, would begin operations on March 1, 2009. How soon do you expect indictments to be issued and trials to begin? There has been speculation among some observers that Syria hopes to leverage peace negotiations with Israel to earn a reprieve from prosecutions of top Syrian officials by the tribunal. What steps have been and should be taken to ensure the tribunal is insulated from political interference?

*Answer.* The United States should continue to support efforts to uncover the truth about the assassinations, and to insulate these efforts from political interference. I am encouraged to see that the Tribunal will officially begin operations on March 1, but as the head prosecutor recently stated, it is unclear when the Tribunal will bring indictments. The Security Council established various safeguards to ensure an objective and expeditious judicial process. First, it includes provisions on enhanced powers, so the Tribunal may take independent measures to prevent unreasonable delays. Second, it mandated a transparent appointment process of international officials, including the judges and prosecutor. Third, it includes provisions on the rights of victims to present their views. The Security Council explicitly requested that the Tribunal be based on “the highest international standards of criminal justice,” and I will work with our international allies to ensure this pledge is fulfilled.

#### GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

*Question 39.* At the climate change negotiations last year in Bali, and again this year in Poznan, one of the greatest points of disagreement between industrialized and developing countries was the format and structure of funding mechanisms to support mitigation, adaptation, and technology transfer. What do you believe are the most useful entities and structures for directing funds to build capacity in developing countries to reduce their emissions and manage the impacts of climate change?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama spoke throughout the campaign about the need to develop partnerships and capacity in developing countries as a part of a global effort to combat climate change. He believes that technology transfer, adaptation assistance, and support for mitigation in developing countries are key components of a global climate change deal. His administration will pursue mechanisms to achieve these goals that are effective, transparent, and provide accountability.

*Question 40.* In 1997, the debate over the Byrd-Hagel resolution clarified the sense of the Senate that any global climate change treaty must secure the participation of both developed and developing countries. That sentiment has not changed, and it will guide our debate as we approach the Copenhagen climate change negotiations next year. Is it the position of the Obama administration that any global deal on climate change must secure some type of measurable, reportable, and verifiable actions from China, India, and the other rapidly industrializing countries?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama believes that climate change is a global problem that requires a global solution. The Bali Action Plan 2007 states that the post-Kyoto agreement should include measurable, reportable, and verifiable actions by developing countries. The Obama administration will pursue such commitments during upcoming negotiations.

*Question 41.* A number of prominent national security officials and organizations have highlighted the security implications of climate change, culminating in a November report from the National Intelligence Council emphasizing that climate change will intensify food and water scarcity, serving as a threat multiplier around the globe. For its part, the U.N. has estimated that there may be as many as 50 million “climate refugees” by 2010. How will the Obama administration integrate climate change into its national security planning and response operations?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama agrees that global climate change is likely to impact U.S. national security. He has warned that competition over resources could lead to conflict and population movements, and has called our dependence on foreign oil and gas a national security crisis. He plans to fulfill existing legal requirements to integrate such considerations into national security planning, and will work with Congress to identify and define additional measures as appropriate.

#### TERRORISM

*Question 42.* In July 2008, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates stated that “military efforts to capture or kill terrorists are likely to be subordinate to measures to pro-

mote local participation in government and economic programs to spur development, as well as efforts to understand and address the grievances that often lie at the heart of insurgencies.” Many have called for a new approach to terrorism that would reconceptualize the “war on terror” as a “global counterinsurgency” that places military action in its proper context alongside our moral authority, diplomatic persuasion and development assistance. What are your views as to how we can craft a more effective worldwide strategy that takes our military operations to capture and kill terrorists and folds them into a larger “information war” designed to win hearts and minds and prevent possible terrorists from ever being recruited?

Answer. I agree with Secretary Gates’ assessment. President-elect Obama has made it clear that we need a comprehensive strategy to fight terrorism that balances and integrates military force, diplomacy, intelligence, law enforcement, financial action, economic might, and moral suasion. He has also stressed that our capacity must be driven by this strategy, saying that while the finest military in the world is adapting to the challenges of the 21st century, it cannot counter insurgent and terrorist threats without civilian counterparts who can carry out economic and political reconstruction missions—sometimes in dangerous places. He promised to strengthen these civilian capacities, recruiting our best and brightest to take on this challenge by increasing both the numbers and capabilities of our diplomats, development experts, and other civilians who can work alongside our military. This new construct will integrate all aspects of American might.

If confirmed by the Senate, I will also work with the President in launching a program of public diplomacy that is a coordinated effort across his administration. And as others learn about America’s ways through their conversations with Americans, American citizens will listen and learn about people of other cultures and countries.

*Question 43.* President-elect Obama has called nuclear terrorism “the gravest danger we face.” The State Department, along with several other agencies, has a critical role to play to address this threat. In your view, has the United States done enough in its diplomatic relations with other countries to demonstrate the priority it attaches to nuclear security and the prevention of nuclear terrorism? What additional steps would you take to convey a sense of urgency and convince political leaders around the world that the threat of nuclear terrorism is real and that immediate steps are needed by every government to reduce this danger?

Answer. Terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, is indeed the gravest security threat we face today. The most effective way of preventing nuclear terrorism is to secure weapons-usable nuclear materials at their source so that they are not vulnerable to theft or seizure by terrorist groups. The Obama administration plans to secure all nuclear weapons and materials at vulnerable sites worldwide within 4 years. It will also work to phase out the use of highly enriched uranium in the civil nuclear sector, strengthen international intelligence and police cooperation to prevent WMD terrorism, and help build the capacity of governments around the world to prevent the theft or diversion of nuclear materials.

*Question 44.* During the campaign, President-elect Obama said he would appoint a White House coordinator for nuclear security, specifically a deputy national security adviser to be in charge of coordinating all U.S. programs aimed at reducing the risk of nuclear terrorism and weapons proliferation. What are your views on such an appointment? Should that position be Senate-confirmed as required by an existing statute? Should it cover all weapons of mass destruction or only nuclear terrorism?

Answer. The Obama administration will follow through on the President-elect’s campaign pledge to appoint a White House Coordinator to address the threat of nuclear terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Among the Coordinator’s responsibilities will be to exercise budgetary oversight over all U.S. programs related to nuclear security and biosecurity.

#### NUCLEAR WEAPONS AND THE START TREATY

*Question 45.* As you know, the START Treaty is due to expire on December 5, 2009. This treaty has served as a vital mechanism of stability and transparency in post-cold-war relations between the United States and Russia. The 2002 Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty, or Moscow Treaty, has no separate verification measures, and limits deployed U.S. and Russian strategic nuclear warheads to a range of 1,700–2,200 for only a single day, December 31, 2012. The Bush administration has reportedly shared with Russia a START proposal that would, like the Moscow Treaty, limit operationally deployed strategic warheads, and would maintain some of the START Treaty’s verification mechanisms. Do you plan to seek a legally bind-

ing replacement for the START Treaty that will enter into force by December 5, 2009?

Answer. The Obama administration will seek deep, verifiable reductions in all U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons—whether deployed or nondeployed, strategic or nonstrategic. As a first step, we will seek a legally binding agreement to replace the current START Treaty which, as you point out, expires in December 2009.

*Question 46.* If a replacement cannot be ratified and brought into force by that time, what options will you consider? Should the United States, Russia, and the other States Parties to the START Treaty (e.g., Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine) extend the treaty for 5 years, as permitted under Article XVII of the treaty, while negotiations for a substitute treaty continue?

Answer. If an agreement cannot be reached, a mutually acceptable means should be found to give the negotiators more time, without allowing key measures, including essential monitoring and verification provisions, to lapse. Ending the cold war practice of keeping nuclear weapons ready for launch on a moment's notice should also be a priority, if it can be done in a mutual and credible manner.

*Question 47.* In your view, how important is it for a follow-on to the START Treaty to lead to further reductions in the numbers of deployed and reserve U.S. and Russian warheads? Should those reductions go below Moscow Treaty numbers? Should negotiations on a substantial follow-on to the START Treaty be delayed until the legally required Nuclear Posture Review is completed?

Answer. The Obama administration plans to set a new direction in nuclear weapons policy, one that reflects the changed security conditions of the 21st century and that shows the world that the U.S. takes seriously its existing commitment under the nonproliferation treaty to pursue nuclear disarmament. Such a new direction should be fully explored and elaborated in the upcoming Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) that is mandated by statute. While some of the key elements of the revised approach may not take shape until the NPR is completed, negotiations on the next step in the arms reduction process—replacing the current START Treaty—can begin even while the posture review is underway.

#### COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST-BAN TREATY

*Question 48.* Both you and the President-elect have expressed your intention to work with the Senate to win its advice and consent to U.S. ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). In preparing for such an effort, what are the most important lessons that you take from the Senate's 1999 rejection of a resolution of ratification on the Treaty? How do you plan to address the substantive concerns that were raised in that debate?

Answer. The President-elect and I are both strongly committed to Senate approval of the CTBT and to launching a diplomatic effort to bring on board other states whose ratifications are required for the treaty to enter into force. A lesson learned from 1999 is that we need to ensure that the administration work intensively with Senators so they are fully briefed on key technical issues on which their CTBT votes will depend, especially the issues of how well the treaty can be verified and how well the reliability of the U.S. nuclear stockpile can be maintained without nuclear testing. Substantial progress has been made in the last decade in our ability to verify a CTBT and ensure stockpile reliability. It will be crucial to make sure that the Senate receives the best scientific evidence available on these two issues as well as on other questions relevant to the merits of the CTBT.

*Question 49.* For the last several years, the State Department has requested insufficient funding to pay all of our voluntary contributions to the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty Organization (Preparatory Commission). While congressional actions have restored some of the funding, this shortfall has impaired construction of the International Monitoring System and has jeopardized U.S. voting rights at the Preparatory Commission. What are your views with regard to allowing sufficient and timely funding to make effective contributions to the Preparatory Commission?

Answer. The Obama administration will fully support the CTBT's International Monitoring System, which gives the United States better capability to detect and identify very low-yield nuclear tests than we would have on our own. We will also support the work of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty Organization's Preparatory Commission and will want to ensure that it is adequately funded. On specific questions regarding the timing and level of U.S. funding, the new administration will want to review the situation and consult with Congress on how to proceed.

## FISSILE MATERIAL CUTOFF TREATY

*Question 50.* The Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorism recommends that the United States should work “to build international support for the negotiation of a treaty halting the production of fissile materials for military purposes.” The Conference on Disarmament for several years has been unable to achieve a consensus to allow negotiations to proceed. What importance do you attach to finding a way for negotiations on a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty to proceed? What are the roadblocks to progress, as you see them, and how might we address them?

Answer. The President-elect made it clear during the campaign that he supports the negotiation of a treaty banning the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons. Such a treaty could help avoid destabilizing arms races in regions such as South Asia and, by limiting the amount of fissile material worldwide, could facilitate the task of securing such weapons-usable materials against theft or seizure by terrorist groups. It would also demonstrate the willingness of the NPT nuclear weapon states to fulfill their obligation under NPT Article VI to pursue nuclear disarmament. However, for over a decade, the Conference on Disarmament has been unable to achieve a consensus to allow negotiations to proceed—in part because of the difficulty of reaching agreement on a work program but, more fundamentally, because some key states wish to continue producing fissile materials for nuclear weapons or at least keep open the option for such production in the future. The Obama administration will work to build the necessary support to get negotiations underway. One step it will take is to return to the policy of previous Republican and Democratic administrations and end the current policy of declaring that a fissile material cutoff treaty should not contain international verification provisions.

## NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION/2010 NPT REVIEW CONFERENCE

*Question 51.* The Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorism recently recommended that the United States “should work internationally toward strengthening the nonproliferation regime, reaffirming the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons.” The 2010 Review Conference of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which is scheduled for April and May 2010, provides one opportunity to pursue that goal. The 2000 Review Conference reached a consensus that 13 practical steps should be taken in order to demonstrate progress on the arms control and disarmament obligations set out in Article VI of the NPT. The 2005 Review Conference ended without reaching substantive consensus on next steps. What importance do you attach to the 2010 Review Conference, and what steps will you take in order to avoid the outcome of the 2005 Review Conference?

Answer. The President-elect said during the campaign that he supports the goal of working toward a world without nuclear weapons. The Obama administration will place great importance on strengthening the NPT and the nonproliferation regime in general. It will encourage all states to support more rigorous IAEA verification measures, tighter restrictions on transfers of sensitive technologies, and stronger means of enforcing compliance.

*Question 52.* Though some of the conditions surrounding many of the 13 practical steps agreed to at the 2000 Review Conference have changed in the intervening years, do you see value in pursuing a comparable set of actions at the 2010 Review Conference?

Answer. The 2010 NPT Review Conference will provide an opportunity to reach agreement on such steps. But gaining the necessary support among NPT parties will require the United States and the other nuclear powers to demonstrate that they take seriously their obligations to pursue nuclear disarmament. While the conditions surrounding agreement on the so-called “thirteen steps” at the 2000 NPT Review Conference have changed, support for a similar package of measures at the 2010 conference could help build the wide support needed to bolster the NPT regime.

## IAEA

*Question 53.* The Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorism recently concluded that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) “is constrained in serving as the world’s nuclear watchdog because its staff is aging and its budget has increased little over the past decade.” The Commission called on the United States to “lead an international effort to update and improve

IAEA capabilities.” What steps do you envision taking to address the resource constraints facing the IAEA?

Answer. Especially if the world’s reliance on nuclear power increases substantially in coming decades, a huge burden will be placed on the IAEA to ensure that civil nuclear facilities and activities are not diverted to military uses and that nuclear facilities and materials are secure against theft or seizure by terrorist groups. The IAEA is understaffed and underresourced for the current and growing responsibilities placed on it by the international community. That is why the President-elect has called for doubling the IAEA’s budget over the next 4 years. We also favor strengthening the Agency’s verification capabilities by promoting universal adherence to the Additional Protocol and by expanding the Agency’s verification authorities beyond those contained in the Additional Protocol to provide more effective means of detecting clandestine facilities and activities.

#### NUCLEAR FUEL BANK

*Question 54.* The Commission on the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction and Terrorism has recommended that the United States should lead the international effort to create a bank that would guarantee countries a supply of nuclear reactor fuel. The United States has already transferred \$50 million to the IAEA to support the creation of a fuel bank, and the European Union recently agreed to contribute up to €25 million to support the effort. But the IAEA Board of Governors has not agreed on the mechanisms and rules under which the fuel bank will actually operate. What importance do you attach to actually expending the funds pledged and bringing the fuel bank into reality? Should there be a parallel effort to assure countries of affordable spent fuel services?

Answer. President-elect Obama and I strongly supported legislation providing \$50 million to the IAEA for the creation of an international nuclear fuel bank. We believe the United States should work with other countries and the IAEA to put in place new mechanisms, including an international fuel bank that would allow countries to benefit from the peaceful uses of nuclear energy without increasing the risks of nuclear proliferation. An international fuel bank could reassure countries embarking on or expanding nuclear power programs that, as long as they comply with their nonproliferation obligations, they could reliably purchase reactor fuel in the event that their existing fuel supplies were cut off. This would reduce any incentives a country genuinely interested in nuclear energy might have for going to the trouble and expense of building its own enrichment or reprocessing facilities. Assuring countries of reliable spent fuel services (e.g., long-term storage) would serve the same goal of reducing incentives for acquiring indigenous fuel-cycle facilities.

#### ORGANIZATION OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT FOR ARMS CONTROL AND NONPROLIFERATION

*Question 55.* The Bureaus of the State Department that report to the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security have undergone numerous organizational and personnel changes in the last decade. Do you envision taking any major steps early in your tenure as Secretary to further alter the organization of the Bureaus reporting to this Under Secretary? What steps will you take to ensure that, in particular, the Political-Military Affairs Bureau and the Verification, Compliance, and Implementation Bureau have the people and the resources they need to carry out their important missions?

Answer. Because President-elect Obama and I place such high importance on arms control, nonproliferation, and other political-military issues, I am giving special attention to the three Bureaus of the State Department that report to the Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security. It is essential that those Bureaus be well organized and well staffed with first-rate professionals, both from the Civil Service and Foreign Service. I am currently reviewing the situation and am determined to take whatever steps may be necessary to ensure that those bureaus are fully capable of doing the crucial work we will be expecting of them in coming years. I will keep Congress fully apprised of my plans in this area.

#### U.N. CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA

*Question 56.* In 1994, the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea (the Convention) was submitted to the U.S. Senate for accession and ratification. While the Foreign Relations Committee has favorably reported this treaty in prior years, the full Senate has not yet taken it up. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice wrote to this committee that the State Department supported “early Senate action” on the Convention. At the time, the administration’s Treaty Priority List expressed an “urgent

need” for Senate approval of the Convention. More recently, President Obama stated in September 2008 that he will “work actively to ensure that the U.S. ratifies the Law of the Sea Convention.” If confirmed, do you intend to make ratification of the Convention your top treaty priority at State?

Answer. The President-elect and I both supported ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention as Senators and, as the question notes, he has publicly committed to working actively to ensure that the U.S. ratifies the Convention.

The Convention remains an important piece of unfinished treaty business. If confirmed, its ratification will be one of my top treaty priorities at State, and the new administration will work with the Senate to secure approval.

*Question 57.* If the Foreign Relations Committee were to report out the Convention in the 111th Congress, how would the administration plan to work with the Senate to help bring the Convention and Implementing Agreement to a successful floor vote?

Answer. As in the case of any treaty that the President supports, the administration would work closely with this committee and the Senate leadership on devising and implementing a strategy for successful approval of the treaty by the full Senate.

*Question 58.* Admiral Mike Mullen, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and Admiral Gary Roughead, the Chief of Naval Operations, support approval of the Convention. Admiral Roughead stated to the Senate Armed Services Committee that “accession to the Law of the Sea Convention is in our national security interests.” Do you agree with him, and if so, why? What effect, if any, would accession have on the U.S. military’s ability to conduct ongoing or future operations? Would accession in any way restrict efforts to prevent the shipment of weapons of mass destruction or any other nonproliferation programs, such as the Proliferation Security Initiative?

Answer. The incoming administration agrees with the Chief of Naval Operations, and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of whom endorsed the Convention during the 110th Congress. Joining the Convention will advance the interests of the U.S. military. As the world’s leading maritime power, the United States benefits more than any other nation from the navigation provisions of the Convention. Those provisions, which establish international consensus on the extent of jurisdiction that States may exercise off their coasts, preserve and elaborate the rights of the U.S. military to use the world’s oceans to meet national security requirements.

Joining the Convention will enhance, not restrict, our ability to interdict shipment of weapons of mass destruction on the ocean. The Convention’s navigation provisions derive from the 1958 law of the sea conventions, to which the United States is a party, and also reflect customary international law accepted by the United States. As such, the Convention will not affect applicable maritime law or policy regarding interdiction of weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery, and related materials.

Like the 1958 conventions, the LOS Convention recognizes numerous legal bases for taking enforcement action against vessels and aircraft suspected of engaging in proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including exclusive port and coastal State jurisdiction in internal waters and national airspace; coastal State jurisdiction in the territorial sea and contiguous zone; exclusive flag State jurisdiction over vessels on the high seas (which the flag State may, either by general agreement in advance or approval in response to a specific request, waive in favor of other States); and universal jurisdiction over stateless vessels.

Nor will the Convention undermine the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). PSI requires participating countries to act consistent with national legal authorities and “relevant international law and frameworks,” which includes the law reflected in the Law of the Sea Convention. Finally, nothing in the Convention impairs the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense (a point which is reaffirmed in the Resolution of Advice and Consent proposed by the committee in the 110th Congress).

#### NATIONAL SECURITY REFORM

*Question 59.* Last November, a prominent group of experts and practitioners from the congressionally mandated Project on National Security Reform (PNSR) released a report that called for significant improvements in how the U.S. coordinates and implements national security strategy and programs. Do you agree that fundamental reform of our national security system, structures, and processes is needed so that this country can anticipate, prepare for, and respond to the kinds of complex and diffuse threats we face in the 21st century? What types of reform are required?

[NO RESPONSE RECEIVED ON THIS QUESTION]

*Question 60.* National security missions increasingly require inputs from multiple departments to be successful. The PNSR report has concluded that existing interagency mechanisms are insufficient to achieve unity of purpose, effort, and command. Instead, PNSR has recommended that we provide interagency mechanisms backed by specific legal authorities related to the U.S. Government's capabilities to accomplish particular missions. Would you support such efforts? Would you be willing to cede authority over some of the assets and resources of your Department so that an interagency team can accomplish its mission?

Answer. The President-elect has made it clear that the United States must enhance our ability to use, balance, and integrate all elements of national power—military, diplomatic, intelligence, law enforcement, economic, and moral—to achieve our national security goals. He has called for the process of preparing the National Security Strategy (required by the Goldwater-Nichols Act of 1986) to determine the appropriate interagency infrastructure to maximize the use of all elements of our national power. This exhaustive review will include an examination of force sizing, intelligence agencies, and weapons systems, as well as the development of long-term plans to deal with emerging threats like cyberterrorism. We are aware of the effort of the Project on National Security Reform report and we look forward to consulting with Congress on the appropriate structure for our national security agencies.

FOREIGN AID REFORM AND REWRITING THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT

*Question 61.* Many are calling for substantial reform of U.S. foreign assistance programs, which have been criticized as fragmented and uncoordinated, failing to match resource allocations with strategic objectives, inefficient, and lacking capacity to ensure appropriate accountability, oversight, and implementation. To what degree are you in support of such reform efforts? What would you identify as the highest priority areas in need of reform?

Answer. The President-elect is committed to a strengthened and enhanced role for foreign assistance and development in our foreign policy, as am I. It is both right and smart for the United States to renew its leadership as a nation that seeks to promote opportunity and security around the world. To that end, the President-elect has committed to doubling U.S. foreign assistance over his first term, and I look forward to working closely with the Congress to fulfill this goal. The President-elect has said that the current economic crisis could slow increases in foreign assistance.

Our foreign assistance infrastructure must be able to meet the challenges we face today while anticipating those in the months and years ahead. We should look at areas which can be better coordinated and streamlined, and would look forward to engaging the committee on ideas for reform. The President-elect has stressed the need for clearer leadership and coordination in Washington, and continued efforts to prevent abuses and corruption among recipient countries. Similarly, we should look at those areas which have proved effective and build on those successes, while determining if poorly performing initiatives are able to be improved.

*Question 62.* Many argue that to increase effectiveness, it is important to establish a strengthened and independent development agency separate from direct control and budgetary oversight of the State Department—a "USAID 2.0." Some would even elevate this development agency to a Cabinet-level department. To what extent would you support these proposals? Do you believe U.S. foreign assistance would be better served operating in an independent capacity? Is it worth revisiting the existing USAID operational model in favor of something significantly different?

Answer. USAID, like almost every Federal agency, can be improved. President-elect Obama shares the concerns that many members of this committee have expressed about the ability of USAID and the other government aid agencies to provide help effectively and in a manner where foreign nations can sustain the progress that the United States helps to bring about. While there have been lifesaving and life-changing acts brought about by USAID, supporters and critics alike believe that the agency can do a better job at fulfilling its mission.

The President-elect's commitment to a strengthened and enhanced role for development in our foreign policy means a reinvigorated USAID, playing a central role in the formulation and implementation of critical development strategies. We have to make sure that we rebuild USAID so that is more nimble in the face of change, less reliant on contractors doing work that ought to be carried out by our own government professionals, and uses tax dollars responsibly. We are still in the process of thinking through the precise organizational design—and I look forward to the advice of the committee and the Congress as we consider our approach. In moving for-

ward with this process, the goal of the President-elect—and my goal—is to enhance USAID's capacity and standing to carry out its vital missions.

*Question 63.* Others contend that U.S. foreign assistance should be closely linked to U.S. foreign policy priorities and should be integrated into the State Department's operations to ensure close coordination. To what degree should the State Department exert policy oversight and control over U.S. foreign assistance programs? How would you ensure that development programs retained their distinctiveness and were not relegated to second priority status?

*Answer.* Efforts to modernize U.S. development and foreign assistance programs will require a substantial investment of time and effort. But the President-elect believes that these efforts can pay significant returns in global stability, security, and prosperity. In addition, this modernization will increase accountability, transparency, and innovation. During the campaign, President-elect Obama pledged to take a look at ways to improve the distribution of U.S. foreign assistance, including the possibility of consolidating key foreign assistance programs in an elevated and empowered USAID. I can assure this committee that, if confirmed as Secretary of State, I will look to you for ideas and input. I also look forward to working closely with Secretary Gates, General Jones, and other members of the new administration on this challenge.

As for the possible relegation of development programs to a second-priority status, let me be clear: The Obama administration is committed to a robust foreign assistance program.

*Question 64.* What can Congress do to support foreign assistance reform efforts? Many have called for the Congress to rewrite the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Do you think this step is warranted? If so, what priority areas would you identify in need of legislative reform?

*Answer.* Congress—and particularly this committee—will play an indispensable role in providing advice and guidance about the future of U.S. foreign assistance programs. As Secretary, I look forward to consulting with the committee about foreign assistance priorities, and the implementation of those priorities. No decision has been made about the need for legislative reform.

*Question 65.* There are at least 26 agencies variously responsible for different elements of foreign aid. How would you suggest reducing fragmentation and strengthening coordination? Should USAID's mandate be broadened to encompass all U.S. development programs (including those currently housed in other departments and agencies), as well as all humanitarian and post-conflict reconstruction and stabilization programs? Should the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) and the President's Emergency Plan for HIV/AIDS Relief be placed under the umbrella of a strengthened U.S. development agency?

*Answer.* The President-elect has committed to coordinate and consolidate programs currently housed in more than 20 executive agencies so as to enhance effectiveness and accountability. He and I are also committed to a restructured, empowered, and streamlined USAID. If confirmed, I look forward to working closely with the Congress as we review the best way to maximize the impact of these essential programs. The administration will review what programs can be consolidated to elevate the importance of development in our overall foreign policy, and improving budget planning, coordination, and execution.

*Question 66.* President-elect Obama has articulated a far-reaching and detailed platform to elevate and strengthen U.S. diplomacy and development assistance as critical tools for foreign policy and national security. His commitments include: Doubling foreign assistance to \$50 billion by 2012, investing at least \$2 billion in a global education fund, increasing funding to combat HIV/AIDS, TB, and malaria to \$50 billion over 5 years and ending all deaths from malaria by 2015. Do you believe that U.S. foreign assistance is underresourced? What priority areas require more resources? How do you intend to advocate for these commitments in the current budgetary environment?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama said during the campaign that he would double foreign assistance to \$50 billion during his first term in office. After the onset of the economic crisis, he said it could take slightly longer to phase in this increase by the end of his first term due to the budgetary restrictions created by the need to confront the economic crisis. We will ensure that these new resources are invested wisely with strong accountability measures and directed toward strategic goals.

President-elect Obama identified key priorities for any development program in his administration, including: Fighting extreme global poverty; achieving the Millen-



num Development Goals; fighting corruption; eliminating the global education deficit; enhancing U.S. leadership in the effort to combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and tuberculosis and improving global health infrastructure; providing sustainable debt relief to developing countries; expanding prosperity through training, partnerships, and expanded opportunities for small and medium enterprise; supporting developing countries in adapting to the challenges of a changing climate; reforming the IMF and World Bank; and supporting effective, accountable, democratic institutions and governments. If confirmed as Secretary of State, I look forward to working with this committee and your colleagues in the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs to achieve these priorities.

*Question 67.* The MCC has been one of President Bush's signature development programs. It has been both praised as encompassing innovative and creative ideas, as well as criticized for being too slow to disburse funds once a compact has been signed, not demonstrating results on the ground quickly enough, and being inadequately coordinated with other U.S. foreign assistance programs. What reforms would you advocate to strengthen the MCC?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama supports the MCC, and the principle of greater accountability in our foreign assistance programs. It represents a worthy new approach to poverty reduction and combating corruption. However, there are challenges within the MCC. Pace of implementation is certainly one challenge, as is the danger of a lack of coordination with overall U.S. foreign assistance. The Obama administration looks forward to working to build on the promise of the MCC as we move forward with modernizing U.S. foreign assistance programs.

#### BUDGET ISSUES

*Question 68.* The U.S. National Security Strategies for 2002 and 2006 divide our national security apparatus into three components: Defense, diplomacy, and development. However, the International Affairs Budget represents less than 7 percent of our Nation's national security budget. In July 2008, Secretary Gates stated: "Our diplomatic leaders . . . must have the resources and political support needed to fully exercise their statutory responsibilities in leading America's foreign policy." What efforts do you plan to undertake to secure greater funding of the International Affairs Budget?

*Answer.* America's national security interests require a vigorous and well-funded State Department. I am concerned that the Department's funding is insufficient to the task.

Both President-elect Obama and I believe that our diplomacy needs to be more robust. In keeping with that goal, he has called for a 25-percent increase in Foreign Service staffing, opening more consulates, and a doubling of our foreign assistance levels during his first term in office. We clearly also need to invest urgently in the Department's technological and other infrastructure platform, so that our diplomacy can be both efficient and effective.

The Obama administration plans to put forward a robust FY 2010 budget request. I look forward to working closely with you and your colleagues to ensure that the Department is funded to achieve its goals on behalf of the American people.

*Question 69.* State has recently been short positions in Iraq, Afghanistan, areas of emerging importance, and in new language and functional requirements, among other areas. What is the nature and scope of existing shortfalls in these and other high-priority areas for your Department?

*Answer.* All of us should be proud of what the men and women of our Foreign Service do each day to advance America's interests abroad. They and their families also deserve our gratitude for stepping up to the demands of war-zone service in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Department's personnel system has been strained by staffing needs in Iraq and Afghanistan, however, leaving positions at many other important posts unfilled. We also need increased personnel to support a stronger diplomatic presence in countries of emerging importance to America's security and economic interests, and to tackle stabilization and humanitarian needs around the world. A training float is also essential if our diplomats are to learn the critical language and project management skills needed for success.

The 25-percent increase in Foreign Service staffing that President-elect Obama has called for would do much to address these needs. That request is very much in line with the Department's own internal analysis, and with recommendations made by outside observers.

I look forward to working closely with the Congress in order to obtain the funding needed to realize this personnel increase as a high priority.

## ROLE OF MILITARY IN FOREIGN POLICY

*Question 70.* Secretary of Defense Robert Gates has said that “the United States military has become more involved in a range of activities that in the past were perceived to be the exclusive province of civilian agencies and organizations . . . This has led to concern among many organizations . . . about what’s seen as a creeping ‘militarization’ of some aspects of America’s foreign policy. This is not an entirely unreasonable sentiment.” Are you concerned about this supposed trend toward the militarization of our foreign policy?

Answer. Improving the State Department’s civilian capacity to respond to international crises will be a top priority for the Obama administration—and the Department. We need to better integrate the military, the State Department, and other civilian agencies in stabilization and aid efforts. If confirmed, I look forward to working with Defense Secretary Gates and other members of the national security team to strike the right balance.

*Question 71.* The Defense Department has been surprisingly vocal about calling for more civilian resources and capacity. Secretary Gates: “It has become clear that America’s civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long—relative to what we spend on the military, and more important, relative to the responsibilities and challenges our nation has around the world.” What do you think it will take to bring civilian institutions up to the task? What reforms, investments, and changes need to occur so civilians can be effective counterparts to the military? What is preventing these reforms from taking place currently? If the leaders of the State and Defense Departments are in such close agreement about the need for more resources for civilian national security agencies, do you see any possibility of reducing DOD’s share of the budget to make resources available? Or do we need to simply accept that America’s national security requires much larger State Department and USAID budgets, along with large military budgets?

Answer. The President-elect has said that we cannot counter insurgent and terrorist threats without civilian counterparts who can carry out economic and political reconstruction missions—sometimes in dangerous places. He has pledged to strengthen these civilian capacities, recruiting our best and brightest to take on this challenge, and to increase both the numbers and capabilities of our diplomats, development experts, and other civilians who can work alongside our military.

I agree with Secretary Gates that “America’s civilian institutions of diplomacy and development have been chronically undermanned and underfunded for far too long.” In order to equip the State Department with the tools that it needs to address today’s challenges, we will need to invest additional resources in the Department. President-elect Obama has also called for better integration of Federal agencies and the military in stabilization and aid efforts. Specifically, he has called for the creation of Mobile Development Teams (MDTs) that bring together personnel from the military, the Pentagon, the State Department, and USAID, fully integrating U.S. Government efforts in counterterrorism, state-building, and post-conflict operations. He has also called for the establishment of an expeditionary capability within non-Pentagon agencies (State Department, U.S. Agency for International Development, Homeland Security, Justice, Treasury, Agriculture, and Health and Human Services, etc.) to deploy personnel where they are needed. These civilians will be integrated with, and sometimes operate independently from, our military expeditionary capabilities.

*Question 72.* The dominant mode of cooperation among the State Department, USAID, and the U.S. military on development operations in Iraq and Afghanistan has been the PRT model. Do you view this model as successful, and will you recommend continuing to use PRTs in other places as the need arises?

Answer. The President-elect believes that we need to learn from the use of PRTs in Iraq and Afghanistan to build upon their successes while addressing any shortcomings.

The PRTs across Iraq and Afghanistan confront different conditions and challenges, and consequently differ in structure, focus, and results. As new situations arise, the Obama administration will carefully consider what tools will best accomplish our goals including the future use of PRTs. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the national security team in reviewing the PRT model, considering its applications elsewhere, and consulting with this committee and the Congress as we make decisions.

## STABILIZATION AND RECONSTRUCTION

*Question 73.* A key lesson from Afghanistan and Iraq is that stabilization and reconstruction efforts are as important as war-fighting in achieving our national security priorities. The U.S. Government lacks capacity and coherence in its efforts to assist stabilization and reconstruction in countries transitioning from war to peace. There is currently no entity within the U.S. Government that has the mandate and means to lead stabilization and reconstruction efforts. International cooperation, essential to success, is ad hoc and poorly managed. What steps should we take to address these deficiencies?

[NO RESPONSE RECEIVED FOR THIS QUESTION]

*Question 74.* What do you believe is the appropriate role for the Office of Stabilization and Reconstruction (S/CRS)? Is it best served working out of the State Department? Or would it improve operational effectiveness if S/CRS and the Civilian Response Corps were relocated into USAID and consolidated with several other USAID offices? Will the administration be requesting additional funding for the Office in the upcoming supplemental or in the FY 2010 budget?

Answer. As the committee knows, the Office of Stabilization and Reconstruction was created several years ago, and its functions were codified last year by legislation sponsored by Senator Lugar and Vice-President-elect Biden. Their legislation is consistent with the President-elect's goal to build civilian capacity that can be deployed on short notice to help stabilize countries in urgent need. Stabilization and reconstruction is a mission that is of growing importance to our national security, and it is also important that the State Department have the resources and authorities to carry out this function effectively. An effective stabilization and reconstruction function within State will both reduce the burden on our Armed Forces and lead to better coordination among our civilian agencies and with the Pentagon to act effectively to stabilize and rebuild societies at risk of, or emerging from, conflict. I believe that the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization at the State Department has made a lot of progress despite a number of challenges it faced in implementing its mandate. If confirmed, I look forward to enhancing its capacity and to working closely with the committee to ensure the State Department has the means and the organization to carry out these important duties effectively.

## STATE DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS

*Question 75.* A recent study by the American Academy of Diplomacy calls for a rapid increase in resources, training, and personnel for the State Department and related civilian agencies. It proposes adding 4,735 new hires at an annual cost of \$2 billion, as a minimum needed increase. It also calls for expanding public diplomacy programs at a cost of \$445 million by 2014. Do you support these proposals? Would you go further? What do you see as the priorities for increasing America's civilian capacity to more effectively execute U.S. foreign policy?

Answer. Current Foreign Service staffing clearly is insufficient to America's diplomatic needs in today's challenging world. The Academy's staffing recommendation is broadly in line with President-elect Obama's call for a 25-percent Foreign Service staffing increase. If confirmed, obtaining the funds needed to realize this staffing increase will be one of my highest management goals.

The Academy is, of course, correct in calling for a more effective public diplomacy effort to improve America's image and advance critical policy goals. We also need to do more to train our personnel for new demands, including those associated with reconstruction and stabilization missions.

I look forward to working with Congress to ensure that the Department of State is staffed and equipped to meet the many challenges that America faces abroad.

*Question 76.* Do we need to rethink the current personnel system, including the Foreign Service system, which forms the backbone of the State Department and USAID? As the HELP Commission Report on Foreign Assistance Reform pointed out, the current human resource management practice is still based on the expectation that individuals will remain with a single government agency until retirement. Does such a system make sense given present-day workforce realities? Does it hinder creativity, innovation, and flexibility?

Answer. This is an issue facing the Federal Government as a whole. I am sure that the President-elect's nominee to head the Office of Personnel Management will be looking closely at this matter.

For my part, I certainly want the Department to do everything possible to keep the talented men and women it works so hard to attract. If confirmed, we will evalu-

ate how the Department's personnel policies stack up against those of America's best private sector companies and work to see that our training, assignment, and promotion policies are geared toward ensuring that our workforce is as creative, innovative, and flexible as it needs to be in today's challenging world.

Finally, minorities remain underrepresented at the Department. As Secretary, I will ask the Director General and the Office of Civil Rights to work vigorously to ensure that our diplomatic corps reflects the diversity of American society.

#### FOREIGN SERVICE PAY REFORM

*Question 77.* Under existing law, Foreign Service (FS) personnel stationed in the United States receive a salary adjustment that is based on comparable private sector salaries in their locality (e.g., Washington, DC). Although armed services personnel receive a similar comparability adjustment while stationed overseas, FS personnel do not, despite typically serving two-thirds of their careers abroad. Some have argued that the resulting pay disparity in 2008 effectively amounted to a 20.89-percent pay cut for FS members serving overseas. In 2009, that disparity is expected to grow to 23.10 percent. Do you intend to make correction of the FS pay disparity a top management priority at State? If so, how?

Answer. Rectifying this pay disparity will indeed be a high priority for me.

At heart, this is an issue of fairness. As you have noted, Foreign Service officers are required to spend significant portions of their careers abroad. The loss of salary income they incur is grossly unfair, all the more so given that they are compensated less than colleagues at other agencies with whom they work side by side in service to our country. We cannot expect to retain the best talent in these conditions.

I know that this issue has been put before the Congress in previous years. I hope that we can work together to redress this matter on a priority basis.

#### GEORGIA

*Question 78.* How has the United States recalibrated its policy toward Russia in the aftermath of the country's disproportionate military response in Georgia? Now that we have had a few months to digest recent developments in Georgia, how do the salient facts of the Russian-Georgian conflict inform your view of our policy toward Russia and Georgia?

Answer. Whatever sequence of events precipitated conflict within Georgia's borders in August 2008, the Russian military response was disproportionate and illegal, a fact recognized widely within the international community. Russia's decision to recognize Abkhazia and South Ossetia as independent states was also disturbing. The United States must work closely with our allies and friends throughout the world to ensure that the Russian Government's decision to undermine Georgia sovereignty does not gain international legitimacy.

As we have begun to go through a multiyear \$1 billion assistance package assembled by the Bush administration and approved by Congress last fall, the United States and our allies must help to rebuild Georgia. Collapse of Georgia's economy or democracy would embolden those inside Russia who support the use of military force to achieve Russian goals and would weaken democratic forces throughout the region. The Georgian Government's recent pledges to strengthen democratic institutions are a positive sign, a demonstration of the learning and recalibration that can occur in democracies.

The United States can support Georgian territorial integrity, economic recovery, and democratic development and also work with Russia on issues of common strategic interest. The United States and Russia have many mutual interests, including countering nuclear proliferation, reducing our nuclear arsenals, expanding trade and investment opportunities, and fighting al-Qaeda and the Taliban. Russia's recent choices—not our decisions—threaten this future and remind us that peace and security in Europe cannot be taken for granted. At the same time, I look forward to working with my Russian counterparts on those issues of common interest even when we disagree about other issues.

*Question 79.* Do you believe that Russian leaders view democratic government in Georgia or any other country within what President Medvedev has called Russia's "sphere of influence" as a threat? How should the West respond?

Answer. The United States and our allies must remain unequivocal in rejecting the principle of spheres of interests and affirming the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the countries in Russia's neighborhood. Helping these countries strengthen their sovereignty will include not only diplomatic and economic support but also developing a strategy for reducing their dependence on Russian energy exports. In parallel, we also must seek a more constructive relationship with Russia, as im-

proved relations between the West and Russia might help to demonstrate to the Russian leadership that their long-term interests are best served by becoming a stakeholder in the international community and not served as well by using coercive instruments to assert Russian power abroad.

*Question 80.* The United States has made a significant investment in the future of Georgia as an independent, democratic nation. What dividends are we seeing? How would you assess the status of Georgia's democracy? What are the country's most pressing challenges? Are you satisfied with the safeguards that have been put in place to assure U.S. assistance to Georgia is spent appropriately? In your view, has the United States coordinated effectively with other donor countries to assure that assistance is used wisely?

Answer. Over the long haul, there is no question that American assistance to Georgia has yielded dividends regarding both Georgia's democracy and independence. In the last few years, however, independent evaluators such as Freedom House have recorded a decline in Georgian democratic practices. Obviously, Georgia's territorial integrity also has been weakened by the war last August.

The response to these setbacks should not be retreat but a better, smarter policy. The American aid package approved last year, coupled with the pledges of assistance made at the donors' conference last October, will help to begin rebuilding Georgia's infrastructure, which in turn will serve as an economic stimulus package to help jump-start the Georgian economy.

Transparency regarding the spending of these resources is essential. Because democratic institutions facilitate oversight and accountability, deepening Georgian democratic practices must be a critical objective of our assistance. It is encouraging that Georgian President Mikheil Saakashvili and many other senior Georgian officials have expressed a similar recommitment to strengthening Georgian democratic institutions.

*Question 81.* Georgia has expressed an interest in negotiating a free trade agreement (FTA) with the United States. Would you support an FTA with Georgia?

Answer. The United States has an interest in expanding export opportunities for American companies and securing the benefits of increased imports for the American consumer. The United States and our allies also have an interest in integrating Georgia into the Western community of democratic states, and trade can facilitate this process. I look forward to working together with Congress to create the proper legal framework for expanding trade between the United States and Georgia.

#### RUSSIA

*Question 82.* Which areas of our relationship with Russia offer the best prospects for cooperation going forward? Are there points of convergent interest where we can work to improve relations? What incentives could we offer Russia to act more responsibly at home, in its neighborhood and on issues of common concern like arms control, counterterrorism, and Iran? What leverage do we have to change Russian behavior if incentives do not work?

Answer. President-elect Obama seeks a future of cooperative engagement with the Russian Government on matters of strategic importance, while standing up strongly for American values and international norms. That is my view as well. Some of Russia's recent actions have been reprehensible and they have disrupted its relations with the West. As we confront those actions, we must not shy away from pushing for more democracy, transparency, and accountability. Still, there can be no return to the cold war. Russia is not the old Soviet Union, and this is not the 20th century. The new administration will work with Russia on areas of common strategic interest like counterterrorism and counterproliferation, while pressuring Russia when it interferes with its neighbors and abuses power at home—for example, on Georgia, where the President-elect condemned Russia's escalation of the conflict and clear invasion of Georgia's territory and illegal recognition of Abkhazia and South Ossetia as independent states. Real pressure on Russia will not come from rhetoric alone—it will come from a unified transatlantic alliance, and forging that unity will be one of my top priorities. If Russia refuses to abide by international norms, its standing in the international community will diminish.

The Obama administration will seek deep, verifiable reductions in all U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons—whether deployed or nondeployed, strategic, or nonstrategic. As a first step, we will seek a legally binding agreement to replace the current START Treaty which expires in December 2009. It is important that we not allow essential monitoring and verification provisions, which give us a better understanding of Russian strategic capabilities than we would have without them, to

lapse. The administration will also work with Russia in a mutual and verifiable manner to increase warning and decision time prior to launch of nuclear weapons.

*Question 83.* For the last several years, the Russians have proven adept at dividing traditional allies within the Euro-Atlantic community. What steps would you take to develop a joint strategy for managing relations with Russia in cooperation with our European allies? Going forward, what are the prospects for forging a common approach to Russia given the arrival of a new administration?

Answer. America's national security interests require improved ties with our European allies and stronger Euro-Atlantic institutions. Russia's actions in Georgia last August highlight how important it is to work closely and effectively with our European allies to develop a unified approach to Russia, pursue energy security, and stand up for the rights of sovereign nations in Europe and Eurasia. The President-elect has made it clear that a strong trans-Atlantic alliance is critical to our ability to encourage Russia to abide by international norms.

*Question 84.* A number of observers have commented with increasing alarm on Russia's backsliding on democracy and human rights. How would you address this trend?

Answer. Democratic backsliding in Russia is real and disturbing. Yet, Russia's political system is not monolithic and pockets of pluralism, critical thinking, and independent actions exist in Russia today. Without any illusions about short-term fixes, our administration must do what we can to support these democratic elements.

President-elect Obama has made clear that we will not turn a blind eye to violations of human rights and democratic practices in the false belief that doing so will help us to secure Russian cooperation on other issues. At the same time, berating Russian leaders about democracy abuses also has not worked. Our administration must rise above ineffectual bluster and empty threats on the one hand and business as usual on the other. We can cooperate with our Russian counterparts without pretending to be personal friends and without checking our values at the door.

To support democracy, transparent government, and the rule of law in Russia and the region, our administration will strongly support funding for the Freedom Support Act (FSA) programs and ensure robust funding for the National Endowment for Democracy.

#### EASTERN EUROPE AND EURASIA

*Question 85.* During the last several years, Russia utilized control over scarce energy resources—and an associated financial windfall—to pursue foreign policy goals that were often at odds with those of the United States. The recent reduction in global oil and gas prices along with increasing instability in Russia's own economy might now erode Russia's ability to apply pressure on neighboring countries that seek independence from Moscow. Given these changing dynamics, what principles should guide U.S. policy in Eastern Europe and Eurasia? In particular, how can we work with our allies to decrease their dependence on Russia's energy supplies? How can we ensure that the region will be more hospitable to the development of independent, democratic governments?

Answer. United States-Russia relations have been becoming increasingly strained over the last several years. Russia's antidemocratic drift, threats, and pressure against some of its neighbors, gas cutoffs to Ukraine and others, and especially the invasion and dismemberment of Georgia last summer have made it impossible for the United States to pursue business-as-usual with Moscow. That said, there has not been, and will not be, a return to the cold war. The President-elect and I both seek to engage the Russian Government on matters of strategic importance, while also standing up strongly for American values and international norms.

If confirmed, I will seek to engage Russia directly on a wide range of issues of potential cooperation, including strategic arms control, nuclear nonproliferation, terrorism, the environment, Afghanistan, and economic relations. I will make clear that we will not accept "spheres of influence" in Europe, but also that our two countries have many common interests that the Obama administration stands ready to pursue with our counterparts in Moscow.

*Question 86.* How do you assess the impact of the Russian military action against Georgia on neighboring countries? Do you believe it has caused them to reevaluate their strategic calculus?

Answer. Yes. Our NATO allies want to make sure that our Article 5 commitments to them are robust and we should signal that they are through contingency planning. Other non-NATO countries in the region with close ties to the West also have expressed new worries about their security. Developing a comprehensive new strat-

egy for the entire region, which fosters stable peaceful relations between states and respect for sovereignty of all states in the region, is a central strategic challenge for our administration and our partners in Europe.

*Question 87.* At last year's summit in Bucharest, Romania, NATO did not issue Membership Action Plans for Ukraine and Georgia, but it did agree to a communiqué which establishes a firm commitment to eventual membership. At this December's NATO ministerial, the U.S. agreed not to put the MAP issue on the summit's agenda. Is NATO's door still open to Ukraine and Georgia, and if so, what does the likely road ahead look like for Ukraine's and Georgia's candidacies?

Answer. While there are different views among allies on the best way to promote eventual NATO membership for Georgia and Ukraine, it is essential that we work closely with our allies to develop a common approach on alliance enlargement. The NATO-Ukraine Commission and the NATO-Georgia Commission (established last summer) are other avenues available for deepening relations between the alliance and Georgia and Ukraine. NATO's door must remain open to European democracies that meet membership criteria and can contribute to our common security. How and when new countries might join must be determined together with all our allies in the alliance.

#### UKRAINE

*Question 88.* Ukraine is a country of tremendous strategic and political importance, but it has struggled to develop a stable, functional government since the Orange Revolution brought democracy to the nation 4 years ago. If confirmed, what steps will you take to help Ukraine fully realize its democratic potential?

Answer. President-elect Obama and I understand the importance of helping to consolidate democracy in Ukraine. The failure of democracy in Ukraine would deliver a blow to the democratic forces throughout the entire region, including inside Russia.

We will need to work with our partners in Ukraine to develop an anticrisis strategy, including a solution to the current standoff between Ukraine and Russia regarding gas prices. Today, an even more dramatic economic meltdown is the greatest threat to Ukrainian democracy.

In the long run, a Ukraine firmly imbedded in Europe's institutional architecture will have the greatest chance at stability and prosperity. Our administration will encourage our European Union partners to strengthen their links with Ukraine, including creating a membership perspective.

#### TRANSATLANTIC RELATIONS

*Question 89.* The United States alliance with the democracies of Europe ranks among our country's most valuable strategic assets. However, during the last 8 years, relations with our European allies have frequently been strained and occasionally dysfunctional. What are your expectations for the Euro-Atlantic alliance going forward? If confirmed, what concrete steps would you take to revitalize the United States partnership with the members of NATO and the European Union? What should our allies expect from the new administration—and what should we expect from them?

Answer. The U.S. alliance with the democracies of Europe is a valuable strategic asset. Indeed, of the many global challenges we will face in the coming 4 years—from the financial crisis to global warming, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, terrorism and nonproliferation—there is not a single one on which we are not stronger when we benefit from the cooperation of our European allies. The President-elect has pledged to reestablish America's strong partnership with our European allies and I intend to support him in that critical task. As the President-elect has said, we will "treat allies with respect, repair America's damaged moral authority, and recreate a mutually beneficial partnership with our European friends." At the same time, "we will ask more of our European friends. A more responsible and cooperative America will look to Europe to uphold its own responsibilities on issues such as Afghanistan, Iran, terrorism, Africa, and the environment."

*Question 90.* There are numerous mechanisms available to the United States when engaging the countries of Europe—NATO, the European Union, the Organization for Security and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and our bilateral relationships are four of the most prominent. If confirmed, which of these mechanisms do you plan to rely on most heavily? Would you propose firmer guidelines designating specific forums for the discussion of specific issues or prefer to rely upon a more ad hoc approach?

Answer. NATO, the EU, the OSCE, and our bilateral relationships in Europe all serve U.S. interests in different ways. I do not believe we should favor any one mechanism over the others but rather consider all of them potential tools in helping achieve our goals of peace, prosperity, and stability not just in Europe but around the world. There are, of course, differences among these forums—NATO includes a collective defense commitment while the EU has a much greater economic role, for example—but in a world in which defense, security, and prosperity are closely linked all of these institutions must form part of a coherent overall strategy.

*Question 91.* In your view, is it time for NATO to adopt a new strategic concept? If so, when and how should the process of formulating that concept occur? What should we expect when that process is over?

Answer. If confirmed, I will work with the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the rest of our national security team to explore the potential need for a new NATO Strategic Concept. NATO last updated its Strategic Concept in 1999, before threats like terrorism, energy insecurity, cyber attacks, and climate change were as apparent as they are today, and before NATO was engaged in global missions such as Afghanistan. A new Strategic Concept would provide an opportunity for NATO allies, among other things, to reiterate their commitment to Article 5; reconsider and address new and emerging threats to allied security; clarify NATO's relationship to the United Nations and other multilateral bodies; clarify the NATO–EU relationship; and address the issue of global partnerships and missions. The April 2009 NATO summit will provide a useful forum for discussing this issue with our key alliance partners and forging a consensus on whether to draft a new Strategic Concept and, if so, on the timetable for doing so.

#### BOSNIA-HERZEGOVINA

*Question 92.* The United States made significant investments to help bring peace to Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 1990s, but the situation in the country has received too little high-level attention in the intervening 8 years. Bosnia-Herzegovina is currently facing a serious political crisis that threatens much of what the country has achieved since the signing of the Dayton Accords. What plans do you have to address this crisis?

Answer. More than a decade after the United States led the effort to bring peace to Bosnia-Herzegovina, the situation in that country is still not satisfactory. We should be proud of the fact that, along with our NATO allies, we stopped a devastating civil war and gave the citizens of Bosnia-Herzegovina the opportunity to build a stable peace and functioning institutions, but much progress remains to be made. With the parties to the Dayton agreement at odds over a range of issues, and with the international community uncertain about how to move forward, the situation requires urgent attention. If confirmed, I will ensure that Bosnia-Herzegovina receives the enhanced and sustained U.S. engagement its needs to overcome the divisions that prevent it from fulfilling its potential.

#### CHINA

*Question 93.* China's growing economic strength and global power presents the U.S. Congress with an extremely complicated set of policy issues. On the one hand, many see China as an essential partner for the United States on global issues such as the international financial system, alternative energy sources, climate change, public health and many others. On the other, many argue that China's size, international engagement, and growing confidence mean it is increasingly able to compete with—or even to challenge—the United States more directly and more effectively in economic, political, and military terms. What is the administration's view of China's role in the world? Is China a threat to U.S. interests, is it a "responsible stakeholder," or at times both? What does your assessment mean for the future of U.S. China policy, and how does it guide a U.S. strategy that can help shape China's choices?

Answer. China is a critically important actor in a changing global landscape. We cannot put a simple label on a complex relationship. We want a positive and cooperative relationship with China, one where we deepen and strengthen our ties on a number of issues, and manage our differences where they persist. But this is not a one-way effort—much of what we do depends on the choices China makes. We can encourage them to become a full and responsible participant in the international community—to join the world in addressing common challenges like climate change and nuclear proliferation—and to make greater progress toward a more open and market-based society. But it is ultimately up to them. As we engage with China, we also have to maintain and enhance our strong relationships with our allies in



the region—Japan, South Korea, Australia, and others—who will help us meet the opportunities and challenges we are facing in Asia. The global financial crisis has demonstrated once again the need to think about common challenges in a new way. There are a number of emerging powers that will be critical players in this new century. With American leadership and their responsible engagement, we can improve the common good and confront common threats. That is the approach that I will take into my job if I am fortunate enough to be confirmed.

*Question 94.* During the Bush administration, the United States initiated several new high-level dialogues with China: The Senior Dialogue under the auspices of the State Department and the Strategic Economic Dialogue administered by the Treasury Department. How does the Obama administration intend to continue or expand these efforts?

Answer. It is important to have high-level discussions to discuss economic issues with the Chinese Government. We are looking carefully at the question of how to develop this important engagement with China. We expect high-level engagement to continue in some form.

*Question 95.* China has been the world's fastest growing economy in recent years and is now the largest holder of U.S. Treasury Securities. What role does the administration see for China in dealing with the current global financial and economic crisis?

Answer. Our economic policy toward China has to be closely coordinated with our foreign policy. They cannot be pursued in isolation to one another. China is a critically important actor in a changing global landscape. We want a positive and cooperative relationship with China, one where we deepen and strengthen our ties on a number of issues, and manage our differences where they persist. But this is not a one-way effort—much of what we do depends on the choices China makes. The global financial crisis has demonstrated once again the need to think about common challenges in a new way.

*Question 96.* Last year, China surpassed the United States as the world's largest emitter of carbon dioxide. While Prime Minister Hu Jintao has advanced and is implementing important clean energy policies, China continues to build one pulverized coal-fired power plant every week, and the country's primary energy demand is projected to double by 2030. This trend is unsustainable, in light of the urgent need to stabilize and reduce global greenhouse gas emissions. What steps will you personally—and the Obama administration more broadly—take to improve United States-China collaboration on climate change and clean energy technologies?

Answer. Climate change is one of the most pressing challenges facing the United States and the global community. The United States will take a leadership role in combating the threat of global climate change from the beginning of the new administration. The President-elect has specifically pledged to set a goal of an 80-percent reduction in U.S. emissions and a 50-percent reduction in global emissions by 2050—a policy goal I am committed to as well. In pursuit of that goal, we will ask the biggest carbon emitting nations to join a new Global Energy Forum to lay the foundation for the next generation of climate protocols.

*Question 97.* Taiwan remains the most sensitive issue in United States-China relations. Does the Obama administration plan to hold another Taiwan Policy Review along the lines of that conducted in 1994 by the Clinton administration?

Answer. The administration's policy will be to help Taiwan and China resolve their differences peacefully while making clear that any unilateral change in the status quo is unacceptable. We will maintain our "one China" policy, our adherence to the three United States-PRC Joint Communiqués concerning Taiwan, and observance of the Taiwan Relations Act, which lays out the legal basis for our relationship.

*Question 98.* The Government of China and the Dalai Lama of Tibet disagree on the issue of greater autonomy for the Tibetan Autonomous Region, which has been a stumbling block in their ongoing dialogue. Meanwhile, many Tibetans have lost faith in the possibility of a negotiated compromise, while Chinese leaders have expressed a deep distrust of the Dalai Lama's intentions and foreign contacts. What options may be acceptable to both sides? What kinds of international pressure, if any, would be helpful in promoting a resolution?

Answer. The Obama administration will speak out for the human rights and religious freedom of the people of Tibet. If Tibetans are to live in harmony with the rest of China's people, their religion and culture must be respected and protected. Tibet should enjoy genuine and meaningful autonomy. The Dalai Lama should be invited to visit China, as part of a process leading to his return. We will condemn

the use of violence to put down peaceful protests, and call on the Chinese Government to respect the basic human rights of the people of Tibet, and to account for the whereabouts of detained Buddhist monks. We will also continue to press China on our concerns about human rights issues at every opportunity and at all levels, publicly and privately, both through our mission in China and in Washington.

## JAPAN

*Question 99.* Some analysts have suggested that the U.S. alliance with Japan, a linchpin of stability in Asia, has become overly focused on military issues controversial among the Japanese public. Do you think that the United States should continue to press Japan to step up its global engagement using its military resources, or instead concentrate on other shared interests like energy efficiency, climate change measures, and coordination on African development assistance? Is this an either/or choice?

*Answer.* The United States-Japan alliance has been one of the great successes of the postwar era. Japan's achievements and global leadership in world affairs over the past 60 years are a great testament to the Japanese people. A strong and enduring United States-Japan alliance, based on common interests and shared values, is the centerpiece for both American and Japanese policy in the Asia-Pacific region. Japan today plays a vital role in working alongside the United States to maintain regional security and stability, promote prosperity, and meet the new security challenges of the 21st century. As the world's two wealthiest democracies, the United States and Japan have shared interests that cut across a range of challenging issues: Nuclear proliferation, terrorism, financial instability, poverty, and climate change, to name but a few.

As the United States-Japan alliance continues to evolve into a truly global alliance, it must also develop truly global and complementary capacities across a broad range of issues, capacities that will allow us together to address the range of pressing issues on the regional and global agenda. We must strive, for close cooperation, communication, and coordination, at every level. If confirmed as Secretary of State, I will look forward to building on our longstanding friendship to forge an even stronger alliance and partnership in the years ahead.

## SOUTH KOREA/KORUS FTA

*Question 100.* President-elect Obama has stated that he cannot support the KORUS FTA as it currently stands. What specific changes to the agreement will the Obama administration be seeking? How can we work to ensure that the agreement does not affect South Korean perceptions of the United States and the United States-South Korean alliance?

*Answer.* South Korea is an important friend and ally and if confirmed I look forward to building an even stronger bilateral relationship in the years to come. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the United States Trade Representative, the Treasury Secretary, the Secretary of Commerce, and others on the President-elect's economic team on these issues. We will communicate forthrightly and fairly with South Korea, explaining that our concerns with the FTA are discrete and specific and have no bearing on the many collaborative dimensions of our alliance and friendship. We will also work to resolve these concerns to the satisfaction of both parties.

President-elect Obama has opposed and continues to oppose the KORUS FTA that the Bush administration negotiated because although it included some useful improvements for U.S. service and technology industries in South Korea, U.S. negotiators did not do a good job of obtaining a deal that provided for fair treatment for American cars and trucks and other manufactured goods. There are also concerns over U.S. beef exports that we are told are close to resolution.

Despite decades of bipartisan concern over the nontransparent practices used to block U.S. access to South Korea's market, this FTA failed to obtain a deal that provided genuine improvements in this area. Because the FTA gives South Korean auto exports essentially untrammelled access to the U.S. market, ratification of the agreement in its present form would mean the United States would lose its remaining leverage to counteract these nontariff barriers. The result will be a competitive handicap for one of our most important industries.

If the South Koreans are willing to reengage negotiations on these vital provisions of the agreement, we will work with them to get to resolution.

## NORTH KOREA

*Question 101.* What are your views on the recent State Department announcement that the United States and its partners would halt deliveries of heavy fuel oil to North Korea due to Pyongyang's refusal to agree, in writing, on a plan for verifying its nuclear program? Would the new administration be in a better position to take up the nuclear issue with North Korea if the formal verification plan was deferred into the future? Would you be prepared to travel to Pyongyang or to another capital to meet with North Korea's Foreign Minister or other appropriate official?

Answer. The Obama administration will confirm the full extent of North Korea's past plutonium production and its uranium enrichment activities, and get answers to disturbing questions about its proliferation activities with other countries, including Syria. The North Koreans must live up to their commitments and fully and verifiably dismantle all of their nuclear weapons programs and proliferation activities. If they do not, there must be strong sanctions. We will only lift sanctions based on North Korean performance. If the North Koreans do not meet their obligations, we should move quickly to reimpose sanctions that have been waived, and consider new restrictions going forward. The objective must be clear: The complete and verifiable elimination of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs, which only expanded while we refused to talk. As we move forward, we must not cede our leverage in these negotiations unless it is clear that North Korea is living up to its obligations.

As to the question about the HFO shipments, the President-elect has made clear his view that North Korea is not entitled to international support. He said that if North Korea did not live up to its obligations we may in fact reinstate some sanctions. We are going to take a hard look at where the Bush administration and our allies in East Asia ended up on the verification protocols, but we are very much open to maintaining the suspension of the HFO shipments.

As to the questions of any potential travel and meetings, no decisions have been made. Like the President-elect, I would be willing to meet with any foreign leader at a time and place of my choosing if it can advance America's interests.

*Question 102.* Would you support appointing a special ambassador to deal directly with the North Korean nuclear issue as the United States chief negotiator?

Answer. No decisions have been made on whether to appoint a special ambassador to deal directly with the North Korean nuclear issue.

*Question 103.* It is generally understood that the U.S. has a dearth of information about events inside North Korea. The State Department sent an official to Pyongyang this year to be located there permanently. Would you favor expanding that initiative into a proposal to North Korea to exchange interest sections (similar to the U.S. arrangement with Cuba)?

Answer. No decisions have been made about whether to exchange interest sections with North Korea. The new administration will carefully consider its diplomatic options with North Korea.

*Question 104.* Will the United States pursue the normalization of diplomatic relations with North Korea without some progress on human rights measures, including opening up the country's reported labor camps?

Answer. We remain concerned about improving the lives of the North Korean people, including the lives of refugees. The United States is now the largest provider of food aid to the DPRK through the World Food Program and U.S. NGOs under a May 2008 agreement. This administration will continue to address North Korea's human rights abuses, including as part of any normalization process.

## BURMA

*Question 105.* Well over a year has past since Burma's military junta violently dispersed peaceful demonstrators, including unarmed Buddhist monks and students, who were protesting the repressive policies and widespread human rights violations of the ruling State Peace and Development Council (SPDC). In the interim, conditions inside Burma have hardly improved. What do you see as the proper way forward for U.S. policy in Burma? Are existing sanctions working? What over levers are available to pressure Burma's leaders to pursue policies that respect human rights, permit the release of political prisoners like Aung San Suu Kyi and allow for national reconciliation and a return of democracy? Given that existing approaches have not produced tangible results, are you considering alternative strategies?

[NO RESPONSE RECEIVED FOR THIS QUESTION]

*Question 106.* Burma's neighbors—China, India, and Thailand—and Russia could play an important role in convincing Burma's military junta to engage in dialogue with opposition leaders and ethnic minorities toward national reconciliation. Do you intend to raise this issue with these countries and encourage them to modify their current positions?

[NO RESPONSE RECEIVED FOR THIS QUESTION]

*Question 107.* Burma's people have endured tremendous hardships over the years and continue to face dire humanitarian conditions in the aftermath of Cyclone Nargis. What steps do you propose taking to ease their suffering? Would you support the provision of funds for humanitarian purposes to groups that are not affiliated with the Burmese regime beyond existing emergency International Disaster Assistance resources?

Answer. The continuing dire situation in Burma requires urgent attention. Burma's military junta is one of the most repressive regimes in the world. Its odious behavior not only is harmful to the long-suffering Burmese people, but also threatens the stability of neighboring states, since Burma is a breeding ground for HIV/AIDS, narcotics, and human trafficking. The Obama administration will support U.S. trade and investment sanctions against Burma to demonstrate our strong, principled condemnation of the regime's oppressive rule and our solidarity with the Burmese people. The regime must release, unconditionally, all of the nation's political prisoners, including the symbol and leader of Burma's democracy movement, Aung San Suu Kyi.

But our sanctions, if they are to be effective, must be smart, tough, and targeted. They must be crafted, as in the Lantos bill, to bring pressure to bear on the regime itself, and seek, as best as we can, to spare the people of Burma further suffering. So I strongly believe that we should more fully explore possible modalities for humanitarian assistance that will reach the suffering people of Burma and that do not empower the military junta.

Also if confirmed, I look forward to working with the Senate to fill the important position of Special Envoy for Burma as soon as possible.

#### HIV/AIDS

*Question 108.* One of President Bush's most notable achievements was the creation of the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief which has made great strides in the fight against HIV/AIDS, particularly in helping to support treatment for over 2 million people. While the United States has created a new paradigm in demonstrating the capability to provide HIV/AIDS treatment on a wide scale in some of the poorest countries of the world, the spread of the disease continues to outpace treatment efforts. How can the United States assist partner countries in more effective HIV prevention efforts?

Answer. The President-elect has applauded President Bush's efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, and pledged to continue and enhance PEPFAR. There are an estimated 33 million people across the planet infected with HIV/AIDS. We must do more to fight the global HIV/AIDS pandemic, as well as malaria and tuberculosis. The President-elect is committed to fully implementing the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief and to ensuring that best practices, not ideology, drive funding. He has committed to investing \$50 billion over 5 years to strengthen the program and expand it to new regions of the world, including Southeast Asia, India, and parts of Europe. At the same time, the new administration will work to more effectively coordinate PEPFAR with programs to strengthen health care delivery and address other global health challenges. The new administration will also increase U.S. contributions to the Global Fund to ensure that global efforts to fight endemic disease continue to move ahead through multilateral institutions as well. As part of these efforts, the new administration will work with drug companies to reduce the costs of generic antiretroviral drugs. And it will work with developing nations to help them build the health infrastructure necessary to get sick people treated—more money for hospitals and medical equipment, and more training for nurses and doctors.

#### PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

*Question 109.* What measures do you think are necessary to improve U.S. public diplomacy efforts and restore America's image in the world?

Answer. The President-elect intends to launch a coordinated, multiagency program of public diplomacy. And I am committed to restoring the strength and vision of the State Department's public diplomacy mission. As the President-elect has noted, this is not a peripheral enterprise, disconnected from the rest of our foreign policy. It is an important component of our overall counterterrorism strategy, and it is a vital part of our effort to restore American leadership and reassert American values.

With that in mind, the administration will pursue concrete objectives, including opening "America Houses" in cities across the Arab world, which will be modeled on the successful program the United States launched following World War II. We will launch a new "America's Voice Corps," to rapidly recruit and train fluent speakers of local languages and public diplomacy skills. We will offer alternatives to madrassas through the Global Education Fund. In our own hemisphere, we will pursue vigorous diplomacy to rebuild the ties with our friends and neighbors in the Americas.

*Question 110.* Many are critical of the decision to fold the U.S. Information Agency into the State Department in 1999, observing that the long-term efforts of public diplomacy have been subordinated to the short-term rapid-reaction goals emphasized by public affairs. Several have proposed reestablishing a U.S. agency responsible for public diplomacy and strategic communications that would be separate from the State Department. What is your assessment of the relative strengths/weaknesses of how we conduct public diplomacy? Are you open to considering some of the bolder proposals to restructure U.S. public diplomacy and outreach?

Answer. If confirmed, I look forward to working to ensure that the State Department's mission of public diplomacy is matched by the personnel, resources, and organizational structure we need to carry out this critical mission. USIA was an effective, single purpose agency in many ways, but it is more practical at this time to improve the functioning of the public diplomacy in the Department than to recreate an independent entity. If confirmed, I look forward to a full assessment of public diplomacy at the State Department and will look to this committee and the Congress for its counsel as we consider how to make improvements.

*Question 111.* The 2008 Pew Global Attitudes poll found that anti-Americanism remains extremely strong in the Muslim world. Overwhelming majorities of every predominantly Muslim country surveyed except Lebanon, including Egypt, Turkey, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Jordan, had negative views of the United States. What can be done to stem the tide of anti-Americanism in the Middle East? What role do you see for the State Department in these efforts?

Answer. The President-elect has made clear his determination to enhance our relations with the world's Muslims. As indicated above, no public diplomacy task is more important for the Obama administration than restoring the respect for America around the world, but more importantly, among the world's Muslim populations. In addition to the opening of America Houses, discussed above, the President-elect has pledged to give a speech at a major Islamic forum in the first 100 days of his administration. He will make clear, as will I, that we are not at war with Islam, that we will stand with those who are willing to stand up for their future, and that we need their effort to defeat those who proffer only hate and violence.

#### GENOCIDE PREVENTION

*Question 112.* The recently released report of the Genocide Prevention Task Force, cochaired by former Secretaries Albright and Cohen, concluded that preventing genocide must be a national priority. The task force concluded that the United States and the international community currently lack critical tools to identify the early warning signs of impending mass atrocities and respond to them to prevent the escalation of violence. "Gaps remain . . . in the strategic understanding of the challenges that genocide and mass atrocities pose and in developing appropriate ways to anticipate and address civilian protection." What steps would you take to address potential acts of mass atrocity or genocide from occurring or to broaden the range of tools that could be brought to bear? How could these steps be applied to the current crises in the Democratic Republic of Congo or Darfur?

Answer. The President-elect is committed to strengthening U.S. leadership and international efforts to prevent and respond to genocide and other humanitarian crises. He has welcomed this fine bipartisan report cochaired by two distinguished Americans, has pledged to review its recommendations carefully, and has met with Secretaries Albright and Cohen to discuss the contents of their report.

The President-elect has said, and I agree, that we are diminished when genocide or ethnic cleaning is taking place and we stand idly by.

I anticipate that the administration will review how the United States, working with our allies, partners, and international organizations, can build greater capacity and resolve to deter, prevent, and, when necessary, take action to stop mass atrocities. And I look forward to consulting with the committee and other Members of Congress as we consider how best to organize to address this challenge so that there is a process in place to anticipate and address any concerns as early as possible.

## DARFUR

*Question 113.* The situation in Darfur today is far more complex than it was in 2004. Two rebel groups have splintered into over two dozen and these rebels frequently prey upon civilians and aid workers. What are the administration's goals in Darfur and what is its strategy to achieve them in light of this complexity?

Answer. President-elect Obama and I have been very clear and forceful in our condemnation of the genocide in Sudan and in our commitment to far more robust actions to end the genocide and maximize protection for civilians. We have also made very clear our intent to pursue more effective diplomatic efforts to resolve the conflict that underlies the genocide. Today the most immediate and urgent means of providing protection as swiftly as possible to the civilians at risk is the rapid and full implementation of the United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force, which is half its authorized strength.

*Question 114.* More than 4 years after then-Secretary of State Powell's declaration that genocide was taking place in Darfur, the death toll has climbed still higher, the camps for displaced persons have grown more crowded, and humanitarian access to help people in need has diminished in many areas. The United Nations has not made good on its pledge to send 26,000 peacekeepers to Darfur, and has not provided them with the helicopters, vehicles, and other tools to fulfill their mission. Why has this process been so slow to date? What more should the U.S. Government do to strengthen UNAMID so that it can effectively fulfill its mandate to protect civilians?

Answer. First, we need to send a clear message to Khartoum that they must end obstruction of the U.N. force, including through endless bureaucratic hurdles and delays. We also need to address some of the U.N.'s own requirements that have inadvertently slowed UNAMID's deployment thus far. I expect that the questions of Sudan and Darfur will be subject to an early policy review. The administration will take the opportunity to look at all of the steps that it can take most effectively and urgently to maximize protection for civilians, and help to bring this conflict to an end.

*Question 115.* One of the critical gaps that peacekeepers face is the lack of attack and utility helicopters that are desperately needed to cover vast stretches of roadless territory in Darfur. What would you do, if confirmed as Secretary of State, to help secure these badly needed helicopters?

Answer. The administration will, as part of its review, actively pursue options to fill such critical gaps. The President-elect is committed to find ways to help move needed troops and equipment into place on an urgent basis.

## SOUTHERN SUDAN

*Question 116.* The Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between North and South Sudan calls for elections in 2009 and a referendum in 2011 in which the South will vote on the question of remaining a unified country. What will your objectives be in regard to Southern Sudan and what potential pitfalls do you see in the implementation of the CPA?

Answer. As a guarantor of the CPA, the United States has a special responsibility to ensure that implementation of this landmark agreement remains a priority even in the midst of the Darfur crisis. We will work bilaterally to increase support to the Government of Southern Sudan to bolster capacity and good governance, and multilaterally to assure appropriate donor coordination and ongoing political and financial support for CPA implementation.

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement aims to give the Sudanese people greater voice in their political future, and this will remain a priority. National elections that were supposed to be held by July 2009 will clearly be delayed, but the United States will work to ensure that the delay is not protracted, and that free, fair, safe elections are held before the year is out. Preparations for the 2011 referendum must remain on track as well to retain the confidence of the South.

*Question 117.* In April 2008, then-Senator Obama said that "the U.S. needs to work with the International Criminal Court (ICC) to ramp up the pace of indict-

ments of those responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity, while Khartoum must feel increased pressure to hand over those individuals already indicted by the Court." On July 14, 2008, the ICC requested a warrant for the arrest of Sudanese President Omar Hassan al-Bashir for his role in the genocide in Darfur. Many observers expect the ICC to formally indict President Bashir on genocide and possibly other charges in early 2009. Does the administration intend to support the ICC's efforts to hold Bashir and others in Sudan accountable for genocide and other heinous crimes, and, if so, how?

Answer. Yes. Without prejudging the outcome of the ICC prosecutor's recommendation to indict President Bashir, the President-elect believes, as do I, that we should support the ICC's investigations, including its pursuit of perpetrators of genocide in Darfur. The Bush administration has indicated publicly a willingness to cooperate with the ICC in the Darfur investigation. I commend them for this position, which we also support. We can provide assistance in the investigation; we can and should work with our allies in this effort. This is important because it would send a sign of seriousness about Darfur and our determination to end the killings and bring those responsible for war crimes to justice.

#### INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

*Question 118.* President-elect Obama has said that the United States should cooperate with the ICC on many activities, including Darfur. He has not, however, indicated that he will sign the Rome treaty and join the ICC. Questions linger over the scope of the ICC's activities and, in particular, whether U.S. servicemembers would have the necessary legal protections given their disproportionate burden in preserving international peace and security. What concerns, if any, need to be resolved before the administration would consider supporting ratification of the Rome statute? How will the administration work with our military commanders, Congress, and the ICC to address such concerns?

Answer. Now that it is operational, we are learning more about how the ICC functions. Thus far, the ICC has operated with professionalism and fairness-pursuing perpetrators of truly serious crimes, like genocide in Darfur, and atrocities in the Congo and Uganda. The President-elect believes as do I that we should support the ICC's investigations, including its pursuit of perpetrators of genocide in Darfur. Along these lines, the Bush administration has indicated a willingness to cooperate with the ICC in the Darfur investigation, a position which the new administration will support.

But at the same time, we must also keep in mind that the U.S. has more troops deployed overseas than any nation. As Commander in Chief, the President-elect will want to make sure they continue to have maximum protection. Therefore, we intend to consult thoroughly within the government, including the military, as well as non-governmental experts, and examine the full track record of the ICC before reaching decisions on how to move forward. I also look forward to working closely with the members of the committee. Whether we work toward joining or not, we will end hostility toward the ICC, and look for opportunities to encourage effective ICC action in ways that promote U.S. interests by bringing war criminals to justice.

#### ZIMBABWE

*Question 119.* The Mugabe government's brutality and mismanagement in Zimbabwe have ruined the country's economy, destroyed its health system, and deprived its citizens of basic rights and freedoms. Last March the people of Zimbabwe were brave enough to vote for change, but Mugabe continues his hold on power. A massive cholera epidemic is just the latest symptom of the government's failure to provide for its people. What tools can the United States bring to bear to promote democratic change in Zimbabwe?

Answer. The people of Zimbabwe have suffered for far too long under a corrupt leadership that does not serve the needs of its people. The destruction of Zimbabwe's economy and repeated abuses of power have been a catastrophe for Zimbabweans, and threaten the stability of the region.

The United States and the world must take steps to address this growing crisis.

Widened U.S. sanctions are appropriate. It was the right policy to have supported a U.N. Security Council resolution calling for targeted sanctions and an arms embargo.

As Zimbabwe's crisis continues and becomes even more destabilizing to the southern African region, South Africa, the African Union, and the SADC must play a stronger role in pressuring the Mugabe regime.

It will require concerted and sustained diplomacy to try to get the international community to acknowledge the need to act to apply more pressure to the illegitimate government of Robert Mugabe, and to bring an end to the man-made humanitarian crisis that grips Zimbabwe today.

The Zimbabwean people are suffering and the U.S. will push for more efforts, including having humanitarian NGOs resume activity in Zimbabwe.

We will need to consider incentives for reform, and work closely with the EU and other international donors to create a very generous aid and recovery package for Zimbabwe once it has a legitimate government. We would make very clear the specific and practical steps that any Zimbabwean Government can take to qualify for this package.

*Question 120.* Mugabe and his government are responsible for the deaths of untold numbers of people in Zimbabwe. Is this an appropriate matter for the International Criminal Court?

Answer. This is a question that the new administration will review and consider carefully. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the national security team to determine how best to confront and address the extreme abuses in Zimbabwe.

The suffering inflicted on the Zimbabwean people by the illegitimate government of Robert Mugabe is appalling. Ideally, the people of Zimbabwe will decide for themselves how best to address the issues of accountability and justice for crimes committed by Robert Mugabe and his inner circle in ZANU–PF.

As discussed in other responses, I believe that as a general rule we should support the ICC's investigations, including its pursuit of perpetrators of genocide in Darfur. And we should work with our allies in shaping this court for years to come. Whether the ICC is the best vehicle to address the situation in Zimbabwe will be the subject of discussions within the new administration, and if confirmed I would also look forward to hearing the views of this committee.

#### SOMALIA

*Question 121.* Somalia today embodies the principles of failed statehood. The recent increase in the number, range, and impact of acts of piracy in the Gulf of Aden and beyond are only the latest consequence of the lack of government and rule of law in the country. As Secretary of State, what will govern your strategy toward Somalia and the Horn of Africa as a region? What steps can the United States and the international community take to promote prospects for democracy, stability, and security in the region?

Answer. We need to take a very careful look at this set of questions. There are no simple solutions. First and foremost, we have a serious counterterrorism challenge in the context of Somalia. Second, we have a serious humanitarian concern and imperative. Third, we have an interest in trying to facilitate national reconciliation and long-term stability in Somalia. In this context, the question is what tools and initiatives will best advance our efforts along all three of our objectives? If confirmed, I expect to consider this issue in the near future with the President-elect and my colleagues in the Cabinet. As a starting point, an important effort should be finding ways to increase support for and build the capacity of the African Union force.

#### AFRICOM

*Question 122.* The creation of the new unified command for Africa, AFRICOM, may represent sound policy from the standpoint of efficiency and management. The new command also has the potential both to elevate and improve U.S. relations with many African countries, particularly in critical areas such as the training of peacekeepers and the professionalization of forces. However, the presentation and rollout of the new command raised diplomatic concerns. The creation of AFRICOM has also raised questions about the role of the Department of Defense in U.S. development efforts. What do you see as the role of AFRICOM in U.S. Africa policy and in development and humanitarian engagement?

Answer. The President-elect supports the concept of AFRICOM, but has concerns about how it is being implemented. The new administration will review AFRICOM and consult with African nations. The original concept behind AFRICOM was that our engagement with Africa will be improved by streamlining our command structure so that there is a single unified command responsible for Africa, rather than three separate commands as has been the case. A well-conceived AFRICOM, playing the traditional role of a combatant command rather than supplanting the State Department's traditional role, can enhance U.S. Government efforts to foster peace and stability on the continent. The President-elect has cautioned that we must be



very careful not to overmilitarize our relations with African nations. On the other hand, there is a role to play for AFRICOM in helping train and equip African rapid response forces for peacekeeping operations. AFRICOM can also contribute to an enhanced capability of African nations to patrol their own waters.

#### US. POLICY TOWARD LATIN AMERICA

*Question 123.* Many observers believe that the United States has not dedicated adequate attention and resources to Latin America, allowing other countries with hostile ideologies to fill the vacuum. Would you agree with this assessment? What is your agenda for the Americas? What are the most significant challenges confronting U.S. interests in the region?

Answer. Too often, U.S. policy toward the Americas in recent years has been negligent to our friends, ineffective with our adversaries, and disinterested in the challenges that matter to peoples' lives throughout the region. The vacuum created by the lack of sustained U.S. engagement with the region has been filled, in part, by others—including Hugo Chavez, who has tried to use this opportunity to advance outmoded and anti-American ideologies.

As President-elect Obama has stated, administration policy toward the Americas will be guided by the simple principle that what is good for the people of the Americas is good for the United States. We will work in partnership with countries throughout the region to promote an agenda that helps advance democratic governance, opportunity, and security from the bottom up. It is time to focus on working to overcome the common challenges we face in the Western Hemisphere, including economic development, climate change, energy security, and the battle against transnational illicit networks. We must also provide support for democracy that includes strong legislatures, independent judiciaries, free press, vibrant civil society, honest police forces, religious freedom, and the rule of law.

I look forward to working with members of this committee, as well as other Members of Congress to do exactly that and to help create the new partnership in the Americas described by President-elect Obama.

#### BRAZIL

*Question 124.* In recent years, the U.S. and Brazil have worked more closely together on several important issues, including peacekeeping efforts in Haiti and promoting the use and production of biofuels. At the same time, Brazil has taken a leading role in trade and political forums, such as MERCOSUR, the Rio Group, and the newly established Union of South American Nations, which have at times been at odds with U.S. interests in the region. How would you assess the current state of bilateral cooperation between the United States and Brazil? What are possible areas where we might strengthen our relationship? What is your view of the United States-Brazil Energy Cooperation Pact?

Answer. The current United States-Brazil relationship provides a foundation for a deeper, more comprehensive partnership between our two countries. We welcome the important leadership role Brazil has played in the United Nations stabilization force in Haiti. We look forward to ensuring that continued United States-Brazil energy cooperation is environmentally sustainable and spreads the benefits of alternative fuels. The expansion of renewable energy production throughout the Americas that promotes self-sufficiency and creates more markets for U.S. green energy manufacturers and producers is vitally important.

There are a number of areas in which the United States and Brazil can work together. In partnership we can work to help advance democratic governance, opportunity, and security from the bottom up throughout the Americas. Brazil has an important voice on the global stage where we can work together on climate change, energy security, and the global financial crisis, among other important issues.

The March 2007 Memorandum of Understanding to Advance Biofuels Cooperation and the work that has been done since then are an important feature of the United States-Brazil relationship. We look forward to ensuring that continued United States-Brazil energy cooperation is carried out in an environmentally sustainable manner and in a manner that spreads the benefits of alternative energy development throughout the region while expanding the market for U.S. green energy manufacturers and producers. It is also important that U.S. biofuel producers not be prejudiced by efforts to increase United States-Brazil cooperation. We must also ensure that all stakeholders, including those from the labor, environmental and business sectors, are adequately represented in the biofuels cooperation process.

## COLOMBIA

*Question 125.* An October 2008 report by the GAO concluded that, although Plan Colombia improved security conditions in Colombia, it has not significantly reduced the amount of illicit drugs entering the United States. What lessons can be drawn from Plan Colombia, not only to improve its effectiveness, but to improve other U.S. counternarcotics policies, including the Merida Initiative, in Latin America?

Answer. The President-elect has supported the Andean Counter-Drug Program, and believes that it must be updated to meet evolving challenges.

The security situation in Colombia has improved, but very significant quantities of illicit narcotics continue to flow from Colombia to the United States. I look forward to working with Congress and our friends and partners in Colombia to ensure that future investments help staunch the flow of illegal drugs and help consolidate security gains to contribute to a durable peace in Colombia. To do so, we must learn from the successes and failures of the past.

We will fully support Colombia's fight against the FARC, and work with the government to end the reign of terror from right wing paramilitaries.

As we continue our struggle against the scourge of illegal drugs in our society and throughout the Americas, we must ensure that we are doing what is necessary here at home to reduce demand, enforce our laws through effective policing, and disrupt the southbound flow of money and weapons that are an essential element of the transnational illicit networks that operate in Colombia and elsewhere in the Americas. It is important that we work together with countries throughout the region to find the best practices that work across the hemisphere and to tailor approaches to fit each country.

*Question 126.* In light of the concerns previously expressed by President Obama and others, including members of this committee, related to violence against labor unions and other abuses in Colombia, what are your views on the United States-Colombia Free Trade Agreement? How can we work to minimize the impact that disagreements over trade have over other aspects of our bilateral relationship?

Answer. It is important that we not lose sight of the many aspects of the important, dynamic, and complex bilateral relationship that the United States and Colombia have when we discuss the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. I look forward to working to maintain the across-the-board vibrancy of the relationship.

With regard to the trade agreement, it is essential that trade spread the benefits of globalization. Without adequate labor protections, trade cannot do that. Although levels of violence have dropped, continued violence and impunity in Colombia directed at labor and other civic leaders makes labor protections impossible to guarantee in Colombia today.

Colombia must improve its efforts. I look forward to working with members of this committee, as well as other Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to see what the United States can do to help contribute to an end to further violence and continued impunity directed against labor and other civic leaders in Colombia.

The United States and Colombia have long enjoyed a close, mutually beneficial relationship. I am confident that through continued cooperation on the full array of bilateral issues, we can maintain and deepen that relationship. Active engagement with Colombia will be an important part of this administration's approach to hemispheric relations.

## CUBA

*Question 127.* As you know, Cuban Americans currently must obtain a U.S. Treasury Department license to visit family in Cuba. Even if issued such a license, they are permitted to visit immediate family in Cuba only once in a 3-year period. Similarly, Cuban Americans are allowed only to send up to \$300 to their family in any 3-month period. Will the new administration ease these burdensome restrictions so that the Cuban people have to rely less on their repressive government for assistance, as President-elect Obama called for during the election? If so, what is the likely timing of this announcement? Are there other ways that we can send a message to the Cuban people that the United States intends to play a positive role in their future and support their democratic aspirations?

Answer. There are many ways to that we can send a message to the Cuban people that the United States intends to play a positive role in their future. President-elect Obama believes that Cuban-Americans especially can be important ambassadors for change in Cuba. As such, he believes that it makes both moral and strategic sense to lift the restrictions on family visits and family cash remittances to Cuba. We do not currently have a timeline for the announcement of such a new policy, and the

Obama-Biden administration will consult closely with Congress as we prepare the change.

President-elect Obama also believes that it is not time to lift the embargo on Cuba, especially since it provides an important source of leverage for further change on the island.

#### VENEZUELA

*Question 128.* United States-Venezuelan relations have been marked by considerable friction under the rule of President Hugo Chavez. There are a number of areas of U.S. concern: Chavez's concerted efforts to export his brand of populism throughout the region; declining Venezuelan cooperation on counternarcotics and counterterrorism; Venezuela's relations with Cuba, Iran, and Russia; its recent military exercises and arms purchases; and the state of democracy in Venezuela. How do you view recent developments in Venezuela? What approach will you recommend to start to reverse some of these negative trends? Do you see any opportunities for direct engagement over these issues? Would you or President-elect Obama participate in any discussions that occur? Under what circumstances?

Answer. For too long, we have ceded the playing field to Hugo Chavez—a democratically elected leader who does not govern democratically, and whose actions and vision for the region do not serve his citizens or people throughout Latin America. While we should be concerned about Chavez's actions and posture, we should not exaggerate the threat he poses. It's time for the United States to fill that void with strong and sustained U.S. leadership in the region, and tough and direct diplomacy with Venezuela and Bolivia. We should have a positive agenda for the hemisphere in response to the fear-mongering propagated by Chavez and Evo Morales. We believe that bilateral cooperation with Venezuela and Bolivia on a range of issues would be in the mutual interest of our respective countries—for example, counterterrorism, counternarcotics, energy, and commerce.

The pursuit of tough, principled, direct diplomacy has been and must again be a hallmark of effective U.S. foreign policy. We should not take any tool off the table that may help promote our interests and values throughout the hemisphere. Direct, high-level diplomatic engagement with Venezuela, of course, also requires careful preparation and a partner willing to engage in meaningful dialogue. It remains to be seen whether there is any tangible sign that Venezuela actually wants an improved relationship with the United States.

No decision has been taken with regard to the appropriate manner and level at which to engage with the Venezuelan Government.

#### DEMOCRACY PROMOTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS

*Question 129.* What role will democracy promotion and human rights have as part of the broader U.S. foreign policy agenda? What lessons do you take away from the Bush administration's efforts to promote democracy and human rights?

Answer. The President-elect has pledged to be a strong advocate for democratic change around the world. And I wholeheartedly support this policy. Under his leadership, we will support new democracies and help them build sustainable democratic institutions. Democracy must mean more than elections—it must mean support for strong legislatures, independent judiciaries, free press, vibrant civil society, honest police forces, religious freedom, and the rule of law.

We must not allow the war in Iraq to continue to give democracy promotion a bad name. Supporting democracy, economic development, and the rule of law is critical for U.S. interests around the world. Democracies are our best trading partners, our most valuable allies, and the nations with which we share our deepest values. But democracy must be nurtured with moderates on the inside by building democratic institutions; it cannot be imposed by force from the outside.

*Question 130.* Although the Bush administration made the "freedom agenda" a centerpiece of its second term, by most objective measures these efforts have not been successful in the Middle East. The Middle East remains arguably the world's least democratized region; regimes like Iran and Syria have been emboldened; Hezbollah and Hamas have been empowered at the ballot boxes; and prominent democracy and human rights activists are jailed throughout the region, including in countries enjoying close relations with the United States. How can the United States best promote democratization and political reform in the Middle East? Which aspects of the United States recent democracy promotion policies in the region need to change and which aspects have been effective?

Answer. There is no doubt that democracy has been slower to take root in the Middle East than it has in some other parts of the world. Promoting democratiza-

tion and political reform in the Middle East will require skill, patience, and a clear commitment to our principles. It will involve engaging with leaders and with the region's people to find opportunities to advance reforms that can benefit both. We need to understand that these changes happen over time, not overnight, and that they are most successful when they are homegrown, and not perceived to be imposed from outside. Elections are important, but they are not sufficient, and often fail when they precede the establishment of institutions that bolster democratic society—strong legislatures, independent judiciaries, free press, vibrant civil society, honest police forces, religious freedom, and the rule of law. In addition to standing for democracy in the region, we must also stand for opportunity for the region's people—including greater access to education.

Public diplomacy, assistance to reformers, and dialogue with leaderships will all be crucial elements of our approach, but as President-elect Obama has said, our greatest tool in advancing democracy is our own example. That is why closing the detention facility at Guantanamo Bay and following through on a commitment to end torture will not only strengthen our values at home, but will bolster our national interests overseas.

*Question 131.* President Bush and Secretary Rice often met with foreign dissidents and victims of human rights abuses, apparently as a way to signal the importance of these issues to him and his administration. Do you intend to continue this practice?

Answer. Yes. Throughout my career, I have met with and championed the causes of those who have fought for their own rights and the rights of their fellow citizens, and I will continue to do so, if confirmed, in my role as Secretary of State.

#### GLOBAL FINANCIAL CRISIS

*Question 132.* What role can and should the State Department play in facilitating a recovery from the global financial crisis? What steps do you intend to take consistent with this role?

Answer. The President-elect and I understand the connection between our economy and our strength in the world. We often hear about two debates—one on national security and one on the economy—but that is a false distinction. We must be strong at home to be strong abroad. It is close to an iron law of history that great nations owe their greatness to their economic strength—and that nations decline if they let their economy decline. Our economy supports our military power, it increases our diplomatic leverage, and it is a foundation of America's leadership in the world.

As the new administration develops new policy approaches and implements new initiatives to deal with the financial crisis, I intend to collaborate with my colleagues at Treasury and the White House to enhance international cooperation in support of our efforts. State will deploy our embassies worldwide to update foreign governments on U.S. policy responses, to encourage appropriate policies in other countries, and to discourage counterproductive or protectionist reactions to the crisis. And we will seek to address the broader implications of the crisis for economic growth, development, and security around the world. It has become clear that this crisis, concentrated initially in the United States and Western Europe, is undermining both economic progress and stability in many developing and emerging economies, with adverse repercussions for U.S. economic and security interests.

#### GLOBAL POVERTY

*Question 133.* Today, more than 1 billion people live in slums around the world, with that number expected to grow to 2 billion within a couple decades. It is now estimated that for the first time in history more people live in urban areas than in rural areas. Yet, U.S. foreign assistance has almost zero capacity to deal with complex issues related to the concentration of poverty in slums. Furthermore, neither USAID nor the Department of State has an office devoted to addressing urban development issues, either from a programmatic or policy perspective. How do you intend to place greater emphasis on supporting those who live in extreme poverty and slums?

Answer. America must renew its effort to bring security and development to the disconnected corners of our interconnected world. These efforts must strengthen the capacity of weak and failing states, while expanding education and opportunity for the world's people. As we seek to lead the world, the United States has a significant stake in ensuring that those who live in fear and want today, can live with dignity and opportunity tomorrow. That is why President-elect Obama and I have embraced the Millennium Development Goals to cut global poverty in half by 2015. He has

also pledged to double our foreign assistance budget over time—a pledge that I agree with and will help him implement.

The challenges posed by the rise of mega-cities, of the global youth bulge, of increasing resource scarcity, and of the growing gap between rich and poor are challenges we must face in order to uphold our common humanity and ensure our common security. The sharp rise in urban poverty—whether manifested in the growth of slums, an increase in youth violence, rampant unemployment, or gross shortfalls in health and education services—threatens the stability and well-being of literally billions of the world's people.

The good news is that there are clear steps we can take. We have seen in India, for example, that by investing in organizations that can create employment opportunities for women and their communities, we can create jobs and foster dignity—even in slums. We also know that by helping to strengthen government institutions, build economic and trade linkages, and support the private sector—starting with small enterprises and building up—we can help to change the economic environment that generates urban poverty. And finally, we know that if we invest in agriculture, we can ease the global food crisis and help farmers to stay on their land.

#### GLOBAL FOOD CRISIS

*Question 134.* The global food crisis is a triple threat—humanitarian, economic, and strategic. It is pushing an additional 100 million people into poverty, and high prices have caused unrest and riots in dozens of countries, including Egypt, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Haiti. This crisis can be explained by a convergence of factors—a dearth of investment and inattention to long-term agricultural development, high growth in demand, rising energy prices, overreliance on corn-based biofuels, restrictive trade policies, and climate change. What steps would you advocate as Secretary of State to address some of the root causes of the global food crisis?

*Answer.* Although a long-simmering problem, the sharp increases in global food prices last year, combined with supply constraints in many parts of the world, created a severe humanitarian and economic crisis, particularly for countries least able to cope with these developments. A food crisis of this magnitude poses a threat to both prosperity and security in many developing countries. Millions of people are at risk of being pushed back into poverty, jeopardizing achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Moreover, states that cannot feed their people are inherently fragile ones. The United States therefore has not only a moral responsibility but also a strong practical interest in doing its part to address a food crisis of this scope and severity.

The underlying causes of the food crisis that erupted last year were both cyclical and structural. The more immediate causes included poor harvests in key grain-producing nations, sharply higher oil prices, and a surge in demand for meat in high-growth Asian countries. Longer term factors include inadequate investment in enhanced agricultural productivity, inappropriate trade and subsidy programs, and climate change.

Similarly, responses to the crisis must include both short- and long-term measures. In the near term, the United States must work with its partners in the international community to address immediate humanitarian needs and make seeds and fertilizers available in critically affected nations. Key long-term steps include putting more focus on efforts to enhance agricultural productivity in the world's poorest nations, including agricultural research and development, and investment in improved seeds and irrigation methods.

I also fully support and will work to implement President-elect Obama's pledge to launch an "Add Value to Agriculture" (AVTA) initiative, which aims to increase the incomes of subsistence farmers, decrease the pressure on shrinking arable lands, and minimize the vulnerability of commodity exports to global price shocks.

#### TREATIES

*Question 135.* Does the administration intend to submit a Treaty Priority List during the 111th Congress? If so, when does the administration expect to submit the list?

*Answer.* We are still considering whether and when to submit a Treaty Priority List.

*Question 136.* In the late 1980s and early 1990s, the bipartisan Senate Arms Control Observer Group gave members of the Senate an opportunity to observe arms control negotiations and to better understand the treaties that would ultimately be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. As Secretary, what consultative measures, prior to submittal of a treaty for Senate advice and consent

to ratification, do you envision taking to ensure that the Senate is fully prepared to understand and evaluate such treaty? Will you restore regular prior consultation with our committee on treaties and invite Senators to directly observe arms control negotiations?

Answer. I will direct Department officials to closely consult with this committee on treaty negotiations. Members of the committee and the Senate must be kept well informed of the process of developing and negotiating arms control and nonproliferation agreements so that they have a better basis for evaluating such agreements when and if they are completed and brought before the Senate for review or approval. Various arrangements could be used to keep the Senate well informed, including a mechanism similar to the Senate Arms Control Observer Group. I and my Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security will want to consult with members to figure out which approach or approaches would be practical and effective.

---

Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) Between the William J. Clinton Foundation and the Obama Presidential Transition Foundation dated December 12, 2008; Letter Agreements with James H. Thessin Executed by Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton (“Clinton Letter Agreement”) and David E. Kendall (“Kendall Letter Agreement” dated January 5, 2009.

*Question 1.* What compensation, if any, does President Clinton personally derive from the William J. Clinton Foundation (“Foundation”)?

Answer. President Clinton receives no compensation from the Clinton Foundation, which is a 501(c)3 charitable foundation.

*Question 2.* Are all of the contributions made to the Foundation used for purposes that fall within the Foundation’s missions?

Answer. Yes, contributions are used to further the Foundation’s charitable mission, including management and administrative costs. The Foundation strives to keep its overhead costs low; for example in 2007, only 2.7 percent of the Foundation’s expenses were used for management and administrative purposes.

*Question 3.* Please explain the timing of the recent disclosure of contributions to the Foundation. Please confirm that this represents all contributions made to the Foundation to date.

Answer. President Clinton and the Foundation are committed to ensuring that the Foundation’s charitable work does not affect the work of the Secretary of State, should I be confirmed for that position. In that spirit, the Foundation sought its contributors’ support in going above and beyond the requirements of the law and ethics rules by publishing their names. The Foundation published all contributions that were made prior to the date of publication.

*Question 4.* Were you ever personally involved in soliciting contributions to the Foundation?

Answer. While I have participated in events that celebrate the charitable Foundation and raise funds such as the President’s 60th Birthday Celebration, which raised funds for initiatives that provide medicine to those living with HIV/AIDS, combat the threat of global climate change, and address the barriers to sustainable economic development in America, Africa, and Latin America, I have not personally solicited contributions for the Foundation.

*Question 5.* What are the criteria the Foundation uses in making determinations as to the countries in which it will conduct its activities?

Answer. The Clinton Foundation works with governments, nongovernmental organizations, and other partners on some of the world’s most intractable problems—HIV/AIDS, climate change, sustainable economic development. Its work is based on the premise that these problems can be overcome through collaborative and systematic efforts, using business-oriented approaches. The Foundation seeks areas where its involvement can “add value” on projects that are scalable and sustainable. It works at the invitation of governments and in cooperation with them.

*Question 6.* Will all future contributions to the Foundation be disclosed to the public? If so, when and how will these disclosures be made?

Answer. As I understand from the MOU, should I be confirmed, the Foundation will publish annually the names of all contributors for that year.

*Question 7.* Will all pledges for future contributions to the Foundation be publicly disclosed? If so, when and how? If not, please provide an explanation as to why such pledges for future contributions should not trigger the same disclosure process applied to current contributions.

Answer. As I understand from the MOU, should I be confirmed, the Foundation will publish annually the names of all contributors for that year, but it will not publish mere promises to contribute as they are not realized unless and until they are paid.

*Question 8.* Will pledges for future contributions to the Foundation be subject to the same review process as current contributions from foreign governments? If not, please provide an explanation as to why such pledges for future contributions would not raise the same issues, and should not trigger the same review process applied to current contributions under the MOU.

Answer. Pledges from foreign governments are proposed contributions which under the MOU will be presented to the State Department for review.

*Question 9.* What will formally trigger the review process contemplated under section 2 of the MOU?

Answer. The Clinton Foundation will provide the State Department's designated agency ethics official with information about proposed contributions that are covered by the MOU.

*Question 10.* Please describe the standard of review that will be applied by the State Department's designated agency ethics official to contributions from foreign governments pursuant to section 2 of the MOU. If concerns are raised in such a review, how will such concerns be conveyed to you and the Foundation?

Answer. The State Department has determined that the appropriate standard when reviewing certain contributions to the Clinton HIV/AIDS Initiative, the Clinton Climate Initiative, the Clinton Giustra Sustainable Growth Initiative, and the Clinton Hunter Development Initiative of the William J. Clinton Foundation is the existing standard for impartiality in performing official duties, which is found in the section of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch that encompasses the standards and procedures for consideration of appearances of conflicts of interest [5 CFR 2635.502].

In the event the State Department or White House has concerns about a proposed business relationship, speech, or contribution, those concerns will be conveyed to me and to President Clinton's office for appropriate action.

*Question 11.* Under what circumstances will the State Department refer matters to the White House Counsel's office pursuant to section 2 of the MOU? How will any concerns be conveyed to you and the Foundation?

Answer. The State Department has determined that the appropriate standard when reviewing certain contributions to the Clinton HIV/AIDS Initiative, the Clinton Climate Initiative, the Clinton Giustra Sustainable Growth Initiative, and the Clinton Hunter Development Initiative of the William J. Clinton Foundation is the existing standard for impartiality in performing official duties, which is found in the section of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch that encompasses the standards and procedures for consideration of appearances of conflicts of interest [5 CFR 2635.502].

The State Department's professional career ethics officials will determine when to consult the White House Counsel's office. In the event the State Department or White House has concerns about a proposed business relationship, speech, or contribution, those concerns will be conveyed to me and to President Clinton's office for appropriate action.

*Question 12.* What do you anticipate could constitute the "appropriate action" contemplated in section 2 of the MOU in response to these concerns? Would such "appropriate action" by you or the Foundation be voluntary or mandatory?

Answer. Should I be confirmed, President Clinton and I are committed to ensuring that his work does not present a conflict of interest with the duties of Secretary of State. Appropriate action means that decisions will be made based on consideration of all the facts and guidance from the professional career ethics officials. In many, if not most cases, it is likely that the Foundation or President Clinton will not pursue an opportunity that presents a conflict. The State Department's professional career ethics officials, however, may recommend recusal, or taking other appropriate actions to mitigate any perceived conflict and I will be guided by such advice.

*Question 13.* How would you respond to concerns that donations from individuals who may have ties to foreign governments or matters of possible relevance to your official duties could potentially raise similar questions as contributions from foreign governments?

Answer. First, I think it is important to observe that the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) and the professional career ethics officials have advised that neither the law nor the ethics regulations require my husband or the Foundation to take the voluntary steps they have. The Foundation is a 501(c)3—neither my husband nor I has any financial interest. The Presidential Transition Team and the Foundation determined that further steps were not necessary.

Ultimately, there is no conflict between the foreign policy of the United States and the efforts of the Clinton Foundation seeking to reduce human suffering and increase opportunity for people in need. That has been demonstrated quite clearly in President Clinton's and former President Bush's efforts to raise relief funds after Katrina and the Tsunami.

The Clinton Foundation has helped save and extend the lives of more than a million people, many of them children. It is combating climate change and childhood obesity. It is bringing economic opportunity to struggling people in America and around the world. Governments acting alone are not equipped to solve all the world's problems, and as I have said for years, we need NGOs to bridge the gap between what government can do and what is needed to be done.

The agreement that has been reached between the Clinton Foundation and the President-elect's transition team will allow the Foundation's charitable work to continue while providing for an unprecedented level of transparency and ethical review of its activities.

*Question 14.* Please describe the differences, if any, between the review process under section 2 of the MOU for foreign government contributions and the review process contemplated for President Clinton's speech and consulting income under the Kendall Letter Agreement.

Answer. The State Department's professional career ethics officials will review both foreign government contributions under section 2 of the MOU and speech and consulting incoming under the Kendall Letter Agreement. In many, if not most cases, it is likely that the Foundation or President Clinton will not pursue an opportunity that presents a conflict. The State Department's professional career ethics officials, however, may recommend recusal, or taking other appropriate actions to mitigate any perceived conflict. President Clinton and I will be guided by such advice.

---

RESPONSES TO SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOHN KERRY

*Question.* A September 1992 letter from Janet Mullins, then-Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe and the Middle East expressed State Department policy on the definition of a political prisoner. In that letter and on many other occasions, the State Department has characterized a person to be a political prisoner if the person is prosecuted for political reasons and the charges are trumped up or the trial unfair.

- Does the Department still apply this standard in determining whether an individual should be considered a political prisoner?

Recent reports on human rights in Russia prepared by the Department and others consider the official treatment of politically active businessman Mikhail Khodorkovsky to constitute a politically motivated case of selective arrest and prosecution. To date, the Department has not labeled Khodorkovsky a political prisoner, although it applies this label to others subject to politically motivated arrests and prosecutions. As chairman of this committee, Vice-President-elect Joe Biden described Russian actions against Khodorkovsky as part of a pattern by which, in his words, "[t]he Putin government has selectively and ruthlessly utilized its prosecutorial powers to silence incipient rivals and thereby intimidate other potential opponents," stating that "[t]he imprisonment and legal proceedings against Khodorkovsky have violated virtually every canon of fairness and legality."

- Do you agree with Vice-President-elect Biden that the treatment of Mr. Khodorkovsky may be politically motivated? What steps will you take, as Secretary of State, to work for the release of Russian political prisoners?

Answer. The Department looks to a variety of factors in deciding whether to report that an individual may have been the subject of a politically motivated arrest and/or prosecution, such as whether the prosecution is based on the individual's



political beliefs and whether the charges and trial are unfair. However, the Department does not routinely make determinations as to whether an individual is a political prisoner.

As the recent report on human rights prepared by the Department indicated, some human rights groups consider the official treatment of politically active businessman Mikhail Khodorkovsky to constitute a politically motivated case of selective arrest and prosecution.

There are many troubling aspects to the case. The original trial, the continued prosecutions, and the dismantlement of Yukos raise serious questions about the rule of law and due process in Russia. Some aspects of the way the case has been conducted do indeed appear to be politically motivated.

This case reveals broader issues at stake for Russia, namely: respect for rule of law, sanctity of contracts, property rights, independence of the courts, and Russia's commitment to political development.

The Obama administration will continue to raise concerns about the lack of due process in this and other cases that may be politically motivated.

#### EDUCATION

*Question.* In the 110th Congress, you introduced the Education for All Act, an important piece of legislation that seeks to invest up to \$10 billion over 5 years as part of an international effort to enroll in school the 75 million children living in impoverished and conflict-affected countries. During the campaign, President-elect Obama committed to erasing the global primary education gap by 2015 and capitalizing a "Global Education Fund" with at least \$2 billion in funding toward the goal of universal access to education.

- As Secretary of State, will international basic education remain a priority for you? If so, please describe what policies you will design and implement to support this goal, how you envision Congress supporting your efforts, and how significant investment in global education would benefit the recipients and the United States?

*Answer.* The United Nations developed the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) to help reduce the crippling burden of global poverty. One of those goals is to achieve universal primary education by the year 2015. The United States joined other U.N. Member States in adopting the MDGs in 2000, and I applaud our government's commitment to reaching all of these goals, including universal primary education. I look forward to implementing President Obama's vision and ensuring that the United States remains a leader in efforts to help all girls and boys access quality basic education. We should coordinate our efforts with others, including the World Bank's Fast Track Initiative, in order to maximize our investment in global education.

I know there are many ideas as to how the United States can best contribute to the global efforts to achieve universal basic education, and I look forward to working with the Congress and with education experts to develop a comprehensive strategy for education assistance.

I believe that any strategy should include the following components:

- Adequate access to at-risk children: Our efforts to achieve universal education must reach all children, particularly those who are most likely to be out of school. We must ensure that children in conflict areas or disaster sites have the opportunity to continue their education. We must ensure that often-marginalized populations, such as children with disabilities, and indigenous or minority ethnic groups, have access to education. And it is imperative that our global education efforts include increasing enrollment of girls, who currently account for a majority of children that lack access to education.
- Quality education: Our efforts to achieve universal basic education cannot simply be measured by enrollment figures. Rather, we must ensure that every child has access to a quality education, and is in an environment that is conducive to learning. Specifically, we must ensure that we have adequate resources, including a trained teacher workforce and educational materials, and an environment that is free from violence.
- Accountability: We must ensure that our increased investment comes with a plan for coordination, so that we are complementing, not duplicating, other efforts. It is also important to have a strong management within our government to oversee these efforts, facilitate cooperation among agencies and our other partners, and ensure that we are making continued progress toward universal basic education.

## MALARIA

*Question.* Fortunately, malaria is presently little known in the United States, but before the 1950s, some foreign ambassadors serving in the United States received hardship pay because of the risk of catching the disease while serving in Washington due to mosquito infestation in the Potomac. Through a concerted effort, the United States eradicated this concern. However, in 2009, nearly 1 million people, mostly children in Africa under 5 years old, are expected to die as a result of malaria. Senator Clinton, as a candidate for President, you introduced a bold plan to eliminate deaths in Africa from malaria. As a candidate, President-elect Obama shared this vision, and it might be practicable given the existence of low-tech interventions, including bed nets, treatments and environmentally sustainable spraying. Using such interventions, malarial deaths have been reduced by half in Ethiopia and two-thirds in Rwanda.

Last year, as part of the PEPFAR reauthorization, Congress authorized up to \$5 billion over the next 5 years to combat malaria. Can you give us your thoughts on this issue and what plans you have to wipe out this disease that affects many of the world's poorest people?

*Answer.* I share your concern about the critical need to address malaria, which has 300 million cases globally and causes 900,000 deaths annually. Our programs are achieving the ambitious objective set in 2005 of reducing malaria-related deaths in the 15 priority countries by 50 percent by the end of 2010. I plan to build upon that success, especially the program's emphasis on strengthening local health systems to ensure that our successes are sustained. The Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 authorized funding of \$5 billion over 5 years. If these funds are appropriated, our malaria control and prevention programs will expand to benefit approximately 70 percent of the vulnerable populations in sub-Saharan Africa. With full funding of the Hyde/Lantos Authorization, it will be possible to achieve dramatic reductions in the burden of malaria across Africa by 2013.

## AGRICULTURE

*Question.* In 2000, the United States joined a worldwide commitment to halving poverty by 2015. Although we are about halfway to this goal, nearly 1.4 billion people continue to live on just over \$1 per day and about 900 million people in developing countries currently go hungry. The past year has witnessed food crisis that in some instances resulted in political instability in countries such as Haiti, Senegal, Egypt, Pakistan, and the Philippines. Jacques Diouf, the Director General of the Food and Agriculture Organization, stated that "[a]ll indications we have is that this is not a short-term effect." Many experts predict that the cost of food will remain high in the near future and possibly until 2013. Although the United States is a global leader in providing emergency food and disaster aid, such assistance, while critical, is not a sustainable solution to improving the lives of the millions of people who are vulnerable to food insecurity. To use an old adage, we need to teach people how to fish. The EU has committed about 1 billion euros in aid to help increase agricultural production in developing countries and to enable them to feed their populations. As Secretary of State, what commitment and role will you seek for the United States to strengthen our efforts on this important issue?

*Answer.* President Obama has made clear that alleviating hunger worldwide is a top priority of his administration. As he said on the first day of his Presidency, "to the people of poor nations, we pledge to work alongside you to make your farms flourish and let clean waters flow; to nourish starved bodies and feed hungry minds." The President and I intend to focus new attention on food security so that developing nations can invest in food production, affordability, accessibility, education and technology. We are committed to building a new partnership among donor states, developing nations, U.N. agencies, NGO's, the private sector and others to better coordinate policies to achieve the Millennium Development Goals agreed to in 2000. As Secretary of State I will use all of the means available to me to support President Obama's Add Value to Agriculture Initiative (AVTA).

I believe there are three areas which require action. First, we must invest in agricultural research to improve potential crop production. Second, we must also invest in infrastructure related to agriculture in order to spread the benefits of new technology to all farmers, and improve the efficient delivery of food to markets. And third, we have to make markets themselves more efficient, both locally and globally.

*Question.* Both Defense Secretary Robert Gates and National Security Advisor Jim Jones have publicly stated that in the interest of long-term U.S. national security, policymakers should take a three-pronged approach to U.S. foreign policy that

emphasizes defense, diplomacy, and development. While defense and diplomacy are prioritized, the development component of U.S. foreign policy is not only outdated, but is significantly undervalued, underfunded, and in several areas, it underperforms. In order to compliment the other two areas of focus, the U.S. development regime should be reformed and appropriately elevated in terms of its profile and resource allocation.

- Do you agree that development should be elevated as a foreign policy tool? What role do you think economic development and poverty reduction in poor countries play in enhancing U.S. national security?

Nearly 1.4 billion people currently struggle to survive on about one dollar per day. There are estimated to be about 963 million hungry people worldwide, 907 million of whom live in developing countries. Some of these countries have become unstable and, consequently, over the last 10 years, have presented serious security implications for the United States. These countries include Sudan, Somalia, and Afghanistan, where terrorists groups such as al-Qaeda have threatened weak governments, set up training camps to recruit and train operative to attack the United States and our allies, and influenced many of their people to despise America.

- Could you describe how you view the relationship between poverty and U.S. national security and how you would address it as Secretary of State?

A poor international image makes it easier for enemies of America to spread negative propaganda and recruit supporters at both the individual and national level. Over the last 2 years, you and President-elect Obama have asserted that America's image worldwide is badly damaged and stated your intention to take bold and immediate steps to repair it.

- Do you believe the promotion of development is a necessary component of this effort? If so, what development efforts could be enhanced to help repair our tarnished image and restore the United States status as a moral leader in the global community?

Answer. President Obama is committed to elevating the importance of development assistance to America's foreign policy and national security. As Secretary of State, I can assure you that the State Department and USAID will stand ready to more fully integrate development as one of three pillars of a new security strategy, with defense and diplomacy standing as the other two pillars. I believe that development is an equal partner, along with defense and diplomacy, in the furtherance of America's national security. To that end, President Obama and I have committed to increasing foreign assistance, although the economic downturn may affect the pace at which this is possible. President Obama has also called for modernization of U.S. development and foreign assistance programs. While this will require a significant investment of time and effort, we believe that these efforts can pay significant returns in global stability, security, and prosperity.

Meeting the expressed goals of this Congress and the priorities that the President has established, including the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, will require more resources. Defense Secretary Robert Gates believes that future success in foreign policy and the fight against terrorism will be "less a matter of imposing one's will and more a function of shaping behavior—of friends, adversaries, and, most importantly, the people in between." He is absolutely right. Considering the importance of the work ahead, we cannot fail simply for a lack of will or resources. There are few other places in the budget where dollars invested literally means lives saved.

Positive feelings toward the United States in sub-Saharan Africa in part reflect the work that is being done through PEPFAR, through the Malaria Initiative, through our economic growth programs, and through our basic education programs. These programs boast tangible results that make a difference in people's lives. As we look toward the future, it is essential that the role of USAID and our other foreign assistance programs are strengthened, adequately funded and coordinated in a way that makes clear that the United States understands and supports development assistance.

*Question.* PEPFAR and the Millennium Challenge Account were two key initiatives passed during the last administration, with strong bipartisan support in Congress. They have succeeded in saving and improving the lives of millions of people, and took innovative approaches to helping reduce global poverty. President-elect Obama has committed to coordinate and consolidate PEPFAR, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) and other foreign assistance programs into a streamlined U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) in order to reduce duplication of efforts and inefficiencies created by the fragmentation of U.S. foreign assistance.

- As Secretary of State, will you make this an urgent task? How can the best features of PEPFAR and MCC be preserved and translated into a broader framework?

In difficult economic times there is a strong yet dangerous temptation for government to cut funding to foreign assistance programs. There could also be the temptation to focus on reforming our aid regime at the expense of funding. However, even the best development strategy or agenda might fail to meet its objectives if it is not adequately funded to meet its mandate.

- Do you agree that if we are to achieve our foreign policy and national security goals, increased resources for development is a core requirement, and not a substitute, for comprehensive aid reform?
- What do you think are the best elements of U.S. foreign assistance and how do you plan to preserve them in any restructuring of the U.S. foreign aid regime?

Key elements of U.S. foreign assistance reside within the jurisdiction of other government departments. These include multilateral debt relief, which is a critical issue in development that is negotiated by the Treasury Department, trade quotas by the Commerce Department, and infrastructure development that is often undertaken by the Defense Department. President-elect Obama has stated his intention to taking steps to consolidate and reform the U.S. aid regime.

- As Secretary of State, would you seek greater administrative control or coordinating authority for our development agency over these areas?

Answer. President Obama is committed to elevating development in U.S. foreign policy. The administration will review promptly whether fulfilling that objective will necessitate organizational changes. PEPFAR has experienced much success, and the MCC represents a worthy new approach to poverty reduction and combating corruption; we intend to quickly review how these programs can best be managed.

I agree that if we are to achieve our foreign policy and national security goals, increased resources for development is essential. I hope the Congress will work with the new administration in increasing resources for development, and fully fund the President's budget request. These resources will be invested wisely with strong accountability measures and to ensure they are directed toward strategic goals.

Our foreign assistance infrastructure must be able to meet the challenges we face today while anticipating those in the months and years ahead. We should look at areas which we can be better coordinated and streamlined, and look forward to engaging the committee and the Congress on these matters. I will ask my Deputy, Jack Lew, to conduct a review of the entire range of foreign assistance, how it is conducted, and how it is funded and managed. We will look at those areas which have proved effective and build on those successes, while determining if poorly performing initiatives are able to be improved.

President Obama has committed to coordinate and consolidate programs currently housed in more than 20 executive agencies so as to enhance effectiveness and accountability. If confirmed, I look forward to working closely with the Congress as we review what programs can be consolidated and other new ways to elevate the importance of development and the full range of foreign assistance in our overall foreign policy, and improve budget planning, coordination, and execution, while seeking greater resources to be used with maximum flexibility. I look forward to consulting with the committee, and the Congress, on these issues as we move forward.

*Question.* In 2000, the international community agreed to a set of goals that includes halving poverty by 2015, putting every child in school, tackling preventable diseases, and other critical development objectives. While significant progress has been made in several countries, the Africa region continues to lag behind on most indicators. President-elect Obama has stated that he would make the MDGs U.S. policy. As Secretary of State, how will you harmonize U.S. development assistance with the Millennium Development Goals? Will you seek to prioritize the African Continent, where there is the highest concentration of low income countries?

Answer. President Obama and I have embraced the Millennium Development Goals (MDG) to cut global poverty in half by 2015. This administration is committed to elevating development in U.S. foreign policy and increasing foreign assistance. The totals have to grow. I also urge Congress to fully fund the President's budget request which will support the U.S. commitment to achieving the MDGs.

Clearly, Africa has been and will remain a key priority for U.S. assistance. Africa is a region of extreme need and great promise. Africa offers rich development potential, along with huge challenges, including widespread poverty, illiteracy, hunger, disease, environmental degradation, conflict and poor governance. Our responsibility

is to marshal the resources at our disposal and use them in partnership with Africans who must bear ultimate responsibility for solving the problems of Africa.

*Question.* The United States has implemented some trade and economic growth programs, such as the African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) and the Millennium Challenge Account, that have begun to create opportunities for poor countries to prioritize growth and take advantage of greater trading opportunities with the United States. However, trade and economic growth has not been integrated adequately into U.S. development policy. As Secretary of State, how do you plan to better integrate these policy objectives to ensure that we are creating poverty alleviation opportunities through trade and economic development?

*Answer.* Sustainable economic growth in poor countries must be a core U.S. development policy objective. This is the force that empowers families to lift themselves out of poverty, take care of their own long-term needs, and maintain a productive and dignified standard of living. Sustained growth is also essential in generating the resources needed to support critical public services and regulatory oversight, including for public security, health, education, and infrastructure. Particularly in light of the financial crisis, I would like to see a more comprehensive and coherent strategy in which our many different assistance programs work together to establish the building blocks needed to sustain long-term, broad-based economic growth and poverty reduction.

U.S. development policy must include more than just official development assistance. We must work with developing countries to make the most of all the public and private tools in the development financing toolbox, including trade and investment, the work of our many charitable foundations, and debt management.

Trade and openness to the global economy play a crucial role in creating jobs and boosting economic growth in developing countries. Our experience with Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) compacts suggests that trade capacity-building is a high priority for developing countries. There is broad demand for expanded trade capacity-building beyond the small number of MCC compact countries. The recent food crisis demonstrates the importance of facilitating expanded “south-south” trade.

The African Growth and Opportunity Act’s full impact is limited by numerous, long-term capacity constraints in Africa. Infrastructure, technology, and capital are needed, but to be effective they must be accompanied by policy and institutional reforms—in areas such as customs and state price controls—that provide incentives and empower African farmers and entrepreneurs to participate in trade that contributes to long-term, broad-based growth and poverty reduction.

*Question.* During the Presidential campaign, President-elect Obama endorsed U.S. diplomatic initiatives to improve the security of satellites we depend upon for our economic and national security. One of the initiatives he specifically endorsed is an international code of conduct that, among other things, would bar destructive testing of antisatellite weapons and other methods in space that would use satellites for target practice. Do you support this step?

*Answer.* As space becomes an increasingly congested, complex, and contested domain, the United States will take an active leadership role in identifying and implementing cooperative efforts with established and emerging members of the international spacefaring community to ensure the safety of the space assets of all nations.

We also must play a leading role in advancing transparency and confidence-building measures (TCBMs) relating to space activities. Such TCBMs can help increase transparency regarding governmental space policies, strategies, and potentially hazardous activities—thus reducing uncertainty over intentions and decreasing the risk of misinterpretation or miscalculation. In this regard, the administration will continue to work closely with our friends and allies to develop voluntary TCBMs that all spacefaring nations can support and actively participate in for the benefit of all nations.

Further, building upon recent progress at the United Nations on international guidelines for orbital debris mitigation, the United States will sustain its global leadership in spaceflight safety and in the formulation of practical guidelines to preserve the space environment for future generations.

It is a part of longstanding U.S. space policy that the United States will maintain and strengthen the established principle of free access to, and use of, outer space by all nations in support of legitimate economic and security interests. In support of this principle in today’s environment, it is important that the United States work closely with its allies to implement the diplomatic or military measures that may be necessary both to ensure the continued operation (and responsible use) of mili-

tary, intelligence, civil, and commercial satellites and to respond appropriately if these satellites are targeted in a hostile manner.

*Question.* In your prepared statement, you indicated your intent to pursue a verifiable Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty. The Bush administration, by contrast, has argued that a truly verifiable treaty is not technically feasible and would risk the loss of sensitive classified information.

Do you believe that a verifiable treaty is, in fact, feasible without compromising sensitive U.S. national security information? Or do you think that, even though a verifiable treaty may not be feasible, the United States should be willing to begin negotiations on such a treaty and see how much verification can be agreed to without compromising sensitive national security information?

*Answer.* The United States has strongly supported achieving a ban on the production of fissile material for use in nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. Such a ban would serve important nonproliferation goals and has commanded broad international support for many years. One way to accomplish this ban would be through the negotiation of a legally binding treaty. The United States supports the rapid start of negotiations on an FMCT, and such negotiations would certainly include discussions of verification.

A well-crafted, robust verification regime should not have to put sensitive information at risk and the United States will not support an FMCT that compromises national security information. It is worth noting, however, that the United States has entered into arms control treaties, such as the Chemical Weapons Convention, containing robust verification provisions, without placing sensitive national security information at risk. Once my team is in place, they will review the U.S. position with a view to determining if and how verification can be incorporated in an FMCT without compromising sensitive information.

*Question.* Congress and previous administrations have long urged China to respect the religious freedoms of Tibetan Buddhists and to grant Tibetans “meaningful autonomy” as part of a comprehensive resolution of the Tibetan issue. Last year, Congress awarded the Dalai Lama the Congressional Gold Medal in recognition of his courageous advocacy of genuine reconciliation through peaceful dialogue. Unfortunately, eight rounds of dialogue between China and representatives of the Dalai Lama have so far yielded little progress. Chinese religious and ethnic persecution of Tibetans persists. How can we help the Tibetans and Chinese achieve forward movement toward a just and lasting solution to this longstanding problem?

The Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 established the position of Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues in the State Department. It is currently posted at the Under Secretary Level (G). Do you intend to appoint a Special Coordinator at a high level, with adequate resources and access, to signal the Tibet issue’s importance to the U.S. Government?

Will you personally champion the cause of Tibetan human rights as part of your larger dialogue with Chinese leaders on human rights issues?

*Answer.* I can assure you that I take Tibetan issues seriously and plan to appoint a well-qualified coordinator. I will ensure the coordinator has the resources to do the job.

We are disappointed with China’s human rights record and the lack of progress during eight rounds of talks between the Chinese Government and the Dalai Lama’s representatives. We are also very concerned about the increased repression in Tibetan areas over the past year. We will raise our concerns about these issues at the highest levels with the Chinese Government and press for progress. The Special Coordinator for Tibetan issues will sustain our focus on promoting substantive dialogue, directed at achieving meaningful results, between the Dalai Lama and his representatives and the Chinese Government. We believe such talks provide the best hope for resolving longstanding tensions in Tibetan areas of China and for safeguarding the distinct ethnic, cultural, and religious identity of the Tibetan people.

*Question.* On January 1, 2009, the Government of Azerbaijan abruptly terminated broadcasts of Radio Free Europe (RFE) on its domestic airwaves. This termination effectively ended broadcasts to 80–90 percent of RFE Azeri service’s listeners. The position of the Azeri government is that Russian and Iranian radio broadcasts were also terminated. Both of these countries share long borders with Azerbaijan, which regularly broadcast in Russian and Azeri. Needless to say RFE and the BBC do not enjoy similar geographic advantages. U.S. funds RFE in order to increase the plurality of information in relevant countries. What can and should the Secretary of State, who sits on the Broadcasting Board of Governors and has responsibility for RFE, do to ensure that listeners in Azerbaijan and other countries can continue to receive these broadcasts?

Answer. Radio Liberty and Voice of America—alongside the BBC—are, indeed, a much-needed source of information for Azerbaijani citizens to participate in a pluralistic debate. We have been clear in our communications from Washington and the Embassy in Baku that removal of the broadcasts from domestic radio and television frequencies constituted a serious setback to freedom of speech in Azerbaijan. Without distribution on these popular domestic channels, VOA and RFE/RL's substantial audiences in Azerbaijan will be lost. The U.S. Ambassador in Baku made it clear that continuing this course will fundamentally alter the relationship between our governments.

Representatives of the Broadcasting Board of Governors and the Embassy have requested that talks begin in early February aimed at restoring VOA and RFE/RL access to the same frequencies they were licensed to use prior to January 1, 2009, where they can continue to inform public discourse as Azerbaijan moves forward with its democratic debate. We remain committed to working with the Government of Azerbaijan to ensure that these broadcasts can continue on the radio and television networks where they enjoyed a substantial audience. Unfettered access to information across international borders is fundamental, and the Department will be vigorous in defending this right wherever it is threatened.

---

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RICHARD G. LUGAR

FOREIGN AFFAIRS MANAGEMENT ISSUES

*Question 1.* President-elect Obama has nominated two Deputy Secretaries of State. What roles do you envision each playing in the work of the Department?

Answer. The opportunities and challenges in front of all of us are both promising and daunting. The objectives that the President-elect has set forth are compelling, demanding, and necessary to meet our interests. To meet these goals, I am seeking to recruit strong, experienced professionals to join the Department. I am using every position available to maximize the possibility for success and to manage an unprecedented number of responsibilities for our Nation's security and prosperity.

I intend to use both Deputy positions that are available in law—to manage the overall foreign policy agenda and to manage the operations and resources needed for success. Jim Steinberg, if confirmed, will be responsible for assisting me in the formulation and conduct of our foreign policy; Jack Lew, if confirmed, will be responsible for assisting me in the management of the operations and resources of the Department.

I also will recommend to the President-elect under secretaries and assistant secretaries who are at the top of their fields, who think strategically and are strong diplomats and managers of talent. And, I will employ a time-honored tradition to make use of special envoys who will work in a focused fashion to address some of our most difficult challenges.

*Question 2.* During the Presidential campaign you offered the following critique of the Bush administration's foreign policy management:

One of my criticisms of the Bush administration is that they have such a narrow circle of people advising the President. Apparently there is only one diplomat the President will send anywhere and that is Secretary Rice. So if Secretary Rice can't get to the Middle East or get to Pakistan or get to Africa or get anywhere, you don't get the feeling that the President is engaged. I think that is a terrible failure. The President needs to have a broad circle of advisers calling upon distinguished Americans both in and out of government to serve as Presidential envoys, something that I urged when I came back from Pakistan and Afghanistan last January.

- a. Does the Obama administration intend to use Presidential or other special envoys to address particular foreign policy issues in the manner described above?

Answer. I agree that special envoys can play a useful role in addressing foreign policy issues that require intense attention. If confirmed, I will be consulting with the President-elect and other members of the national security team about where special envoys can be most effective. However, no final decisions have been made yet regarding the appointment of special envoys.

- b. Will you commit to making such envoys available to testify before the Foreign Relations Committee on issues related to their duties?

Answer. As Secretary, it will be a top priority for me to insure that the committee is closely consulted and informed about the Department's diplomatic efforts and the

Department will make available the appropriate person to answer the committee's questions.

*Question 3.* During the Presidential campaign, you stated: “[W]hen I become President, Bill Clinton, my dear husband, will be one of the people who will be sent around the world as a roving ambassador to make it very clear to the rest of the world that we’re back to a policy of reaching out and working and trying to make friends and allies and stopping the alienation of the rest of the world.”

Do you expect President Clinton to serve as a roving ambassador on behalf of the Obama administration or the Department of State? If so, what will his specific role and mandate be?

Answer. Any role that President Clinton plays with the incoming administration is for President-elect Obama to decide.

#### RESOURCES FOR STATE DEPARTMENT PROGRAMS

At the end of the Bush administration, Secretary of Defense Gates advocated, strongly, for additional personnel and resources for the Department of State, lamenting that the total number of Foreign Service officers was less than the number of sailors on a single aircraft carrier group, and allegedly, less than the number of active military band members.

*Question 4.* Do you believe the State Department currently has sufficient numbers of personnel, with appropriate training, skill sets, and resources to effectively perform the necessary work of advancing U.S. interests around the globe?

Answer. Based on the briefings I have received so far, I do not believe the Department has an adequate number of personnel. The men and women of the Foreign Service and Civil Service also need additional training opportunities, as well as resources, to carry out the many responsibilities assigned to the Department. If confirmed, I intend to work closely with the President and the Congress to secure the necessary resources for the Department.

*Question 5.* You have signed several letters during your Senate service advocating either that the Function 150 Account should receive a substantial increase or that the President’s proposed 150 Account increase should not be reduced. One such delegation letter sent on April 20, 2004, to the Appropriations chairman and ranking member said “we urge you to allocate at least the President’s request for the civilian foreign affairs agencies and their programs.” Another delegation letter that you signed was sent on December 15, 2004, to President Bush. It called for “a robust increase in the FY06 150 International Affairs Budget as an essential investment in America’s fight against terrorism and efforts to build global stability . . .” On March 16, 2005, during the FY 2006 Budget Resolution debate, you voted along with most Senators to cut the 150 Account by \$410 million and transfer the funding to Veterans Health Care.

- a. As Secretary of State, would you actively advocate against the use of the 150 Account as an offset for other budgetary priorities, regardless of what those priorities are?

Answer. If confirmed, I intend to work to increase the 150 Account, and I intend to work with the Congress to fully fund the President’s budget requests.

- b. What role will you play as an advocate for resources for State Department programs in the Obama administration and what do you see as the most pressing needs for the State Department at this time?

Answer. If confirmed, I intend to be a strong advocate for resources for the Department. I also hope the Senate will promptly consider the nomination of Jack Lew, who the President will nominate for the new post of Deputy Secretary for Management and Resources. As a former OMB Director, Jack is well equipped to assist me in ensuring that additional resources are used effectively and efficiently. Any organization is only as strong as its people, and as strong as the Foreign Service and Civil Service are, I believe that the most pressing need, in the near term, is for the Department to have additional Foreign and Civil Service officers to meet requirements.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

##### *Foreign Assistance Resources*

*Question 6.* Do you believe that the current budget for the State Department’s foreign assistance programs provides adequate resources for these programs? Do you



intend to advocate for increased resources for the State Department's foreign assistance programs within the Obama administration?

Answer. Throughout the campaign, President-elect Obama stated many times the importance of development assistance to America's foreign policy and national security. And he pledged to double foreign assistance. I hope that the Congress will work with the new administration in meeting this goal, and I can assure you that the State Department will stand ready to implement these programs and more fully integrate development as one of three pillars to a new security strategy, with defense and diplomacy standing as the other two pillars. To meet the expressed goals of this Congress and the priorities that the President-elect will establish, including the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals, will require more resources. Defense Secretary Robert Gates believes that future success in foreign policy and the fight against terrorism will be "less a matter of imposing one's will and more a function of shaping behavior—of friends, adversaries, and, most importantly, the people in between." He's absolutely right. Considering the importance of the work ahead, we cannot fail simply for a lack of will or resources. There are few other places in the budget where dollars invested literally mean lives saved.

*Question 7.* Given the expected constraints of a growing Federal budget deficit, a global financial crisis, continued commitments to conflict and crises overseas, what priorities will you establish in assistance areas to guide difficult tradeoff decisions as Secretary?

Answer. Without question, funding will be a major challenge, not only for fiscal year 2010 but for the next several years. President-elect Obama and this Congress will evaluate every spending priority based on what works and what doesn't, and what fits best with America's national security and economic interests. Among other things, we know that U.S. investments targeting preventable diseases like AIDS and malaria are affordable, effective, and proven. We know that taking on extreme poverty with sustainable, smart, innovative solutions is working. And this work increases our security here at home and our influence around the world. Working in partnership, Congress and the Obama administration will have to make smart, strategic budget choices that deal with our problems here at home while also continuing to support effective initiatives that save lives, strengthen our security, and restore America's position in the world.

*Coordination with DOD Security Assistance Programs*

There has been a recent migration of State Department authorities to the Department of Defense. Some are temporary measures such as the responsibility for training and equipping police forces in Iraq and Afghanistan. Others appear intended to become permanent, including section 1206 of the FY 2006 Defense Authorization Act that grants the Defense Department authority to train and equip foreign militaries, a function traditionally performed by State Department programs under longstanding authorities in the Foreign Assistance Act.

*Question 8.* Do you believe the State Department should continue to have the lead role within the U.S. Government in implementing U.S. security assistance programs? If so, what specific steps do you plan to take as Secretary to address this issue?

Answer. Yes. If confirmed, I plan to consult with Secretary Gates and other members of the President-elect's national security team to develop the optimum structure for security assistance programs. In this constrained budget environment, it is an imprudent use of taxpayer resources to duplicate assistance structures throughout the government.

*Question 9.* Are there areas where you believe an expanded role for the Department of Defense in implementing security assistance programs is appropriate and useful?

Answer. As stated above, if confirmed, I plan to consult with Secretary Gates and other members of the President-elect's national security team to develop the optimum structure for security assistance programs.

*Question 10.* What steps do you intend to take as Secretary to ensure that adequate resources are allocated to security assistance programs implemented by the State Department?

Answer. If confirmed, one of my priorities as Secretary will be to work with Congress to increase resources of the Department as well as to make better use of the resources the Department already has. As part of that process, I will be reviewing the current authorities and resources for security assistance and look forward to

consulting with Congress on insuring that the appropriate level of resources is allocated for security assistance programs.

*State Department Management of Foreign Assistance Programs*

In a 2007 committee report entitled "Embassies Grapple to Guide Foreign Aid," Foreign Relations Committee staff identified short-comings of a Washington-centric foreign assistance strategy. The report also highlighted the value of the new Office of the Director of Foreign Assistance at the Deputy Secretary level in the State Department. Other recommendations included: That the assistance planning process should be more inclusive of ambassadors and mission directors and their teams in the field; continuing to make transparent the budget process within the executive and with Congress; further consolidation of budget planning and reporting capabilities.

*Question 11.* Will you retain the position of Director of Foreign Assistance as a confirmable position at the Deputy Secretary of State level?

Answer. If confirmed, I intend to closely review this question soon after taking office.

*Question 12.* What if any changes will you institute with regard to the role and purpose of the position of Director of Foreign Assistance? How will you ensure that the positive consolidation of budget reporting that has taken place in this nascent foreign assistance reform process be sustained?

Answer. I understand that the creation of this position has had, led to an improvement in the reporting of budget data to the Department management and the Congress. Under any circumstance, these improvements must be maintained.

*Question 13.* Whereas less than 60 percent of total U.S. foreign assistance falls under the jurisdiction of the State Department and USAID, what steps would you recommend to develop a more comprehensive and whole-of-government approach to U.S. foreign assistance programs? Is there a role for the DFA to play in this effort?

Answer. As I indicated, I have not made any decision on whether to retain the position of Director of Foreign Assistance. I do believe that close coordination between State and USAID is essential. The administration will also review whether other programs can be consolidated to improve budget planning, coordination, and execution.

*Question 14.* Various studies have recommended that the new administration reorganize how foreign assistance is managed, including calls for elevating development to a Cabinet-level department. Other options include a strengthened aid agency or consolidating aid programs under the State Department.

- a. What are your views on how to elevate development as a component of U.S. foreign policy?
- b. What organizational changes would you recommend?
- c. Where do you believe the Millennium Challenge Corporation fits into any new restructuring?

Answer. During the campaign, the President-elect promised to elevate development in U.S. foreign policy. The administration will promptly review whether fulfilling that objective will necessitate organizational changes. The MCC has been innovative in foreign assistance and we intend to review how its programs can best be managed.

MIDDLE EAST ISSUES

*Israel/Gaza*

*Question 15.* With recent renewed violence in southern Israel and Gaza, and the expiration of the Egyptian-brokered cease-fire agreement, what should be the role of the United States in seeking to achieve an end to the violence, and the creation of a durable peace, not simply a return to a long stalemate? What role do you expect to play as Secretary on this issue?

Answer. We are obviously very concerned about the serious situation in Gaza. President-elect Obama has spoken about his deep concern for the loss of civilian life in Gaza and Israel, and we all agree that it is very important that a durable cease-fire be achieved. That will require an end to Hamas rocket fire at Israeli civilians, an effective mechanism to prevent smuggling of weapons into Gaza, and an effective border regime. We will work hard with our international partners to make sure all these elements are achieved.

The cease-fire should be accompanied by a serious effort to address the immediate humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people and a longer term reconstruction and

development effort. The Bush administration is in the middle of sensitive diplomatic negotiations on behalf of the United States, so it is best that I not comment specifically on the negotiations underway.

The administration plans to be actively engaged on diplomacy in the Middle East in pursuit of peace agreements to resolve conflicts. The administration is committed to helping Israel and the Palestinians achieve their goal of two states living side by side in peace and security, and will work toward this goal from the beginning of the administration.

*Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process*

*Question 16.* To what extent will the Road Map for Middle East Peace remain a guiding document for Obama administration policy with respect to the Israeli-Palestinian Peace Process? What changes, if any, to the roadmap do you believe are necessary for it to be a viable framework for future peace efforts?

Answer. The roadmap, with the mutual obligations it places on the parties, remains one of the important bases for working toward a two-state solution. There are other important bases, including the negotiations that grew out of the 2007 Annapolis conference, and which the parties report have made progress. Our commitment is to help them build on that progress and achieve their goal of two states living side by side in peace and security.

*Question 17.* Given President-elect Obama's repeated comments about making peace between Israel and the Palestinians a top priority issue early in his administration, what would you do specifically to build on the work done last year through the Annapolis process and where would the issue of Israeli-Palestinian peace fall among your priorities as Secretary of State? Do you expect to be personally involved in peace efforts or do you expect the primary work to fall to another Department official or a special envoy?

Answer. If confirmed, there is no doubt that helping Israelis and Palestinians achieve peace and security through a two-state solution will be one of the priority issues to which I will devote time and attention. Success in this effort is in our national security interests, just as it is in the interests of Israelis and Palestinians. So I certainly intend to be personally involved in these efforts, together with other officials in the State Department. No decisions have been made about the personnel structure we will use to implement our Middle East peace efforts.

*Question 18.* In view of comments you made in June 2008 that the United States will never "impose a made-in-America solution" to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, what role do you think the United States should take in helping to bridge the gaps between the two parties on sensitive issues like Jerusalem, refugees and borders? If the two parties continue to be unable to reach a comprehensive agreement on the final status issues, would you be prepared to have the United States offer "bridging proposals"?

Answer. The specific role the administration would play in helping Israel and the Palestinians reach agreements, including on final status issues, would very much be determined as an outgrowth of consultations with the parties. We have not held these discussions, or any discussions with foreign governments, during the transition because of the principle that the United States has one President at a time.

*Question 19.* I met this fall with Lieutenant General Dayton, who has made painstaking gains in the arena of Palestinian security sector reform.

- a. What would you do as Secretary of State to continue these efforts, as well as those of special envoy and now National Security Advisor-designate, Jim Jones?
- b. What specific actions would you take to continue U.S. support for Palestinian efforts to end terror?
- c. Do you believe progress can be made on the negotiating track if Palestinian security forces are unable or unwilling to sufficiently crack down on extremists?

Answer. General Jones, General Selva, and General Dayton have each played important and constructive roles in advancing U.S. efforts to promote peace between Israel and the Palestinians. The Palestinian National Security Force and Presidential Guard members who have been trained in Jordan under the auspices of the United States Security Coordinator have performed well in early tests in Jenin and Hebron. This is an important element of strengthening Palestinian capabilities to enable the Palestinian Authority to meet its commitments to combat terrorism and maintain law and order, which are crucial to improving daily life of Palestinians and ensuring security for Israelis. The Congress has provided \$143 million in funding for this successful program. I will be consulting with GEN Keith Dayton and with

the Congress to determine appropriate funding levels for this program to continue to achieve positive results.

*Question 20.* In June 2008, you noted a link between “security and opportunity” and how providing children with hope can “help dry up the swamp of fear and pessimism that breeds terrorism.” What would you do to bolster support for Palestinian efforts to develop a sustainable economy—a key component of the Annapolis process—including addressing key movement and access impediments and Israeli security concerns?

*Answer.* There is no doubt that improving economic conditions and daily life for Palestinians are key elements of achieving success in Israeli-Palestinian peace efforts. This is, in fact, a point of consensus between Israelis and Palestinians, and they have reached a series of agreements over it.

Some of these agreements have not been fully implemented, either on the side of improving the Palestinian economy and easing movement and access side, or on the side of dealing with Israel’s security concerns. So the first task is likely to be working with the parties to try to get these agreements implemented. From that basis, it will be easier to promote additional investment in the Palestinian economy.

#### *Egypt*

*Question 21.* The United States-Egyptian relationship, despite strains, differences of view, and minicrises, has been one of the most profound and productive bilateral interactions our country has enjoyed over these years. Nevertheless, it is often criticized for lack of progress on human rights issues, political liberalization and democratization. Recognizing that Egypt has often chosen stability over change, what tools will you use to coax Egypt toward greater political transparency, pluralism, and freedoms?

*Answer.* Egypt is an important ally, which retains an important leadership position in the Arab world, and a key to the security of the region. Bilateral cooperation between the United States and Egypt remains strong, and we recognize Egyptian attempts to mediate a cease-fire between Hamas and Israel. At the same time, we will work to support greater political freedom in Egypt and throughout the Arab world, through a mature dialogue with the leadership, and direct engagement with the people. Our role is not to impose reform from the outside, but to help Egyptians at all levels develop and pursue a dialogue about the reforms that they seek for their society. And we will always stand up for our principles and speak out in support of human rights.

#### *Lebanon*

*Question 22.* What do you see as the key U.S. strategic priorities in Lebanon and how to you propose to accomplish these goals?

*Answer.* Key strategic priorities include Lebanese sovereignty and political stability, the disarmament of Hezbollah, and security on the Israeli-Syrian border. President-elect Obama is committed to the full implementation of U.N. Security Council Resolutions that reinforce Lebanon’s sovereignty and end the smuggling of weapons to Hezbollah. We need to work with our partners on the Security Council to consider additional measures to strengthen enforcement tools and toughen penalties for violators. We are also committed to ensuring the international tribunal investigating the assassination of former Prime Minister Hariri is based on the highest standards of criminal justice and international law.

*Question 23.* What can the United States do further to ensure the success of Lebanon’s Qatar-brokered political compromise between the governing March 14 coalition and the Hezbollah-led opposition?

*Answer.* Efforts to promote compromise among Lebanon’s disparate political groups should be conducted with a view toward strengthening the institutions of the central government, including the courts and the Lebanese Armed Forces. Helping the Lebanese build an economic infrastructure that provides for a fair distribution of services, opportunities, and employment is also important. And we need to stand with the government and people of Lebanon against those who would undermine Lebanon’s sovereignty, threaten Lebanon’s political stability, and seek conflict between Lebanon and its neighbors.

*Question 24.* How will the Obama administration respond should Hezbollah do well in Lebanon’s upcoming parliamentary elections and serve in a unity government or potentially even be called to form a government?

*Answer.* Without speculating about the outcome of another country’s elections, I would say that the administration will always stand with those in Lebanon who seek peace with their neighbors, stability and equality of opportunity at home, and

a strong central government dedicated to these principles and to meeting the needs of all Lebanese.

*Question 25.* What would you recommend be done to accomplish Hezbollah disarmament while preserving Lebanese stability? To what extent does U.S. military assistance to the Lebanese Armed Forces play a role? What are the broader strategic implications for U.S. military aid to Lebanon?

Answer. President-elect Obama is committed to implementing U.N. Security Council Resolutions that reinforce Lebanon's sovereignty by requiring the disarming of militias and preventing their rearmament. We need to work with our partners on the Security Council to consider additional measures to toughen penalties for violators, and strengthen enforcement tools. Strengthening the institutions of the central government, including the Lebanese Armed Forces, is a key element of this strategy. As with any assistance to a foreign military, appropriate safeguards are necessary to ensure that our assistance is only used in ways that advance our interests.

#### *Syria*

*Question 26.* Do you believe that continuing to isolate Syria is in our best interests or in the best interests of peace in the region?

Answer. The United States and Syria have profound differences on important issues, and the President-elect and I believe that engaging directly with Syria increases the possibility of making progress on changing Syrian behavior. In these talks, we should insist on our core demands: Cooperation in stabilizing Iraq; ending support for terrorist groups; stopping the flow of weapons to Hezbollah; and respect for Lebanon's sovereignty and independence. We should engage directly to help Israel and Syria succeed in their peace efforts, which both parties have indicated could help advance the talks. The prospects of success in these talks are unknown, but we are committed to making every effort to help them succeed.

*Question 27.* Will the administration be actively supporting Israel-Syria proximity talks?

Answer. Yes.

#### *Saudi Arabia and the Gulf*

*Question 28.* During the Presidential campaign, you stated that the United States "need[s] to be moving quickly toward a coming to terms with our oil companies and our oil producing country allies. We need to demonstrate our commitment to home-grown energy. We can't do that, I know, until the two oil men leave the White House but as soon as they do, we have to be ready aggressively."

- a. Is it the view of the Obama administration that such a "coming to terms" is necessary with countries that produce oil?

Answer. The United States must free itself from dependence on foreign oil. Our addiction to foreign oil doesn't just undermine our national security and wreak havoc on our environment—it also cripples our economy and strains the budgets of working families. This is why President-elect Obama has proposed an investment of \$15 billion a year over 10 years to develop alternative and renewable sources of energy. This plan will help to create millions of jobs, protect our environment, and move America in the direction of energy independence and away from foreign oil.

- b. If so, what specific changes will such an approach involve in U.S. policy toward oil producing states?

Answer. Our principal goal will be to reduce our reliance on oil-producing countries. The Obama-Biden comprehensive New Energy for America plan proposes strategically investing \$150 billion over the next 10 years, which will help create millions of jobs and catalyze private efforts to build a clean energy future. The goal is to expand the use of American-made hybrid cars, ensure that 10 percent of our electricity comes from renewable energy sources by 2012, and 25 percent comes from renewable sources by 2025. We will implement an economywide cap-and-trade program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 80 percent by 2050, and strive to make America a global leader when it comes to energy efficiency and the environment.

*Question 29.* What will your objectives be with respect to policy toward Saudi Arabia?

Answer. Saudi Arabia can be a key partner in helping the United States achieve many of our foreign policy priorities. Foreign policy priorities of the Obama administration include ending the war in Iraq responsibly, finishing the fight against the Taliban and al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, preventing Iran from acquiring nuclear weap-

ons, combating international terrorism, and renewing American diplomacy to support strong alliances, and to seek a lasting peace in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. We will work with our international partners, including Saudi Arabia, to meet these goals. We will also work to promote reform and democratization, women's rights, and success in the struggle against extremism inside Saudi Arabia.

#### *Iran*

*Question 30.* What steps to you intend to take as Secretary to address the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program? How can additional pressure on Iran be mobilized most effectively? What prospects do you see in this regard for further measures in the U.N. Security Council?

Answer. The new administration will present the Iranian regime with a clear choice: Abandon your nuclear weapons program, support for terror and threats to Israel and there will be meaningful incentives; refuse, and we will ratchet up the pressure, with stronger unilateral sanctions; stronger multilateral sanctions in the Security Council; and sustained action outside the U.N. to isolate the Iranian regime. A nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable, and all elements of American power are on the table to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon—that must begin with the power of aggressive American diplomacy.

*Question 31.* During the Presidential campaign, President-elect Obama expressed support for direct diplomacy with Iran.

- a. What steps does the administration intend to take to pursue such direct diplomacy with Iran?
- b. Do you support the opening of a U.S. interests section in Iran as a means for increased United States-Iranian dialogue?

Answer. The Obama administration will support tough, aggressive, and direct diplomacy, without preconditions, with our adversaries. Note that there is a distinction between preparations and preconditions. For possible negotiations with Iran, there must be careful preparation—including low-level talks, coordination with allies, the establishment of an agenda, and an evaluation of the potential for progress.

The U.S. should support and participate in ongoing efforts with our European allies and assemble an international coalition that will exert a collective will on Iran so that it is in their own interest to verifiably abandon their nuclear weapons efforts.

We will carefully prepare for any negotiations—open up lines of communication, build an agenda, coordinate closely with our allies, and evaluate the potential for progress.

We will not sit down with Iran just for the sake of talking. But we are willing to lead tough and principled diplomacy with the appropriate Iranian leader at a time and place of our choosing if—and only if—it can advance the interests of the United States.

We should be careful not to let our engagement with Iran be used by the Iranian regime in the runup to the June Presidential election—but the elections should not prevent us from starting a dialogue if we determine that there is a genuine intent to engage.

By exhausting diplomacy, we will be better able to rally the world to our side, strengthen multilateral sanctions, and to convince the Iranian people that their own government is the author of its isolation.

The decision regarding whether to open a U.S. interests section in Tehran is under review and no decision has been made yet.

*Question 32.* Would you agree that Iran is in a position to impede as well as advance Israeli-Palestinian peace through its influence with Hezbollah and Hamas? How can we modify their behavior toward these regional issues?

Answer. Iran poses a serious threat to Israel, as demonstrated by its pursuit of nuclear weapons and support of Hezbollah and Hamas. Iran has been a source of regional instability and an impediment to peace, and we intend to use all tools at our disposal to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and end its support of terror. This begins with direct, aggressive, and principled diplomacy and may include an expansion of sanctions.

#### *Iraq*

*Question 33.* What do you see as the top national security interests that remain for the United States with respect to Iraq?

Answer. I would define our security interests in Iraq the same as how the President-elect has defined it: A transition to an Iraqi Government that can take respon-

sibility for its future and that leads a country at peace with itself and its neighbors—a peace that prevents sectarian conflict, protects Iraq's sovereignty, and ensures that an al-Qaeda threat does not reemerge.

*Question 34.* What opportunities do you see for the broader international community to become more involved in Iraq? Do you sense a willingness on the part of the EU or other organizations to engage more robustly?

Answer. The Obama administration will pursue a diplomatic initiative with all of Iraq's neighbors—including Iran and Syria—and the U.N. to secure Iraq's borders, isolate al-Qaeda, and support national reconciliation within Iraq. It is in the interest of Iraq's neighbors and the international community to have a stable Iraq that does not become a battleground for sectarian tensions and animosities. And we will communicate that. More broadly, we have a range of diplomatic tools at our disposal that we can deploy to persuade and press Iraq's neighbors to play a constructive role. We have let these tools languish in recent years, but they have served us well in advancing our interests in other difficult conflicts. They can serve us well in Iraq.

As for our European allies, they too have an interest in a stable Iraq, and I look forward to working with them to see how they might engage diplomatically or otherwise to make that possible.

*Question 35.* The Bush administration suggested that one of the objectives of the surge was, to tamp down violence to provide the space for political actors to make the concessions necessary to bring about lasting peace and reconciliation. In your estimation, has that happened? What will you do to bring that reconciliation about?

Answer. There have been security gains in Iraq, but political progress toward lasting peace and reconciliation has been less successful. The Obama administration will proceed with the following overall strategy and core principles we will bring to this set of security and political challenges.

First, as we all know, Iraq is a sovereign country, and any steps we take on security matters moving forward will have to be taken in consultation with the Iraqis. We will certainly do our best to press the Iraqi Government to combat sectarianism in their security forces—and we'll tie future training resources to progress on this front. Improved Iraqi security forces cannot fully replace U.S. forces, but they can certainly help, if the Iraqis step up.

Second, we will take additional steps to help the Iraqi Government consolidate the security gains that have been made in the past 2 years—gains that have facilitated more intensive and effective rebuilding and aid efforts. That will include an intensive diplomatic and political strategy, including an effort to forge a comprehensive compact with Iraq's neighbors.

Third, we will pay particular attention to the humanitarian crisis in Iraq, which risks destabilizing parts of the country. We are committed to an aggressive effort to assist displaced Iraqis. But these are serious challenges, and much of this turns on the capacity and willingness of the Iraqis themselves.

*Question 36.* Iran continues to be the most problematic of Iraq's neighbors from the U.S. perspective. How do you assess Iranian interests with respect to Iraq? What will your priorities be in seeking to manage Iran's impact on Iraq?

Answer. Iran has been the largest beneficiary of the policy failures in Iraq. It has strengthened its position in the Middle East and continues to pursue nuclear weapons, issue threats against Israel, support terrorist organizations including Hezbollah and Hamas, and it continues to meddle in Iraq, where it seeks a Shia-dominated government that is too weak to challenge Iran's dominant regional position. President-elect Obama intends to use tough, principled diplomacy to mitigate the threats posed by Iran against its neighbors, including Iraq.

Iraq is an independent, sovereign state and we wish to see it develop and flourish. Iraq will determine the character of its ties with its neighbors, including Iran. Having normal relations with trade is surely what Iraq seeks. Our interests are in supporting Iraqi independence. To the extent that Iran threatens that or seeks to destabilize Iraq out of a desire to build its leverage over Iraq and its future, our priorities will be geared to supporting Iraq's ability to shape its own destiny.

*Question 37.* Do you believe current arrangements for the security of U.S. diplomatic personnel and facilities in Iraq are appropriate? Do you believe the Department can continue to rely on contractors such as Blackwater to provide security for its operations? Should the Department of State develop the capability to transport and guard diplomats in challenging environments such as Iraq and Afghanistan?

Answer. Ensuring security for U.S. diplomatic personnel and facilities in Iraq is essential. Right now, much of the rebuilding is taking place under a security umbrella provided by the brave young men and women of our Armed Forces. Their de-

parture from critical areas in Iraq will certainly change the security calculus. How we deal with this challenge—both generally and specifically with respect to Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs)—has been and will continue to be the subject of discussions among the national security team and with the President-elect.

Both the President-elect and I have been outspoken in calling for more oversight and accountability for private contractors and more tools to stop abuses in Iraq. I have been highly skeptical of heavily armed military contractors who have operated in Iraq without any law or court to rein them in or hold them accountable. These contractors have at times been reckless and have at times compromised our mission in Iraq.

I look forward to working with the President-elect and the Congress to establish the legal status of contractor personnel, so that we can prosecute any abuses committed by private military contractors. In addition, our experience in Iraq has shown that there must be serious oversight and effective program management—and that starts at the State Department. I will be especially vigilant about this. Finally, it is important to remember that there are many private contractors in Iraq and elsewhere who are honorable, hardworking, and patriotic. But we have seen too many abuses in the past few years to do anything less than impose a new legal regime to hold security firms and individual personnel accountable when they act outside the law.

The protection of State Department personnel operating in areas like Afghanistan and Iraq is an important issue and I look forward to working, along with other members of the President's national security team, to exploring the best way to address that issue if confirmed.

*Question 38.* What impact do you anticipate the drawdown of U.S. forces in Iraq to have on the State Department's ability to carry out its operations there? What steps will you take as Secretary to ensure that State Department undertakes appropriate transition planning in connection with the military drawdown?

*Answer.* As explained in my answer to the question above, much of the rebuilding in Iraq is taking place under a security umbrella provided by the brave young men and women of our Armed Forces. Their departure from critical areas in Iraq will certainly change the security calculus. How we deal with this challenge—both generally and specifically with respect to PRTs—has been and will continue to be the subject of discussions among the national security team and with the President-elect. But if confirmed as Secretary, I will ensure that the State Department undertakes all appropriate transition planning to deal with all contingencies concerning our diplomatic security that might arise from a reduction of military personnel.

#### AFRICA

##### *Sudan / Darfur*

*Question 39.* During your campaign for President, you were critical of the U.N.'s response to the crisis in Darfur. What specific steps do you intend to take as Secretary to improve the effectiveness of U.N. efforts to address the situation in Darfur, including the United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID)?

*Answer.* Today, the most immediate and urgent means of providing protection as swiftly as possible to the civilians at risk is the rapid and full implementations of the deployment of the United Nations-African Union peacekeeping force, UNAMID. The pace of UNAMID's deployment needs to be accelerated, combined with sufficient logistical support to protect civilians on the ground. If confirmed I will work with my colleagues and the President-elect to send a clear message to Khartoum that they must end obstruction of the U.N. force (UNAMID), including through endless bureaucratic hurdles and delays. We also need to address some of the U.N.'s own requirements that have inadvertently slowed UNAMID's deployment thus far. If necessary, the Obama administration will take steps to help move needed troops and equipment into place on an urgent basis.

*Question 40.* Many have been critical of China's role in the Security Council in opposing stronger and more effective U.N. action on Darfur. What specific steps do you intend to take as Secretary to gain greater cooperation from China in efforts to address Darfur?

*Answer.* Cooperation in the Security Council must be at the center of our efforts to build an effective and responsive U.N. With its fast growing economy, ever-growing global interests, and expanding population, China should be expected to assume a more active role on the Security Council, on Sudan and Darfur and elsewhere. The Council's capacity to effectively address key issues derives directly from the ability of its members to identify shared objectives and build pragmatic working relation-



ships. This will be particularly true for the United States and China. Prospects for such collaboration on the Council improve when there are effective, sustained, direct, and serious consultations and negotiations among the Council Members. There are, and will continue to be, times when, despite best efforts, effective Council action is not possible.

*Question 41.* During the Presidential campaign, you urged consideration of a greater role for NATO in addressing the situation in Darfur, including a potential NATO role in enforcing a no-fly zone.

- a. Is it the position of the Obama administration that NATO forces or assets should be deployed to Darfur?
- b. Does the Obama administration believe that NATO forces could play such a role without diminishing the effectiveness of ongoing NATO operations in Afghanistan?
- c. Current U.N. Security Council resolutions do not authorize individual states operating independently from the United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) to enforce a no-fly zone over Darfur. Would the Obama administration support the enforcement of a no-fly zone over Darfur by individual states in the absence of additional authority from the U.N. Security Council?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama and Vice-President-elect Biden and I have been very clear and forceful in our condemnation of the genocide in Sudan and in our commitment to far more robust actions to try to end the genocide and maximize protection for civilians. We have made very clear our intent to pursue more effective diplomatic efforts to resolve the conflict that underlies the genocide.

We have all also advocated the implementation of a no-fly zone as well as far more robust sanctions on the Government of Sudan, both of which Congress has also endorsed.

We've made no final decisions on a no-fly zone, or on the deployment of NATO assets to Darfur. I would anticipate that the questions of Sudan and Darfur would be subject to early policy review of all steps that the U.S. can take to most effectively and urgently maximize protection for civilians. The impact of any actions on our interests elsewhere—including Afghanistan—would be part of that review.

#### *Sudan / CPA*

*Question 42.* How will the Obama administration help sustain the Comprehensive Peace Agreement for Sudan which reaches a pivotal point with the referendum on secession in the next 2 years?

*Answer.* As a guarantor of the CPA, the United States has a special responsibility to ensure that implementation of this landmark agreement remains a priority even in the midst of the Darfur crisis. We will work bilaterally to increase support to the Government of Southern Sudan to bolster capacity and good governance, and multilaterally to assure appropriate donor coordination and ongoing political and financial support for CPA implementation. The Comprehensive Peace Agreement aims to give the Sudanese people greater voice in their political future, and this will remain a priority. National elections that were supposed to be held by July 2009 will clearly be delayed, but the United States will work to ensure that the delay is not protracted, and that free, fair, safe elections are held before the year is out. Preparations for the 2011 referendum must remain on track as well to retain the confidence of the South.

#### *Somalia*

*Question 43.* What steps do you believe should be taken to stabilize the security situation in Somalia?

*Answer.* Somalia's complex emergency is daunting, and U.S. leadership is desperately needed to help address this multifaceted emergency. Failed states like Somalia provide dangerous opportunities to terrorist organizations and international criminals, and they destabilize entire regions.

The U.S. will work with other donors and with Somalis to improve the security conditions for humanitarian operations on the ground. The United States will continue to work with allies and with the shipping industry to combat piracy in the Gulf of Aden and along the East African coast. Ultimately, Somalia can be stabilized only by ensuring that a competent, consensus-based government is in place with the capacity to provide order for the Somali people. We continue to look for diplomatic opportunities to stabilize the security situation in Somalia.

*Question 44.* The Bush administration has advocated the establishment of a U.N. peacekeeping mission in Somalia. Do you support this idea? If so, what do you believe the appropriate size and mandate for such a mission would be?

Answer. I believe we need to take a very careful look at this issue. There are no good solutions in Somalia. The question is whether a U.N. peacekeeping force, assuming it is successfully stood up and deployed, advances our efforts to confront terrorism, address the humanitarian crisis, and promote reconciliation in Somalia. I expect to consider this issue in the near future with the President-elect and my colleagues in the Cabinet.

#### *Zimbabwe*

*Question 45.* What actions will you take as Secretary of State to address the ongoing human rights and humanitarian crisis in Zimbabwe?

Answer. The people of Zimbabwe have suffered for far too long under a corrupt leadership that does not serve the needs of its people. The destruction of Zimbabwe's economy and repeated abuses of power have been a catastrophe for Zimbabweans, and threaten the stability of the region. The United States and the world must take steps to address this growing crisis. Widened U.S. sanctions are appropriate. It was the right policy to have supported a U.N. Security Council resolution calling for targeted sanctions and an arms embargo. As Zimbabwe's crisis continues and becomes even more destabilizing to the Southern African region, South Africa, the African Union, and the SADC must play a stronger role in pressuring the Mugabe regime.

It will require concerted and sustained diplomacy to try to get the international community to acknowledge the need to act to apply more pressure to the illegitimate government of Robert Mugabe, and to bring an end to the man-made humanitarian crisis that grips Zimbabwe today. The Zimbabwean people are suffering and the U.S. will push for more efforts, including having humanitarian NGOs resume activity in Zimbabwe. We will need to consider incentives for reform, and work closely with the EU and other international donors to create a very generous aid and recovery package for Zimbabwe. We would make very clear the specific and practical steps that any Zimbabwean Government can take to qualify for this package.

#### *Eastern Congo*

*Question 46.* The conflict in Eastern Congo has brought human rights violations and humanitarian deprivation on a large scale, in the same region and involving some of the same actors that produced the Rwandan genocide. What actions will you take to help resolve this regional crisis?

Answer. The situation in Congo is deeply disturbing. The President-elect and I have both supported efforts on behalf of a lasting solution to Congo's political disputes. The United States can encourage all parties in Congo and in the region to pursue a negotiated solution and refrain from fueling additional conflict. Ending the crisis and preventing a return to widespread conflict will be a multilateral effort. The Security Council was right to take steps to strengthen MONUC, and the U.S. should support former Nigerian President Obasanjo's diplomatic efforts.

#### *AFRICOM*

*Question 47.* What role do you foresee for the newly created Africa Combatant Command with regard to foreign policy and foreign assistance resources?

Answer. The President-elect supports the concept of AFRICOM, as do I, but we want to make sure that it is implemented properly. I look forward to working on behalf of the President-elect, with Secretary Gates and General Jones, and with African nations on this issue. The original concept behind AFRICOM was that our engagement with Africa will be improved by streamlining our command structure so that there is a single unified command responsible for Africa, rather than three separate commands as has been the case. The President-elect has warned that we must be very careful not to overmilitarize our relations with African nations. On the other hand, there is a role to play for AFRICOM in helping train and equip African rapid response forces for peacekeeping operations. AFRICOM can also contribute to an enhanced capability of African nations to patrol their own waters.

*Question 48.* How will the State Department and USAID interact with AFRICOM within Africa?

Answer. A well-conceived AFRICOM—one that plays the traditional role of a combatant command rather than supplants the State Department's traditional role—can enhance U.S. Government efforts to foster peace and stability on the continent. I look forward to working with Secretary Gates and others to ensure that AFRICOM complements the efforts of State Department and USAID.

#### *AFGHANISTAN*

*Question 49.* What steps do you believe the United States should take to promote Afghanistan's stability and development? How can we most effectively mobilize

international support for such efforts? What role do you intend to play as Secretary on these issues?

Answer. If I am confirmed, designing and implementing a more effective strategy in Afghanistan will be one of my highest priorities at the State Department. We have lost ground in Afghanistan over the past 7 years. Our strategy has to acknowledge Afghanistan as it is, not as we hoped it would be 7 years ago. We also have to acknowledge that we will not see progress in Afghanistan overnight. The President-elect and the entire national security team understand Afghanistan and north-west Pakistan are the central front in the war on terror, and we know that it is critical that we make progress there.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to implement a new set of strategies that will help us confront the resurgence of the Taliban and the persistent threat of al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. Additional troops are certainly a part of that—though Secretary Gates can better speak to the military dimensions of our efforts in Afghanistan.

The President-elect and I have consistently said that our strategy in Afghanistan cannot simply be about adding more troops. He has enunciated an approach that we call “more for more”—more troops and assistance from the U.S. as we seek more from NATO allies, and more from an Afghan Government that needs to focus on improving the lives of its people. We also have to implement a coherent Pakistan strategy, one that involves more nonmilitary aid and more pressure on Pakistan to fight terror. With this set of principles, and with the resources, focus, and diplomatic effort that Afghanistan deserves—and has been denied because of our entanglement in Iraq—we believe that we can make progress in supporting the people of Afghanistan and preventing al-Qaeda from staging future attacks.

*Question 50.* Do you agree that the economic development aspect of stabilization and reconstruction in Afghanistan is as important as security sector reform and how will you assure it is properly resourced?

Answer. Economic development is absolutely essential to Afghanistan’s stabilization and reconstruction. It is inextricably linked to security. The President-elect has proposed a “more-for-more” strategy which will provide additional nonmilitary aid each year—above and beyond what is given now. That money will be focused on initiatives dealing with education, infrastructure, human services, and alternative livelihoods for poppy farmers. And it will be accompanied by tougher anticorruption measures. We will tie aid to better performance by the Afghan national government, including anticorruption initiatives and efforts to extend the rule of law across the country. We will also work to ensure that investments are made not just in Kabul but out in Afghanistan’s provinces.

*Question 51.* How will you ensure that U.S. assistance to Afghanistan produces results and uses funds efficiently?

Answer. As explained above, any U.S. assistance to Afghanistan will be accompanied by tougher anticorruption measures. We will tie aid to better performance by the Afghan national government, including anticorruption initiatives and efforts to extend the rule of law across the country. We will also work to ensure that investments are made not just in Kabul but out in Afghanistan’s provinces. And, of course, I welcome congressional oversight and ongoing consultation with this committee as key tools in ensuring efficient and effective investment of American taxpayer resources.

*Question 52.* How will you ensure our efforts in Afghanistan are based upon a regional strategic approach by the United States and its partners?

Answer. Afghanistan is not just a challenge for the United States—it is a critical security issue for our allies in NATO and for all countries in the region. Afghanistan’s considerable problems will not be resolved without the cooperation of these countries, which requires a regional strategic approach. That is what I will seek to implement if confirmed.

That is why we believe our NATO allies must do more. The Obama administration will seek greater contributions from them in Afghanistan. We will ask our NATO allies to reconsider national restrictions on NATO forces. The NATO force is short-staffed and some countries’ contributing forces are imposing restrictions on where their troops can operate, tying the hands of commanders on the ground. The Obama administration will work with European allies to end these burdensome restrictions and strengthen NATO as a fighting force.

*Question 53.* There is a consensus that the Afghan judiciary is both ineffective and corrupt, and has been neglected for years by the international community. Property rights, human rights, and sovereign rights are at constant risk. Prosecution of crimi-

nals including narcotics traffickers and corrupt officials is severely hampered. This opens up space for the Taliban's version of arbitration and dispute settlement among the people. How will you prioritize the reform and reestablishment of an effective judiciary and rule of law sector that is responsive to Afghanistan's Constitution and its people?

Answer. Legal reform is absolutely vital for Afghanistan's future, and working with our partners, this is an issue that we must make a higher priority. As mentioned in a previous question, we will tie aid to better performance by the Afghan national government, including anticorruption initiatives and efforts to extend the rule of law across the country.

#### PAKISTAN

*Question 54.* What is your assessment of the effectiveness of current U.S. security sector cooperation with Pakistan? Is money for such programs being well spent, and is it helping Pakistan to become a more effective partner in fighting terrorism and in cooperating on other important U.S. interests? Are there ways in which this assistance can be made more effective?

Answer. Since 2001, the U.S. assistance program to Pakistan has lacked strategic focus. The President-elect, the Vice-President-elect and I supported the Enhanced Partnership with Pakistan Act of 2008 as Senators—and I know I speak for each of us when I commend the ranking member for his leadership on this vital issue. But this is not a blank check. We should condition military aid on ensuring that Pakistan is taking on the extremists. Should the 111th Congress choose to reintroduce a new version of the legislation, we look forward to working with this committee and the Congress on legislation to help build a long-term relationship with Pakistan.

*Question 55.* Do you believe that current levels of economic assistance to Pakistan are sufficient to achieve U.S. objectives in helping Pakistan to achieve political and economic stability? How should U.S. economic assistance be most effectively targeted to meet these objectives?

Answer. No.

*Question 56.* How will you engage a civilian government that is often at odds with powerful military and intelligence institutions?

Answer. We need to ensure that we do as much as possible to engage a wide range of Pakistan's democratically elected civilian leaders. In addition, President Zardari needs the support of the military to improve relations with India—to include addressing historical military ties to extremist groups—and the military has sought politicians' support in defending military operations in the tribal areas.

*Question 57.* Following the most recent Mumbai attacks and evidence pointing toward groups supported by Pakistan's intelligence services, what action will you take to ensure U.S. assistance does not provide the means to maintain those military and intelligence elements contrary to our interests?

Answer. U.S. military assistance to Pakistan must be conditioned on Pakistan's efforts to close down training camps, evict foreign fighters, and preventing the Taliban and al-Qaeda from using Pakistan as a terrorist sanctuary. Nonmilitary assistance should be tripled, with a focus on the border regions, so that over the long term we are reducing the pull of the extremists.

*Question 58.* Where do you rank the resolution of Kashmir in U.S. priorities for Pakistan? What role do you believe the United States can play to assist in the resolution of the Kashmir region?

Answer. President-elect Obama and I are very concerned about rising tensions in Kashmir: The situation is dangerous for India, for Pakistan, and for the people of Kashmir. We must encourage all parties to work toward peaceful settlement.

#### INDIA

The Mumbai attacks in November 2008 are yet another attack in India suspected of emanating from groups in Pakistan that have support among Pakistan military and intelligence agencies. These attacks take place at moments of increasing cooperation between the Indian and Pakistan Government and are clearly intended to destabilize relations.

*Question 59.* What actions will you take to ensure progress in political and economic development in the region despite this spoiler role of terrorist organizations?

Answer. We are committed to do as much as possible throughout this critical region to promote political and economic development, and to shut down terrorist networks. In Pakistan, that means increasing nonmilitary assistance, making our military assistance accountable and conditional on Pakistani actions, and doing more to improve the lives of everyday people. In India, it means continuing to deepen our close partnership on a wide range of economic and development issues. We cannot, and will not, allow terrorists to stand in the way of progress.

*Question 60.* What is your assessment of the reaction India has made to the attack to date?

Answer. The Indian people—as well as victims from many other countries, including the United States—suffered a terrible tragedy with the Mumbai attacks. We should support its efforts to pursue a full investigation of who organized and plotted the attack, ultimately bringing the perpetrators to justice.

*Question 61.* What is your assessment of the response Pakistan has taken since it provided information regarding the attackers?

Answer. The Pakistani Government must do all it can to find out who perpetrated these horrible attacks and bring these terrorists to justice.

*Question 62.* What support will you give to the recent civilian nuclear cooperation agreement with India and how will the U.S. ensure such cooperation is limited to civilian purposes?

Answer. The Obama administration will favor a closer relationship between the U.S. and India and believes that civil nuclear cooperation will help build a better relationship. We need to explore how we can take advantage of nuclear agreement to build a wider and deeper relationship with India as well as to work together to cement progress on proliferation goals, including ratification of the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty. As the relationship deepens, the U.S. and India can work together to address global and regional problems of shared concern including proliferation, counterterrorism, poverty, and climate change.

*Question 63.* In a 2007 article in *Foreign Affairs*, you wrote “As cochair of the Senate India Caucus, I recognize the tremendous opportunity presented by India’s rise and the need to give the country an augmented voice in regional and international institutions, such as the U.N.” In what ways specifically do you believe India’s voice at the U.N. should be augmented? Do you support India’s desire to become a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council?

Answer. The United States has an enduring interest in a maximally efficient and effective United Nations Security Council. Any expansion would need to preserve both those elements. We recognize that the Council was created many years ago at a time when there were very different international realities and that there is a strongly felt sentiment among many Member States that the Security Council should better reflect changing circumstances. The administration will support expansion of the Security Council in ways that would not impede its effectiveness and its efficiency. We need to make a serious, deliberate effort, consulting closely with key allies and capitals, as well as with the committee and the Congress, to find a way forward.

#### EAST ASIA

##### *Japan and China*

During the Bush administration, we witnessed an expansion of the United States-Japan relationship to new levels of cooperation on regional and global issues, including our respective national security concerns and areas of economic cooperation. Japan is eager to partner and closely collaborate with the United States to address present and future challenges within Asia. With the reemergence of China on a global and regional basis, there is elevated tension between China and Japan, and a return to debate on events of history involving both countries.

*Question 64.* How can the United States most effectively nurture our important relationship with Japan while pursuing constructive engagement with China?

Answer. Maintaining both a strong partnership with Japan and a constructive relationship with China are not contradictory; they are entirely consistent with U.S. interests.

A strong and enduring United States-Japan alliance, based on common interests and shared values, is the centerpiece for both American and Japanese policy in the Asia-Pacific region. As the world’s two wealthiest democracies, the United States and Japan have shared interests that cut across a range of challenging issues: Nu-

clear proliferation, terrorism, financial instability, poverty, and climate change, to name a few. As the relationship continues to broaden and deepen, we must strive to enhance communication and consultation between our two countries, and seek closer coordination on critical issues where we have shared interests and goals, such as how to best resolve the abductee issue in the context of efforts to achieve the complete and verifiable elimination of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs. This will ensure that the alliance continues to play its critical role of ensuring security, stability, and prosperity in the Asia-Pacific region.

In our relationship with China, we should work where possible to expand the areas of cooperation while managing the areas of competition. It is essential that China's rise be peaceful. The United States cannot by itself ensure that result, but it can help create an environment in which China makes the right choices—choices such as contributing to global economic stability, ensuring fair trade, supporting international efforts to halt nuclear proliferation, ending support for repressive regimes such as those in Zimbabwe and Burma, protecting human rights, and combating global warming. The Obama administration will work to promote these and other important objectives in its interaction with China.

#### *Trans-Pacific Trade Agreement*

Last fall, U.S. Trade Representative Susan Schwab announced the beginning of talks on a regional trade agreement with Singapore, Chile, New Zealand, and Brunei, known as the Transpacific Trade Talks. An eventual Transpacific agreement could be an important doorway for further U.S. economic engagement in Asia. Other countries, including Australia, are considering participation as well.

*Question 65.* Do you favor continued U.S. participation in the Transpacific Trade Talks?

Answer. The Asia-Pacific region as a whole accounts for nearly 60 percent of global GDP and nearly half of world trade. U.S. trade with Asian countries totals nearly \$1 trillion annually. Our economic interaction with Asia underpins our overall relationship with that vital region and enhances both American prosperity and security. I support further expansion of trade with Asia, provided that it is safe, fair, and beneficial to American workers and consumers.

Any trade agreements the Obama administration pursues will ensure the greatest possible benefits for American exporters, workers, and consumers; contain binding standards of labor and environmental protections; and be rigorously monitored and enforced. If confirmed, I look forward to working with Congress to review the status of the Transpacific Trade Talks and determine whether they will advance these objectives.

*Question 66.* What are specific steps you will propose to increase U.S. trade interaction with East Asia?

Answer. As the President-elect and I have said, strengthening economic ties with Asia enhances both our prosperity and security. I support expanded trade with East Asia provided that it is safe, fair, and beneficial to American workers and consumers. The Obama administration will use all the tools at its disposal to expand market access in Asia for U.S. exporters, end unfair trade practices, and ensure that imports into the United States are safe. It is our shared belief that trade in low carbon energy technologies is a win-win for the United States: Providing growth in innovative industries in the United States while helping our friends in Asia meet their growing energy needs in a manner consistent with our shared climate goals. Ensuring that the United States will be a technology leader in this innovative field is a priority of the Obama administration.

#### *ASEAN*

The 10 nations comprising the Association of Southeast Asian Nations represent the fourth largest export market for the United States. Since its inception in 1967, with the original five nations of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand, ASEAN has been an important contributor to stability throughout Southeast and East Asia. Unfortunately, among ASEAN leaders, there has been a lingering perception that the region is not of significant interest to the United States. This impression has been reinforced by Secretary Rice's infrequency of visits to the region, and Assistant Secretary Hill being necessarily occupied with the North Korean nuclear issue.

Over 2 years ago, I introduced, and the Senate passed legislation establishing the position of U.S. Ambassador for ASEAN Affairs. President Bush eventually proceeded to appoint Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Scot Marciel, to serve as U.S. Ambassador to ASEAN. The United States was the first country to make such an

appointment. Japan, China, Vietnam, and other countries have followed the U.S. example and appointed Ambassadors to ASEAN.

*Question 67.* If confirmed, will you recommend continued appointment of a U.S. ambassador to ASEAN?

Answer. I share your assessment of the critical importance of ASEAN and the need for the United States to enhance and elevate its relations with the region. In 2006, President-elect Obama was one of the cosponsors of your legislation, S. 2697, to establish the position of U.S. Ambassador for ASEAN Affairs, and both he and I were proud to support both that bill and your resolution in the last Congress commemorating the 30th anniversary of United States-ASEAN relations and encouraging President Bush to make this important appointment. If confirmed, I would recommend to the President the continued appointment of a U.S. ambassador for ASEAN affairs, and look forward to working with you and other Members of Congress to assure that this position continues to play an important role in advancing U.S. relations with the region.

*Question 68.* Will you be prepared to travel to Southeast Asia early in your term of office?

Answer. While it would be premature of me to comment on my future travel schedule if I am confirmed as Secretary of State, I understand the importance of consistent high-level U.S. diplomatic engagement with Southeast Asia and, if confirmed, would seek to explore all the options for early travel to the region.

*Question 69.* What are additional ways of reinforcing the United States-ASEAN relationship?

Answer. I believe that it is critical that the United States maintain a strong presence in the region, and that our diplomacy be active, forward-leaning, and engaged at every level. That includes, of course, the participation of the Secretary of State in such gatherings as the ASEAN Regional Forum meetings, but also consideration, when and as appropriate, of a Presidential-level summit with ASEAN. Also, if confirmed I would look forward to working with the President and with this committee to explore the desirability and feasibility of the United States signing the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation with ASEAN.

#### *Six-Party Talks*

The six-party talks focusing on the North Korea nuclear issue have provided a helpful forum in bringing together diplomats from Northeast Asia to consider the way forward to eliminate North Korea's nuclear program. While progress has been modest and incremental, the venue has provided opportunity for U.S. and other diplomats to compare notes on matters related to North Korea's nuclear program and other regional issues.

*Question 70.* What do you view as the prospect for the six-party talks becoming a model, or perhaps the basis to establish a regular forum for multilateral discussion related to other issues of significance to the region?

Answer. If confirmed, I am committed to pursuing vigorous and creative diplomacy to tackle a wide range of issues in Asia, working with other countries through existing international institutions and established diplomatic mechanisms or, if necessary, fashioning new ones. The six-party talks are one model of fashioning a multilateral discussion, but the particular framework will depend on the specifics of the goal we are trying to meet.

#### INDONESIA—PEACE CORPS

Indonesia has made remarkable progress in its move to democracy, with legislative and Presidential elections set for later this year. The United States-Indonesia partnership continues to expand with enhanced collaboration in areas of mutual interest including trade, education, and military matters. The United States has a window of opportunity to contribute to Indonesia's development, thereby also supporting regional stability. Indonesian officials have repeatedly expressed to the Foreign Relations Committee and to the executive branch, their interest in welcoming the Peace Corps to Indonesia.

*Question 71.* Do you see this as a possibility, and will you encourage the Peace Corps to establish a presence in Indonesia?

Answer. With close to 240 million people, the world's largest Muslim majority country, and the world's third largest democracy, Indonesia is the giant of Southeast Asia and a crucial and valued U.S. partner in Asia. Over the past several years—and in the face of economic and social turmoil as well as an unprecedented natural

disaster in the December 2004 tsunami—Indonesia has made impressive progress on key reforms, human security, pursuing militant extremists, growing its economy, and reestablishing its role in ASEAN. Although there are of course areas where increased accountability and transparency are still needed, the Indonesian people have every reason to be proud of their accomplishments.

Indonesia plays a central role in the region, and I look forward to working with the committee and others in Congress to explore appropriate ways to continue to develop and deepen cooperation between our two nations. If confirmed, I would encourage the Peace Corps to establish a presence in Indonesia as part of an enhanced United States-Indonesia partnership that promotes democracy, leads to increased transparency and accountability, encourages economic growth and development, and enhances human rights and human security.

#### NORTH KOREA

*Question 72.* How do you assess the situation in North Korea regarding prospects for elimination of that country's nuclear program?

Answer. North Korea's nuclear ambitions are a deep concern. The Obama administration will confirm the full extent of North Korea's past plutonium production and its uranium enrichment activities, and get answers to disturbing questions about its proliferation activities with other countries, including Syria. The North Koreans must live up to their commitments and fully and verifiably dismantle all of their nuclear weapons programs and proliferation activities. The objective must be clear: The complete and verifiable elimination of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs, which only expanded while we refused to talk. As we move forward, we must not cede our leverage in these negotiations unless it is clear that North Korea is living up to its obligations.

*Question 73.* In your view, what is the best way forward, and will you be recommending elimination of North Korea's nuclear program in its entirety, or elimination of North Korea's nuclear weapons program and inventory?

Answer. The new administration will pursue direct diplomacy bilaterally and within the six-party talks to achieve the complete and verifiable elimination of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs, and an accounting for North Korea's past plutonium production, uranium enrichment activities, and proliferation activities.

Sanctions should only be lifted based on North Korean performance. If the North Koreans do not meet their obligations, we should move quickly to reimpose sanctions that have been waived, and consider new restrictions going forward.

*Question 74.* Under what circumstances would you envision normalized relations between North Korea and the United States?

Answer. Normalized relations will not be possible without the complete and verifiable elimination of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs, and an accounting for North Korea's past plutonium production, uranium enrichment activities, and proliferation activities. We must also continue to address North Korea's human rights abuses, which must be part of any normalization process.

*Question 75.* Should the United States encourage continuation of the six-party talks, and under what conditions, if any, are you open to direct bilateral discussions between the United States and North Korea?

Answer. The six-party framework has provided flexibility through which to pursue multilateral and bilateral approaches. We have the most leverage when presenting united positions supported by China, Japan, the Republic of Korea (ROK), and Russia. At the same time, the United States will continue to engage the DPRK bilaterally within the six-party framework.

*Question 76.* How will addressing North Korean human rights issues be configured in the administration's overall North Korea strategy?

Answer. We remain concerned about improving the lives of the North Korean people, including the lives of refugees. The United States is now the largest provider of food aid to the DPRK through the World Food Program and U.S. NGOs under a May 2008 agreement. An Obama administration will continue to address North Korea's human rights abuses, including as part of any normalization process.

*Question 77.* The North Korea-Burma relationship continues to grow. In addition to normalizing diplomatic relations, North Korea is among those countries exporting conventional weapons to Burma. As North Korean planes and ships continue to arrive in Burma, there are questions about possible collaboration between those two countries toward the development of Burma's nuclear program. North Korean officials have neither confirmed nor denied multiple committee inquiries as to whether



their country is providing nuclear materials and technology to Burma for weaponization purposes. What will be your recommendation to the President in the event information is received confirming North Korean collaboration with Burma to develop nuclear weapons?

Answer. The military regime in Burma is one of the most repressive regimes in the world, and is at the epicenter of a range of transnational threats, from narcotics to avian flu. Any information suggesting that North Korea is collaborating with Burma on a nuclear program would be very troubling and treated with the seriousness it demands.

#### CHINA

##### *Vital Interests of China and the United States*

In the November/December 2007 issue of "Foreign Affairs," you wrote, "We must persuade China to join global institutions and support international rules by building on areas where our interests converge and working to narrow our differences. Although the United States must stand ready to challenge China when its conduct is at odds with U.S. vital interests, we should work for a cooperative future."

*Question 78.* In what ways today is China's conduct at odds with our vital interests, and how specifically would you propose to "challenge China?"

Answer. The Obama administration will seek to expand areas of cooperation with China, while also managing our differences and strengthening our ability to compete in the 21st century. We need to engage China on common interests like climate change, North Korea, and Iran, even as we continue to encourage its shift to a more open and market-based society. But to protect our interests and strengthen our economy, and to enforce the principles of our international trading system, this administration will seek a level playing field and stand firm on piracy of American intellectual property and illegal tariffs against U.S. firms. We have ceded too much leverage to China because of our debt and our singular focus on Iraq.

##### *Strategic Economic Dialogue with China*

During the last year, China and the U.S. held numerous formal and informal meetings, including sessions under the auspices of the United States-China Strategic Economic Dialogue (SED) and the United States-China Joint Commission on Commerce and Trade. Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson was the leading administration interlocutor with China, as he represented the United States in SED sessions.

*Question 79.* What is your perspective on the Strategic Economic Dialogue? Has it been a constructive forum with which to convey U.S. interests and engage with the Chinese?

Answer. It is important to have high-level discussions to discuss economic issues with the Chinese Government. We are looking carefully at the question of how to develop this important engagement with China. We expect high-level engagement to continue in some form.

*Question 80.* Will you be recommending continuation of the SED, and if so, whom should serve as the U.S. point person, the Secretary of the Treasury, yourself if confirmed by the Senate, or perhaps someone else?

Answer. As explained above, if confirmed, I look forward to working with the President-elect and my colleagues at Treasury, Defense, and throughout the government to structure our diplomatic and political engagement with China.

##### *China—Energy*

In its 2008 report to Congress, the United States-China Economic and Security Review Commission observed that China's economy, energy use and environment "are inextricably linked" and that the linkages are not unique to China. "China and the United States face similar challenges in devising energy policy, securing sufficient energy supplies to support the national economy and the desired standard of living, and addressing such related issues as climate change." You also have repeatedly pointed to the importance of cooperation on energy and environmental issues with China.

*Question 81.* What is your perspective on the current "United States-China Ten Year Energy and Environment Cooperation Framework?"

Answer. The "United States-China Ten Year Energy and Environment Cooperation Framework" demonstrates the shared recognition of the energy and environmental challenges facing the United States and China. The Framework is aimed at developing new ideas for energy security, economic sustainability, and environ-

mental sustainability. It works to identify, develop, and implement energy and environmental innovations for the future. If confirmed, I look forward to the opportunity to work on these critical issues as part of this Framework as well as other diplomatic means that we might establish.

*Question 82.* What role should the State Department have in energy cooperation with the Government of China? Given the rapidity with which China's energy consumption is expanding, how can U.S. efforts to promote clean energy and improved efficiency be expanded and pursued with more urgency?

*Answer.* Our economic policy toward China has to be closely coordinated with our foreign policy. They cannot be pursued in isolation to one another. We will press China to live up to its commitments in trade agreements and to meet its international responsibilities. We must vigorously defend U.S. trade interests with China by ensuring we operate on a level playing field.

Energy security and climate change is one of the most pressing challenges facing the United States and the global community. The United States will take a leadership role in combating the threat of global climate change from the beginning of the new administration. The President-elect has specifically pledged to set a goal of an 80-percent reduction in global emissions by 2050—a policy goal I am committed to as well. In pursuit of that goal, we will ask the biggest carbon-emitting nations to join a new Global Energy Forum to lay the foundation for the next generation of climate protocols.

It is also our shared belief that trade in low carbon energy technologies is a win-win for the United States: Providing growth in innovative industries in the United States while helping our friends in Asia meet their growing energy needs in a manner consistent with our shared climate goals. Ensuring that the United States will be a technology leader in this innovative field is a priority of the Obama administration.

*Question 83.* Given your concern for volatility and vulnerability of global oil supplies, what actions would you recommend to work with China in reducing growth of its dependence on oil?

*Answer.* We need to work with China on agreeing to a global carbon cap. We also need to work closely with China and other countries on the development on low carbon energy technologies to reduce our shared reliance on carbon intensive energy.

#### *China and Currency*

*Question 84.* In your opinion, is Chinese currency now being fairly valued against the U.S. dollar, and if not, what measures do you favor or oppose to bring the yuan into proper alignment?

*Answer.* It is critical that China plays by the rules and acts as a positive force for balanced world growth. President-elect Obama has indicated his strong concerns with China's behavior on its currency. I will work with the other members of the economic team to forge an integrated strategy on how best to achieve our goals in our bilateral relationship with China in the current economic environment.

*Question 85.* During the Presidential campaign, both you and Senator Obama supported legislation that would punish China for currency manipulation. Would the Obama administration favor similar legislation today?

*Answer.* As described above, President-elect Obama has indicated his strong concerns with China's behavior on its currency. The incoming administration looks forward to working with Congress regarding the best strategy for addressing this behavior.

#### RUSSIA

*Question 86.* After 10 years of sharp disputes over Kosovo, NATO enlargement, democracy, missile defense, and now Georgia, our political relationship with Russia is in difficulty. How do you intend to reverse the downward spiral that threatens vital security and foreign policy interests, including reducing nuclear stockpiles, preventing WMD proliferation, and fighting terrorism?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama seeks a future of cooperative engagement with the Russian Government on matters of strategic importance, while standing up strongly for American values and international norms. That is my view as well. Some of Russia's recent actions have been reprehensible and they have disrupted its relations with the West. As we confront those actions, we must not shy away from pushing for more democracy, transparency, and accountability. Still, there can be no return to the cold war. Russia is not the old Soviet Union, and this is not the 20th century. The new administration will work with Russia on areas of common strategic interest

like counterterrorism and counterproliferation, while pressuring Russia when it interferes with its neighbors and abuses power at home—for example, on Georgia, where the President-elect condemned Russia's escalation of the conflict and clear invasion of Georgia's territory and illegal recognition of Abkhazia and South Ossetia as independent states. Real pressure on Russia will not come from rhetoric alone—it will come from a unified transatlantic alliance, and forging that unity will be one of my top priorities. If Russia refuses to abide by international norms, its standing in the international community will diminish.

*Question 87.* Last year the administration submitted a Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Agreement, or 123 Agreement, between the United States and Russia to the Senate for approval. After the Russian invasion of Georgia President Bush asked the Senate to suspend its consideration. Will President-elect Obama ask the Senate to approve the United States-Russia Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation Agreement?

Answer. If I am confirmed, the President-elect and I will seek to cooperate with Russia on issues that are in our mutual interest—including in our efforts to halt and reverse nuclear proliferation. The 123 Agreement can be an asset to those efforts. But the Agreement's passage cannot be decided in isolation from the larger question of our relationship with Russia. If confirmed, I will look forward to working with the committee on charting the best way forward.

#### NATO

*Question 88.* Early in 2009, NATO will hold a summit of the heads of state of each of the member governments. What will the U.S. position be on extending Membership Action Plans to Georgia and Ukraine?

Answer. While there are different views among allies on the best way to promote eventual NATO membership for Georgia and Ukraine, it is essential that we work closely with our allies to develop a common approach on alliance enlargement. The NATO-Ukraine Commission and the NATO-Georgia Commission (established last summer) are other avenues available for deepening relations between the alliance and Georgia and Ukraine. NATO's door must remain open to European democracies that meet membership criteria and can contribute to our common security. How and when new countries might join must be determined together with all our allies in the alliance.

*Question 89.* In 2006, I delivered a speech at a conference prior to the start of the NATO summit in Riga, Latvia. I urged leaders to identify the response to an energy cutoff as an Article V commitment and develop an action plan to respond to such attacks. I pointed out that my recommendation did not mean that I favored a military response to energy cutoffs. What steps will the administration take to develop a strategy for the alliance to prepare for, and respond to, the use of energy as a weapon or political tool against fellow members?

Answer. Russia's decision to use energy as leverage against Ukraine and other countries in Europe demonstrates the urgency of developing a more coherent transatlantic energy strategy. You have been a leader in the efforts to develop such a strategy. The question of how the alliance guarantees security in the 21st century—not only against military threats but against a much broader array of threat, including to energy and cyber security—should be a major topic of discussion at the NATO summit in April. The discussion of potentially updating NATO's Strategic Concept must address the question of the nonmilitary aspects of allies' security, including energy security.

#### KAZAKHSTAN

*Question 90.* What U.S. interests do you believe are most important in our relationship with Kazakhstan, and what do you believe the objectives of our policy toward Kazakhstan should be?

Answer. The United States has been working to develop an effective and cooperative relationship with Kazakhstan since its independence in 1991. Kazakhstan participates in the U.S.-led coalition against terrorism, shares information with the United States on mutual threats, and provides support for U.S. efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq. The United States has played an important role in building a more modern Kazakh military that can both meet Kazakhstan defense needs and help Kazakhstan fulfill its international responsibilities. Kazakhstan is also a key regional player in Central Asia and an important energy producer. The United States has an interest in helping Kazakhstan in its efforts to diversify its export routes and expand its energy trade with its neighbors.

In 2010, Kazakhstan will become the first former Soviet state to hold the chairmanship of the OSCE. To carry out that important role effectively, Kazakhstan must improve its human rights record and do more to support democratic norms. The country's leadership has pledged to implement political reforms before assuming the OSCE chairmanship and the United States should hold them to that pledge.

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

*General*

*Question 91.* The United States remains the strongest outside power in Latin America by most measures, including trade and military cooperation. Yet U.S. influence has sunk to perhaps the lowest point in decades. Does improving the U.S. role in Latin America and the Caribbean require changes of policy or does it simply require a change in the way we communicate our current policy? What specific policy changes would you make that depart from the policies enacted during the last 8 years?

Answer. President-elect Obama has made clear that after decades of pressing for top-down reform, we need an agenda in the Americas that works to advance democracy, security, and opportunity from the bottom up. There are aspects of existing policy that should be retained, albeit updated to meet evolving challenges. There must, however, be more of an emphasis on helping respond to the basic desires of the people throughout the Western Hemisphere in a way that advances U.S. interests and values.

*Mexico*

*Question 92.* Is the Merida Initiative enough to combat the threat of widespread corruption in Mexico?

Answer. The Merida Initiative is an important step in helping our partners in Mexico address rising security challenges that pose a threat to Mexico and the United States. The President-elect suggested during the campaign that he appreciated the vision you laid out, Senator, of an expanded Merida Initiative that incorporates our friends in Central America. I look forward to working with you, members of the committee, and other Members of Congress, in determining how we can most effectively support the rule of law in this important neighborhood.

*Question 93.* There has been criticism in Mexico that a 2004 decision by President Bush to allow a ban on U.S. sales of semiautomatic assault weapons to lapse has led to an increase in the number of such weapons in the hands of Mexican drug gangs, weapons trafficking from the United States to Mexico, and a growing level of violence that affects our societies on both sides of the border. Please provide your views regarding measures to ensure more cooperation among border officials to stem the movement of firearms across the border, such as e-trace and Project Gunrunner. Please provide your views regarding the presence of the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (ATF) in Mexico—do we need more ATF agents in U.S. consulates in Mexico to stem the movement of firearms across the border?

Answer. As the President-elect has made clear, we must do our part in helping staunch southbound flows that are crucial to the drug trafficking cartels, including the flow of guns, cash, and stolen vehicles from the United States to Mexico. Doing so will require cooperation across numerous federal agencies, between federal and state authorities and with Mexican counterparts. If confirmed, I look forward to ensuring that the State Department plays an important and effective role in such efforts. I also look forward to working with you, members of the committee, and other Members of Congress to determine the most effective means of achieving these goals.

*Question 94.* The collapse of oil prices and the growing effect of the recession in the United States have compounded Mexico's problems. Mexico's state-owned oil giant Pemex, the provider of 37 percent of the government's income, is expected to produce less oil and generate fewer pesos for the government in 2009. U.S. manufacturers in northern Mexico, especially those connected to the auto industry, are cutting their workforces and some are even asking employees to accept pay cuts. Rising unemployment in Mexico could create instability, expand illegal immigration, and drive desperate Mexicans into participating in the drug trade. Given the importance of Mexico's "oil income," please provide your views on working with the Mexican Government on a closer energy partnership.

Answer. The interrelated challenges of inequality and insecurity pose significant challenges for Mexico and countries throughout the Americas. To help address these challenges and advance our interests and values, the United States has a strong in-

terest in supporting bottom-up development in Mexico and throughout the region. President-elect Obama's proposed Energy Partnership for the Americas, in which we hope Mexico would play an important role, could serve as a vehicle for working together to forge a path toward sustainable growth and clean energy. I look forward to working with you, members of the committee, and other Members of Congress as we flesh out how best to proceed in this and other areas of the bilateral United States-Mexico relationship.

#### *Brazil*

*Question 95.* The committee passed the "Western Hemisphere Energy Compact" in September 2008 and will be reintroducing this legislation during the next Congress. Building on the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on biofuels signed in March 2006, this bill would create the framework for greater cooperation between Brazil and the United States in the sharing, research, and development of renewable energy technologies. Please provide your views regarding the MOU and if you will be continuing this initiative. Please provide your views regarding the "Western Hemisphere Energy Compact."

*Answer.* The March 2007 Memorandum of Understanding to Advance Biofuels Cooperation and the work that has been done since then are an important feature of the United States-Brazil relationship. We look forward to ensuring that continued United States-Brazil energy cooperation is carried out in an environmentally sustainable manner and in a manner that spreads the benefits of alternative energy development throughout the region while expanding the market for U.S. green energy manufacturers and producers. It is also important that U.S. biofuel producers not be prejudiced by efforts to increase United States-Brazil cooperation. We must also ensure that all stakeholders, including those from the labor, environmental, and business sectors, are adequately represented in the biofuels cooperation process.

I look forward to examining the specifics of the "Western Hemisphere Energy Compact" legislation in the coming weeks and months and working with you and other members of the committee to ensure that we work together to advance U.S. interests and value in the Americas through enhanced energy cooperation.

*Question 96.* Please provide your views regarding the viability of devising MOUs with Brazil on food security and HIV prevention throughout Latin America, the Caribbean, and Africa.

*Answer.* The current United States-Brazil relationship provides a foundation for a deeper, more comprehensive relationship between our two countries. There are a wide range of issues on which we hope to work closely with our Brazilian partners to help advance democratic governance, opportunity and security from the bottom up throughout the Americas. I look forward to your counsel, as well as that from other members of this committee and Congress, as a whole, regarding particular areas of potential focus as we endeavor to deepen the bilateral relationship.

*Question 97.* President Lula has advocated the goal of opening Brazil's economy through trade liberalization. Lowering barriers to international trade is an important way to raise productivity growth. The benefits from greater trade include improved access to needed capital imports and technology to raise productivity and improve living standards. Please assess the feasibility of negotiating a Bilateral Investment Treaty (BIT) between the United States Government (USG) and the Government of Brazil (GOB). Please provide your views regarding the viability of negotiating a Tax Treaty with Brazil.

*Answer.* As noted in response to Question 96, we believe there are a wide range of issues on which we hope to work closely with our Brazilian partners to deepen the bilateral relationship. I look forward to your counsel, as well as that from other members of this committee and Congress, as a whole, regarding particular areas of potential focus in that endeavor.

#### *Colombia*

*Question 98.* Please provide your views regarding President Alvaro Uribe's desire to continue in power for a third consecutive term.

*Answer.* As you are aware, the Colombian Congress is in the process of addressing the question of reelection. I do not believe it is proper for the United States to attempt to dictate the result of any internal democratic process in the region.

*Question 99.* Despite the best effort and funding from the U.S., cocaine production continues unabated in Colombia. Please provide your views on the success or failure of Plan Colombia, on funding for alternative development efforts in Colombia, and on military assistance for Plan Colombia.

Answer. The security situation in Colombia has improved, but very significant quantities of illicit narcotics continue to flow in significant quantities from Colombia to the United States. I look forward to working with Congress and our friends and partners in Colombia to ensure that future investments help staunch the flow of illegal drugs and help consolidate security gains to contribute to a durable peace in Colombia. To do so, we must learn from the successes and failures of the past. Continued support for Colombia through the Andean Counterdrug Initiative is important. That assistance must be updated to meet evolving challenges. We must provide meaningful support for Colombia's democratic, civilian institutions, and the rule of law.

As we continue our struggle against the scourge of illegal drugs in our society and throughout the Americas, we must ensure that we are doing what is necessary here at home to reduce demand, enforce our laws through effective policing, and disrupt the southbound flow of money and weapons that are an essential element of the transnational illicit networks that operate in Colombia and elsewhere in the Americas. It is important that we work together with countries throughout the region to find the best practices that work across the hemisphere and to tailor approaches to fit each country.

*Question 100.* Please provide your views on the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) with Colombia. Will you oppose the FTA in its current form? What changes need to be included in the current agreement to gain the administration's support?

Answer. It is important that we not lose sight of the many aspects of the important, dynamic, and complex bilateral relationship that the United States and Colombia have when we discuss the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. I look forward to working to maintain the across-the-board vibrancy of the relationship.

With regard to the trade agreement, it is essential that trade spread the benefits of globalization. Without adequate labor protections, trade cannot do that. Although levels of violence have dropped, continued violence and impunity in Colombia directed at labor and other civic leaders make labor protections impossible to guarantee in Colombia today.

Colombia must improve its efforts. I look forward to working with members of this committee, as well as other Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to see what the United States can do to help contribute to an end to further violence and continued impunity directed against labor and other civic leaders in Colombia.

The United States and Colombia have long enjoyed a close, mutually beneficial relationship. I am confident that through continued cooperation on the full array of bilateral issues, we can maintain and deepen that relationship. Active engagement with Colombia will be an important part of this administration's approach to hemispheric relations.

#### *Cuba*

*Question 101.* The 50th anniversary of the Cuban Revolution on January 1, 2009, presents an auspicious moment to reexamine the contentious United States-Cuban relationship. Please provide your views on reviewing all elements of Cuba policy.

Answer. There are many ways that we can send a message to the Cuban people that the United States intends to play a positive role in their future. President-elect Obama believes that Cuban-Americans especially can be important ambassadors for change in Cuba. As such, he believes that it makes both moral and strategic sense to lift the restrictions on family visits and family cash remittances to Cuba. We do not currently have a timeline for the announcement of such a new policy, and the Obama-Biden administration will consult closely with Congress as we prepare the change.

President-elect Obama also believes that it is not time to lift the embargo on Cuba, especially since it provides an important source of leverage for further change on the island.

*Question 102.* Despite the official embargo, agricultural trade represents a significant area of interaction between the United States and Cuba. Since the Trade Sanctions Reform and Export Enhancement Act (TSRA) of 2000 lifted sanctions on sales of agricultural commodities and medicine, the U.S. has become Cuba's most important food provider, although many restrictions and licensing requirements remain in place. Please provide your views on expanding trade with Cuba.

Answer. We anticipate a review of U.S. policy regarding sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba and look forward to working with members of the committee and other Members of Congress as we move forward in the consideration of appropriate

steps to take to help advance U.S. interests and values in the context of relations with Cuba.

*Question 103.* The United States has pursued cooperation with Cuba in drug interdiction on a very limited case-by-case basis. Please provide your views on a broad formalized agreement or Memorandum of Understanding between the U.S. and Cuba in order to improve coordination of antidrug efforts and provide for exchange of information.

Answer. Given the threat posed by narcotics trafficking, it is important to cooperate with Cuba where such cooperation is effective in stopping trafficking.

*Question 104.* Cuba has been on the State Department's State Sponsors of Terrorism list since 1982. Please provide your views regarding why Cuba should or should not remain on the State Department's State Sponsors of Terrorism list.

Answer. We anticipate a review of U.S. policy regarding Cuba and look forward to working with members of the committee and other Members of Congress as we move forward in the consideration of appropriate steps to take to help advance U.S. interests and values in the context of relations with Cuba.

*Question 105.* Please provide your views on United States-Cuban cooperation on energy security and environmentally sustainable resource management, especially as Cuba begins deep-water exploration for potentially significant oil reserves.

Answer. We anticipate a review of U.S. policy regarding Cuba and look forward to working with members of the committee and other Members of Congress as we move forward in the consideration of appropriate steps to take to help advance U.S. interests and values in the context of relations with Cuba.

#### *Bolivia*

*Question 106.* Under the Bush administration benefits from the Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act (ATPDEA) were suspended for Bolivia. This is a challenging topic and relationship for the U.S., but one in which the door to a more positive engagement needs to remain open for the sake of our broader interests in the region. Please provide your views on reinstating ATPDEA benefits.

Answer. The unjustified expulsion of Ambassador Phillip Goldberg as well as other actions taken by the Bolivian Government against U.S. personnel and programs raises significant questions regarding Bolivia's desire for a constructive bilateral relationship. The future of ATPDEA benefits is one of the issues in the United States-Bolivia relationship that merits careful consideration as we move forward, particularly given our interest in helping promote economic opportunity from the bottom up throughout the Americas. I look forward to working with you, members of the committee and Members of Congress to ensure that U.S. policy in Bolivia helps advance our interests and values.

#### UNITED NATIONS

##### *U.N. Security Council*

*Question 107.* Effective action by the U.N. Security Council to address threats to peace and security requires building support among Council members, including Russia and China. Difficulty in winning such support has hampered efforts in recent years to address a number of U.S. priorities in the Council, including stronger action to address the threat posed by Iran's nuclear program, the crises in Darfur and Zimbabwe, and human rights abuses in Burma. As Secretary, what steps would you take to increase the effectiveness of U.S. engagement in the Security Council?

Answer. The President-elect and I believe that it is important for the United States to lead in strengthening the effectiveness of the United Nations, in modernizing it, so that it can be more capable of meeting the challenges of the 21st century. We believe that in light of the global challenges we face in the new century, the value and potential of the U.N. is as great if not more so today, than at its founding 60 years ago. Clearly, cooperation at the Security Council must be at the center of our efforts to build an effective and responsive U.N. on the challenges you cite, from Burma to Darfur to Iran to Zimbabwe. In this regard I am struck by the findings of the 2005 congressionally mandated task force on the U.N., cochaired by Senator Mitchell and Speaker Gingrich, which said with respect to inaction to prevent mass atrocities, "On stopping genocide, all too often 'the United Nations failed' should actually read 'members of the United Nations blocked or undermined action by the United Nations.'"

That is why working intensively and aggressively to secure Security Council cooperation is critical. We must both build pragmatic working relationships, while making our priorities clear. If confirmed, I look forward to working with Dr. Rice

who is also committed to the principle that the Security Council should not be an obstacle to advancing critical foreign policy goals and interests. In this regard, it is also essential that our permanent representative in New York have the full backing of American diplomacy, including the full support of the Department of State to engage capitals in order to reinforce our diplomacy in New York.

*Question 108.* There have been a number of proposals to increase the size of the U.N. Security Council and to expand the number of permanent members of the Council.

- a. How do you believe U.S. interests would be affected by the expansion of the Council's size or by the addition of more permanent members?

Answer. The President-elect and I agree that the Security Council was created many years ago at a time when there were very different international realities. Our administration will make a serious, deliberate effort, consulting with key allies and capitals, to find a way forward that enhances the ability of the Security Council to carry out its mandate and effectively meet the challenges of the new century. Obviously, this will not happen over night.

- b. What factors do you believe most important in evaluating any such proposals?

Answer. We will support reforms that would not impede the Security Council's effectiveness and its efficiency. We would also consider how to enhance the standing of the Council in the eyes of those nations that seek a greater voice in international fora.

- c. Changes in the composition of the Security Council would require an amendment to the U.N. Charter, which in turn would require the advice and consent of the Senate. Do you commit to consulting with the Foreign Relations Committee in advance of any future international discussions of proposals to change the composition of the Council?

Answer. If confirmed, not only would I commit to such consultations, I will actively seek out the Foreign Relations Committee's counsel and expertise on this important and challenging issue.

#### *U.N. Human Rights Council*

Critics contend that the new U.N. Human Rights Council is a marginal improvement at best over the discredited U.N. Human Rights Commission it replaced. The Bush administration decided not to seek membership to the Council and in June 2008 all but completely withdrew the United States from observer status, declaring that we would only engage with the Council when it involves "matters of deep national interest."

*Question 109.* What is the position of the administration regarding the U.N. Human Rights Council?

Answer. Unfortunately, the new Human Rights Council has strayed far from the principles of the authors of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. It has passed eight resolutions condemning Israel, a democracy with higher standards of human rights than its accusers, but it is only with difficulty that it adopted resolutions pressing Sudan and Myanmar. The United States should seek to reform the U.N. Human Rights Council. We need our voice to be heard loud and clear to call attention to the world's most repressive regimes, end the despicable obsession with Israel, and improve human rights policies around the globe.

*Question 110.* Will the Obama administration seek to become a member of the Council at the next opportunity?

Answer. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the President-elect and the U.N. Permanent Representative and consulting with this committee as we review whether and when to run for election to a seat on the Council. Whether or not we seek election, we will certainly fully engage to make reform of the human rights system a priority of the United States.

*Question 111.* What role does the administration see the Council playing in the field of human rights?

Answer. American leadership on human rights is essential to making the world safer, more just, and more humane. As the President-elect has said, leadership begins at home, and we must lead by example, by ending torture, official cruelty, and by closing Guantanamo. But we also must go much further. We should work with others to shape human rights institutions and instruments tailored to the 21st century. We must work to make the U.N.'s human rights institutions more effective



voices for those who are subjected to human rights violations. The President-elect has committed to champion accountability for genocide and war crimes, ending the scourge of impunity for massive human rights abuses. We will stand up for oppressed people from Cuba to North Korea and from Burma to Zimbabwe and Sudan. We will accord greater weight to human rights, including the rights of women and children, in our relationships with global powers, recognizing that America's long-term strategic interests are more likely to be advanced when our partners are rights-respecting. We will address human trafficking, both labor and sex trafficking, through strong legislation and enforcement to ensure that trafficking victims are protected and traffickers are brought to justice.

*Question 112.* Does the administration believe the Council spends a disproportionate amount of attention criticizing Israel while ignoring more pressing human rights crises?

Answer. Yes. There is no question that the Human Rights Council has been seriously flawed. Rather than focus its efforts and energies on the most egregious instances of human rights abuses around the world, in places like Burma, Zimbabwe, Sudan, and elsewhere, it has, as I said earlier, passed eight resolutions condemning Israel, a democracy with higher standards of human rights than its accusers, but it is only with difficulty that it adopted resolutions pressing Sudan and Myanmar.

#### *U.N. Peacekeeping*

In the 1990s, United Nations peacekeepers often found themselves sent without adequate political or military support to complete missions that were ill-designed. The United Nations seems to have learned the painful and tragic lessons of those events and has recently avoided inserting blue-helmeted troops in such "no-win" type operations.

*Question 113.* Do you believe U.N. peacekeepers can effectively perform stabilizing or "peace enforcement" roles in situations, such as Somalia, where there is an ongoing conflict and no peace agreement among the parties?

Answer. It is certainly the case, that the Security Council is indeed levying more requirements and mandates on U.N. peacekeepers than ever before. In Somalia, there are no good solutions. We have a serious counterterrorism challenge; a serious humanitarian concern and imperative; and an interest in trying to facilitate national reconciliation and long-term stability in Somalia. In this context, the question is whether a U.N. peacekeeping force, assuming it can be successfully established and deployed, would advance our efforts along all three of our objectives. If confirmed, I expect to consider this issue in the near future with the President-elect and my colleagues in the Cabinet.

*Question 114.* Do you believe the consent of the parties is a necessary precondition to effective peacekeeping? Do you believe there are situations where U.N. peacekeepers should be authorized to deploy to a country without the consent of the host government?

Answer. There are many different kinds of peacekeeping operations. The ideal circumstance is when the parties consent to the deployment of the peacekeeping mission. But there are times when the Security Council will authorize the use of force when the parties do not consent or oppose outside intervention. One thing we can no longer tolerate, however, is a circumstance such as in Sudan, when the government, in an effort to block full deployment of the African Union-United Nations mission, picks and chooses which troop contributions it is prepared to accept.

#### *U.N. Peacekeeping Budget*

For many years, the level of funding requested in the Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities (CIPA) account was significantly below known requirement levels. Deficiencies were then routinely made up via supplemental appropriations. Many in Congress view this "low-balling" as either shoddy bookkeeping or a disingenuous attempt to dodge difficult political issues.

*Question 115.* Does the Obama administration intend to request funds for the CIPA account sufficient to meet the anticipated U.S. assessed dues for U.N. peacekeeping operations?

Answer. It is the intention of the President-elect and my intention to meet our U.N. obligations in full and on time, and that requires us to make a determined effort to budget for peacekeeping operations as accurately as we can.

*Question 116.* Are there any specific steps you believe the United Nations should take to reduce the overall size of the U.N. peacekeeping budget? If so, what are they?

Answer. Over the last several years, U.N. peacekeeping has seen its greatest growth both in numbers and scales. A large portion of the U.N.'s budget is devoted to peacekeeping. It will be important that, as peacekeeping mandates come up for renewal, we appropriately scrutinize the objectives, mandate, and deployment of these peacekeeping forces. Any new peacekeeping mandate must also be evaluated to ensure that the U.N. has the capacity and resources to fulfill the added responsibility.

*Question 117.* Are there any specific U.N. peacekeeping missions you would support reducing or terminating in order to reduce the costs of U.N. peacekeeping? If so, which missions do you believe should be reduced or terminated?

Answer. The administration will review each peacekeeping operation as it comes up for renewal at the Security Council. The administration does not have a position about reducing supporting or terminating specific peacekeeping operations at this time.

#### *Responsibility to Protect*

In 2005, the United Nations World Summit endorsed the concept of a responsibility of states to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. The concept as endorsed by the United Nations provides that where states manifestly fail to protect their populations from such atrocities, the international community, acting through the U.N. Security Council, is prepared to take collective action in a timely and effective manner to provide such protection. The U.N. statement is silent on the question of intervention by individual states without authorization from the U.N. Security Council to protect populations in such situations.

*Question 118.* Do you believe that individual states may legitimately use force to protect other states' populations from atrocities without U.N. Security Council authorization? Do you believe such a right is recognized in international law?

Answer. I believe we must begin by making every effort to persuade those who might be inclined to use their veto to block action to stop or prevent mass atrocities from doing so. Our preference is to obtain Security Council approval because this enhances our ability to bring others along, shares the cost of the burdens, and increases the likelihood of success. Yet there may well be current and future instances in which despite our best efforts to obtain Security Council support we are unable to do so, as was the case with Kosovo, where the United States and its NATO allies took action initially without U.N. Security Council approval. That was the right thing to do at the time, and it must remain an option. As the President-elect has said, we are diminished if we fail to act in the face of mass atrocities and genocide.

*Question 119.* If you believe in such a right, what principles should govern such interventions? What impact would such a doctrine have on the general prohibition in international law against the use of force between states except in cases of self-defense? How could states be prevented from using such a doctrine as a pretext to justify uses of force undertaken for ulterior political motives?

Answer. The responsibility to protect is a norm that was supported by the United States, by the U.N. 2005 World Summit, and subsequently by the Security Council. The responsibility to protect is a doctrine that begins with prevention and encompasses the full range of policy options. The emphasis is on prevention, though we cannot and must not rule out the use of force if other options fail. My main concern about the responsibility to protect is not overuse, but the gap that exists between what the norm promises and the failure of the international community to live up to that norm with strong action in places like Darfur.

*Question 120.* Some commentators have advocated that the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council should forswear the use of the veto in the Council in cases where international intervention is proposed for ostensibly humanitarian reasons.

Do you support the United States announcing a policy that it will not use its veto in the Security Council in some category of future cases involving proposals for humanitarian intervention?

Answer. Our preference should be to obtain Security Council approval for an action because this enhances our ability to bring others along with us, shares the cost of the burdens, and increases legitimacy. This should not be a binary choice of foregoing our right as a Permanent Member of the Security Council or sacrificing a principle of a commitment to the protection of civilians. It is also unrealistic to believe that all possible future hypothetical scenarios can be identified in an evaluation of the use of the Security Council veto.

*Question 121.* If so, would such a position preclude the United States from vetoing a hypothetical proposal for intervention in Gaza if some Council members asserted that such intervention was required for humanitarian reasons?

Answer. No. The United States maintains an unwavering commitment to Israel, and will oppose efforts by the Security Council and elsewhere to put forward resolutions and other statements that seek to unfairly target the State of Israel.

*Question 122.* Some commentators have advocated more frequent recourse to the U.N. General Assembly to authorize interventions for humanitarian reasons in cases where the Security Council fails to authorize such interventions.

Do you support an expanded role for the U.N. General Assembly in authorizing humanitarian interventions in cases where the Security Council declines to do so?

Answer. The United States should pursue those avenues, opportunities, and strategies that represent the best possibility of achieving our national objectives. This is not about the General Assembly versus the Security Council. President-elect Obama's overarching objective is advancing America's interests and values, protecting our security, and ensuring our prosperity.

#### ARMS CONTROL

*Question 123.* In 2003, when administration officials testified before this committee in support of the Moscow Treaty, they pointed out that the agreement would be buttressed by the START Treaty's verification regime. The START verification regime is due to expire in December of this year. In other words, the underpinning of the START and Moscow Treaties and our strategic relationship depends upon something which is about to expire. What is your opinion on the importance of extending the START Treaty and what steps do you plan to take to address this matter?

Answer. The Obama administration will seek deep, verifiable reductions in all U.S. and Russian nuclear weapons—whether deployed or nondeployed, strategic or nonstrategic. As a first step, we will seek a legally binding agreement to replace the current START Treaty which, as you point out, expires in December 2009.

*Question 124.* I have been concerned by reports that the efficacy of the Chemical Weapons Convention is in doubt due to U.S. funding shortfalls. I understand that not all of the funding for this work comes from the State Department—some comes from the Department of Commerce. What steps will you take to ensure that U.S. treaty commitments are met?

Answer. Uncertainty about when, or even whether, the U.S. will pay its bill has created problems each year for the OPCW in carrying out its inspection program, especially because the U.S. assessment constitutes 22 percent of OPCW's budget. Given the Obama administration's strong support for the Chemical Weapons Convention and the OPCW, the State Department will review this issue to see whether there are practical ways to address the problem of adequate funding for international organizations.

*Question 125.* In 2006, I visited the headquarters of the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, Austria, and its Safeguards Analytical Laboratory located a few miles away. Samples collected by IAEA inspectors during inspections are brought there to verify that there are no undeclared nuclear materials and activities. Unfortunately the laboratory's aging equipment and dangerous working conditions hamper the important work done there. This situation will likely worsen as more samples arrive there and as more states expand their nuclear power infrastructure. Such a situation could, in the future, shut down this critical nonproliferation facility. What steps will you take to ensure that the IAEA has the resources and leadership it needs to continue its important safeguards mission?

Answer. The Obama administration will give strong support to the IAEA, especially its safeguards system which plays the crucial role of monitoring compliance with the nonproliferation treaty. At the urging of the United States and many other IAEA members, the Agency's responsibilities and workload have expanded rapidly in recent years, including in implementing Additional Protocols to members' safeguards agreements, assisting members to enhance the physical protection of their nuclear installations and materials, and, hopefully in the future, helping create and administer a nuclear fuel bank that can reduce incentives for countries to acquire their own fuel-cycle facilities. Yet the IAEA's budget has not kept pace with its growing responsibilities. It needs to strengthen its talented workforce and ensure that its monitoring equipment and facilities, such as its laboratory at Seibersdorf, are fully up to date. That is why President-elect Obama has called for doubling the IAEA's budget over the next 4 years.

*Question 126.* When President-elect Obama was in the Senate we worked together to fashion legislation to dramatically increase funding for conventional weapons dismantlement and weapons and materials of mass destruction detection and interdiction assistance. Unfortunately, these efforts did not translate into an increased financial or leadership commitment from the Department of State. What plans do you have to revitalize State Department efforts in this area?

Answer. I strongly support implementation of the Lugar-Obama legislation that was designed to strengthen U.S. efforts to assist other countries to dismantle conventional weapons as well as to detect and interdict materials and weapons of mass destruction. While some of the U.S. programs to address these problems are funded by other agencies, the State Department has responsibility for significant programs of its own, including the Small Arms/Light Weapons Destruction Fund and the Export Control and Related Border Security (EXBS) Program. It is my understanding that funding for conventional weapons destruction rose from \$8.6 million in FY06 to \$16 million in FY07 (when the Lugar-Obama legislation was adopted) to over \$44 million in FY08. In FY07, \$42 million was obligated to the EXBS program, which assists the capabilities of other states to detect and interdict WMD smuggling. The Lugar-Obama legislation requires that not less than 25 percent of the funds provided in the nonproliferation chapter of the Foreign Assistance Act be devoted to enhancing the capabilities of other countries to detect and interdict WMD materials. In FY07, EXBS spending was well over that threshold. So my understanding is that the legislation has had a significant impact. The Obama administration will review these and other assistance programs and decide what more may be needed to meet the requirements of the legislation and to support the important policy goals of conventional weapons destruction and the detection and interdiction of materials and weapons of mass destruction.

#### COUNTERTERRORISM

*Question 127.* In the 109th Congress you proposed legislation (S. 1705) that among other things would designate an individual in the NSC to serve as the Senior Advisor to the President for the Prevention of Nuclear Terrorism, who would direct and coordinate U.S. policies for preventing nuclear terrorism. Would you continue to advocate such a position, or do you believe that this job can be handled by the Under Secretary of State for Arms Control and International Security and the Coordinator for Counterterrorism?

Answer. Yes, I continue to advocate such a position. The possibility of terrorists acquiring and using weapons of mass destruction, especially nuclear weapons, is the gravest national security threat we face today. The Obama administration will therefore follow through on the President-elect's campaign pledge to appoint a White House Coordinator to address the threat of nuclear terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Among the Coordinator's responsibilities will be to exercise budgetary oversight over all U.S. programs designed to address the WMD threat.

*Question 128.* One of the keys to international counterterrorism is the cooperation among states, especially in several ungoverned tri-border regions. Do you see greater role for the Department of State in this respect? What will be your counterterrorism philosophy?

Answer. Our ability to contain and diminish the threat of international terrorism depends heavily on our ability to build partnerships among nations and deepen cooperation across a range of areas, including law enforcement, intelligence sharing, border controls, and safeguarding of hazardous materials. The United States—and the State Department in particular—has historically played a central role in this area. I strongly believe that keeping terrorists on the defensive, reducing their room for maneuver, and preventing them from striking at us and our allies will require that the Department act energetically to build the international cooperation that is essential for confronting a transnational threat that no one country can successfully fight alone.

#### ENERGY

*Question 129.* At a Presidential campaign debate on April 16, 2008, you stated: "We are so much more dependent on foreign oil today than we were on 9/11, and that is a real indictment of our leadership." You have also repeatedly pointed to a concern that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has also warned of: The degree to which energy security issues—particularly dependence on foreign oil supplies—harm U.S. foreign policy and security. While growing attention has been given to the need to reform domestic energy policy to reduce oil usage, compara-

tively little attention has been given to the need for U.S. diplomatic engagement on energy.

- a. What priority would you assign to energy security in U.S. foreign policy? Is this an issue on which you would personally engage? How would you ensure that energy security is integrated into State Department activities?
- b. As Secretary of State, what role will you play in explaining to Americans the national security, economic and humanitarian costs of our current domestic and global energy portfolio?

Answer. The President-elect identifies energy security as one of his top national security priorities during the campaign. I have long believed that energy security—and the twin challenge of climate change—are among the most pressing challenges facing the United States and the global community and must be among the top national security priorities. These are issues on which I will personally engage, and they will consistently receive high-level attention at the Department. I will work with our friends and partners around the world, who are facing the same challenges. I also intend to ensure that the Department works vigorously through the interagency process on these issues. I am still reviewing whether to make any organizational changes in the Department on these issues—I will certainly consult with the committee as we work to ensure that energy security plays a prominent role in State Department activities.

If confirmed as Secretary, I will be active in making the case that the United States must free itself from dependence on foreign oil. Our addiction to foreign oil does not just undermine our national security and wreak havoc on the environment—it also cripples our economy and strains the budgets of working families. The United States and our friends and partners throughout the world are facing a protracted period of major energy challenges. Overdependence on individual countries or fuels creates vulnerabilities by permitting market distortions and opportunities for political blackmail. Along with the President-elect and my colleagues, I will urge a swift and effective response that focuses on improving energy efficiency, developing energy technologies that do not contribute to global warming, and for the near-term future, securing stable and diverse supplies of conventional energy.

*Question 130.* Signed into law in December 2007, the Energy Independence and Security Act required the creation of a Department of State Coordinator for International Energy Affairs. This position, originally proposed in legislation offered on March 16, 2006, originated from my judgment that the myriad threats posed by global energy concerns require devoted attention by an individual with significant stature placed within the office of the Secretary of State, and with the political experience necessary to communicate and pursue our diplomatic energy priorities to a broad audience. The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously approved legislation mandating of the Coordinator position in a bill offered by myself with Senators Biden, Craig, Salazar, Landrieu, Coleman, Lieberman, Hagel, and Thune.

Rather than appointing a full-time Coordinator as per congressional expectation, the current Secretary of State chose to “dual-hat” the Under Secretary of State for Economic, Energy and Business Affairs—a position that has also required, among other issues, responsibility for leading State Department engagement on the global financial crisis. Thus, the highest ranking State Department official exclusively devoted to energy issues remains at the level of Office Director.

- a. Do you believe that energy security concerns warrant a high-level, full-time State Department official?
- b. What role will the Coordinator for International Energy Affairs play in State Department activities if you are confirmed as Secretary of State?
- c. What staff support will be made available to the Coordinator? What budgetary support will be available for the Coordinator?
- d. Do you intend to seek additional authorities or budgetary support for the Coordinator and other energy security activities within the 150 Account?

Answer. I very much appreciate and agree with your initiative to elevate energy diplomacy as a key function in the Department of State, and do believe that energy security warrants high-level attention in the Department. Energy security must be an important and integrated element of our foreign policy. I am still reviewing whether to make any organizational changes in the Department, but of course I will implement the statutory requirement to have a Coordinator. If confirmed, I will also soon be working with OMB on the President’s budget request for FY 2010, so it is premature for me to comment on issues involving budgetary support. I will be happy to consult with you further about this issue, if confirmed.

*Question 131.* On March 31, 2008, a Presidential Envoy for Eurasian Energy was appointed. This position is not unlike that established under President Clinton,

which was crucial in establishing energy cooperation amongst Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Turkey. The appointment of the current envoy position, made with the encouragement of Senators Lugar and Biden, came at a time when new opportunities for United States engagement in Central Asia are possible and while Russian authorities have made a strong effort to further their control of energy supplies in the greater Caspian region.

- a. What level of U.S. engagement do you believe is helpful to promote opening of trans-Caspian energy trade and investment?

Answer. Vigorous U.S. engagement to promote opening of trans-Caspian energy trade and investment is an important priority for U.S. interests. Russia's cutoff of gas shipments to Ukraine (and by extension to much of the rest of Europe) in early 2009 (following a similar move in 2006) served as a sharp reminder of how dependent Europe is on energy imports from Russia. That energy dependence can create a degree of political dependence that we should seek to help the Europeans avoid. Just as the Clinton administration helped promote the Baku-Ceyhan-Tbilisi pipeline in the 1990s, the United States today should be heavily engaged in helping to promote stable and transparent energy trade in Europe—including between Russia and Ukraine—and energy diversification for Europe, a goal that requires more energy trade with producers in the Caspian region.

- b. Do you intend to appoint, or encourage the President to appoint, a full-time envoy for Eurasian energy?

Answer. The complex issue of Eurasian energy requires high-level U.S. attention and engagement. If confirmed, I will consult with the President and with our energy and national security teams to determine the best way to devote that attention. The appointment of a strong, full-time envoy is one option worth serious consideration. No matter what staffing approach is employed, it will be essential to have a focused, well-elaborated strategy.

*Question 132.* The proposed Nabucco natural gas pipeline project is intended to be the final link connecting Caspian region energy resources with European consumers that could substantially contribute to diversification of Europe's natural gas imports, but it is being challenged by the Russian-backed alternatives Nordstream and South Stream. The United States has been supportive of the Nabucco project, and numerous North Atlantic Treaty Organization and European Union Member States have attempted to make the Nabucco pipeline a reality. Unfortunately, their efforts have been stymied by other influential European governments that have more actively pursued independent deals with Russia for gas supplies. Failure to complete the Nabucco pipeline would be significant blow to European security, and challenge unity in the trans-Atlantic community.

- a. If confirmed, what steps would you take to conclude necessary political agreements for Nabucco to be constructed?

Answer. The Nabucco pipeline could prove to be a critical element in the necessary efforts to diversify European energy supplies. Completing such an expensive, complicated, multinational project, however, will require painstaking alignment between commercial and governmental actors. An essential element of such a project will be the commercial fundamentals. A successful strategy to promote Nabucco or other pipelines along the Southern Corridor to European markets will require consistent, high-level political engagement, including by the United States. If confirmed, I and my team would strongly encourage our European allies to make the political agreements necessary to facilitate the construction of Nabucco or other pipeline capacity that can help Europe diversify its gas supply.

- b. The Republic of Turkey has indicated a desire to participate in the Nabucco project, but it has expressed concerns for first meeting its projected domestic energy needs. What is your perspective on steps the United States bilaterally with Turkey, and multilaterally, can take to accelerate progress on the necessary intergovernmental agreements?

Answer. The President-elect has said that “a close relationship with a stable, democratic, Western-oriented Republic of Turkey is an important U.S. national interest.” I could not agree more. Turkey is a critical U.S. partner not only on energy issues but on a wide range of critical national security issues. Its cooperation is certainly critical to the success of gas diversification projects such as the Nabucco pipeline and the Turkey-Greece-Italy pipeline. If confirmed, I will seek to restore and develop the longstanding U.S. strategic partnership with Turkey—which has come under strain in recent years. Supporting Turkey's effort to develop and implement sound and sustainable energy policies is in the interest of Turkey, all of Europe, and

the United States because it will help Turkey to be a reliable partner and transit country for gas flowing to other European markets.

*Question 133.* The United States Senate, as part of its amendment to H.R. 6 in 2007, approved legislation I authored promoting enhanced ties between the International Energy Agency (IEA) and the Governments of the People's Republic of China and the Republic of India. One central component of such cooperation would be formal coordination of strategic petroleum reserves as those countries construct their domestic reserves. United States diplomats have encouraged such enhanced cooperation. You have repeatedly recognized the importance of enhanced formal ties with China and India on energy, including with the IEA.

- a. What benefit and risks do you see to formal inclusion of China and India in membership in the IEA?

Answer. The IEA should be laying the groundwork now for eventual Chinese and Indian membership in order to achieve the benefits of: (1) Increasing energy policy coordination with rapidly growing energy consumers like China and India; (2) maximizing the opportunity for agreeing on energy standards and principles like transparent energy markets; (3) ensuring the coordinated release of strategic petroleum reserves during a major oil market disruption; and (4) maintaining its position as the voice of the world's major energy consuming nations.

The center of energy demand growth is shifting away from the OECD countries to many of the world's developing countries. The IEA was created as an institution that represents the interest of the major energy consuming nations. If its membership does not change to reflect who those nations are today, its authority and effectiveness will erode.

- b. Would you promote more formal inclusion of China and India in the International Energy Agency, including in coordination of strategic petroleum reserve usage?

Answer. The great majority of increased global energy demand in coming years will come from emerging economies, in particular China and India. Both are also building strategic petroleum reserves. Given their growing weight in international energy markets it is in our interest to include them as members of the International Energy Agency and to coordinate closely with them on usage of strategic petroleum reserves in case of an oil supply emergency. Global energy security will benefit from the integration of their potentially large strategic reserves into the IEA system.

- c. If necessary, would you promote revisions to the IEA's underlying treaty if necessary to include China and India?

Answer. Full membership would likely require the modification of the original 1974 International Energy Program treaty agreement that created the International Energy Agency (IEA), but the range of options potentially available to integrate China and India into the IEA have not yet been explored. The IEA makes decisions by consensus among the Member States, and consensus can and will be reached on how to prepare the IEA for eventual Chinese and Indian membership, even as China and India must also commit themselves to and prepare for IEA membership. The State Department will support these efforts, up to and including revision of the International Energy Program.

*Question 134.* Access to reliable and affordable energy is vital to economic development, and the threat of global climate change underscores a common interest for developing countries to not build extensive infrastructure based around carbon-intensive power generation and usage. Likewise, production of renewable energy, particularly biofuels, offers a value-added product for rural areas in the developing world. In a Foreign Affairs article, you commented, "We must also help developing nations build efficient and environmentally sustainable domestic energy infrastructures. Two-thirds of the growth in energy demand over the next 25 years will come from countries with little existing infrastructure."

- a. What role do you see for United States foreign assistance in promotion of access to energy in developing countries?

Answer. As developing countries address energy poverty, the United States should do all it can to promote the adoption of clean energy technology and best practices. The full suite of energy sources—oil, gas, coal, nuclear, and all renewables, in tandem with conservation and efficiency improvements—will be necessary to meet projected global and domestic energy demand over the next 25 years.

U.S. foreign assistance that promotes energy access in the developing world should focus on clean energy technology—which includes renewable energy, energy

efficiency, as well as clean coal technology. The United States leads in research, development and deployment of renewable energy.

- b. What budgetary changes would be needed to increase U.S. assistance in promoting energy access?

Answer. Were the United States to give priority to the elimination of energy poverty, with a focus on enabling reliable, affordable, clean energy, we would need a very substantial increase in U.S. assistance.

Most of the required investment, however, must come from the private sector. In order to mobilize that investment, major policy and regulatory reforms are needed in many countries. Neither public nor private utilities and their investors can generate the capital required to expand access to clean, sustainable energy supply, for example, when regulatory regimes prevent them from recovering their direct and indirect operating costs.

Developing countries must bear primary responsibility for moving the reform process forward. When they do, U.S. assistance can support them in two major ways. First, our technical assistance can help to establish the overall regulatory and policy environment needed to stimulate large new public and private investments. And, second, our project-based financial guarantees and other support can help to reduce the perceived risks and costs of mobilizing the much larger flows of private sector financing required.

- c. What is your perspective on how the United States can promote global development of advanced biofuels from diverse feedstocks such as specialty energy crops, agricultural waste, and municipal waste?

Answer. Sustainable biofuels is an area where the State Department can continue to foster global cooperation. The United States works both multilaterally and bilaterally to advance sustainable biofuels. If confirmed, I will review this ongoing work with an eye toward expanding this focus. Examples of work which could be expanded included the G-8-launched Global Bioenergy Partnership as well as the United States-Brazil Memorandum of Understanding on Biofuels Cooperation, which includes both research and development work on advanced biofuels, as well as broader efforts to establish common technical standards to foster a global market for these products.

*Question 135.* As a United States Senator, you cosponsored S. 879 “No Oil Producing and Exporting Cartels Act of 2007” and S. 2976 “OPEC Accountability Act.” What repercussions do you believe legal actions against OPEC nations would have on United States economic interests, trade and security relationships, and U.S. companies operating in affected countries? If confirmed as Secretary of State, how do you intend to balance U.S. and global market dependence on reliable supplies of oil from OPEC nations with encouraging them to undertake more open-market behavior?

Answer. Given ongoing U.S. court cases concerning these matters, as a potential administration official I need to respect the judicial process and not comment on these matters specifically at this time.

If confirmed, I will support the President’s efforts to promote U.S. energy security. This will include maintaining a strong dialogue with the major oil producing countries—both OPEC and non-OPEC members—to impress upon them the need to ensure adequate energy supplies to meet global energy demand.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

During the Presidential campaign, you said that you would “engage in high level meetings with leaders around the world every 3 months, if that’s what it takes to hammer out a new agreement” on climate change. You further indicated that “my goal will be to secure a new agreement by 2010.”

*Question 136.* What role do you intend to play in the Obama administration with respect to international negotiations on climate change? As Secretary, do you expect to meet with foreign leaders every 3 months to discuss climate change?

Answer. President-elect Obama has made it clear that the United States must reassert leadership in international negotiations on climate change. If confirmed, I will play a leading role as Secretary of State in the Obama administration’s efforts in that regard. Given the urgency of the problem and the timeframe set out in the UNFCCC process, this issue would be a key priority for me and for the Department.

*Question 137.* Parties to the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change agreed on a work plan aimed at producing a new climate change agreement by the



end of 2009. Do you support this goal, or do you believe more time will be necessary to reach such an agreement?

Answer. As President-elect Obama has emphasized, few challenges facing America—and the world—are more urgent than climate change. The science is beyond dispute and the facts are clear. Sea levels are rising. Coastlines are shrinking. We have seen record drought, spreading famine, and storms that grow stronger year after year.

President-elect Obama has made it clear that his administration will mark a new chapter in U.S. leadership on climate change. Under President Obama, the U.S. will once again engage vigorously in the U.N.-sponsored climate negotiations. The U.S. will also pursue progress on climate change in subglobal, regional, and bilateral settings. The U.S. is fully prepared to agree to binding caps as part of the international climate negotiations. It is also apparent that, to solve this problem, all major emitting nations must join in the solution. Major developing nations such as China and India must not be far behind in making their own commitments. The precise nature of commitments sought from these countries will be shaped in the course of negotiations.

We are committed to working with all nations to make the 2009 Copenhagen conference under the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change a success. The world must move forward without delay to address this urgent problem.

*Question 138.* Committee staff following the climate change negotiations have recommended that in addition to showing leadership in the forthcoming climate talks, the U.S. should engage China, India, and Brazil in high level bilateral discussions on a number of issues including climate change and energy security. Secretary Paulson has done that with China. Do you support holding similar discussions with Brazil and India?

Answer. President-elect Obama has stated that he plans to pursue international agreements on climate change through a number of avenues in addition to the UNFCCC process, including multilateral discussions that include China, Brazil, and India.

#### PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

As Secretary Gates noted in 2007: “Public relations was invented in the United States, yet we are miserable at communicating to the rest of the world what we are about as a society and a culture, about freedom and democracy, about our policies and our goals. It is just plain embarrassing that al-Qaeda is better at communicating its message on the Internet than America. As one foreign diplomat asked a couple of years ago, ‘How has one man in a cave managed to out-communicate the world’s greatest communication society?’ Speed, agility, and cultural relevance are not terms that come readily to mind when discussing U.S. strategic communications.”

*Question 139.* How does the Obama administration intend to reverse this course of events? Additionally, does the administration believe the problem rests, as Secretary Gates said, with the method of communications, or rather with the message?

Answer. The President-elect and I believe strongly that the challenge of restoring America’s leadership in the world community hinges on improving the content of our policies; in altering the strategic approaches we employ in our dealings with the world (especially moving from unilateralism to a more balanced diplomatic and consultative strategic orientation); and third, we must have effective and respected traditional and public diplomatic capabilities. We can do a better job of attracting the best and the brightest. We must do a better job of giving our talented women and men the resources they need to guarantee that our strategy and our policies can be pursued successfully. All three elements are essential—policies, strategy, and instruments—and I, if confirmed by the Senate, intend to assure that each is strong, and that they all work together to be mutually reinforcing.

*Question 140.* Does the Obama administration support the idea that there needs to be a collocation waiver for public diplomacy facilities that would enable them to remain outside of new embassy facilities where the security environment permits it?

Answer. Ensuring the security and safety of U.S. Government employees overseas is very important to President-elect Obama. So too is the imperative for our people to get outside the guarded perimeters of embassy compounds to get to know the local populations, and to be known by them. If confirmed by the Senate, I intend to work closely with the professionals in the Bureau of Diplomatic Security to review collocation issues for public diplomacy. Another alternative that I would like

to review is expanding the use of binational commissions to create welcoming and secure spaces for public diplomacy. I would be happy to keep you abreast of these actions as we move forward.

#### BROADCASTING

Many have criticized the Bush administration's decision to try to reach broader audiences in the Middle East through efforts such as Radio Sawa and Al Hurra TV. Critics argue that Sawa—which relies primarily on a pop-radio format with a smattering of news—fails to deliver sufficient information to serious listeners who desire to hear unfiltered news about their country and the rest of the world. Opponents of Al Hurra—which attempts to serve as a counter to Al Jazeera—claim that it often fails to provide sufficient counterpoints to radical and inaccurate claims made by participants on many of its programs.

*Question 141.* Does the Obama administration intend to continue funding Radio Sawa in its current, mostly music, format? Similarly, what changes does the administration intend for Al Hurra?

*Question 142.* Does the Obama administration believe that the Broadcasting Board of Governors, which oversees both Al Hurra and Radio Sawa as well as Voice of America, Radio Free Europe, and Radio Free Asia, is the appropriate vehicle to provide managerial and policy guidance to the disparate broadcasting entities? Does the administration seek to alter or even replace the BBG?

Answer. Let me answer these two questions together. For the most part, the performance of America's international broadcast entities has been quite successful in telling America's story (largely the task of the VOA), and in serving as important surrogates for missing independent media in countries where a free press and independent media have been repressed, such as Afghanistan and Burma, where RFE/RL and Radio Free Asia respectively operate. Beyond the precise content of the news, our international broadcast services demonstrate an essential lesson of free societies—the requirement of an independent media for a robust democracy.

A robust and effective BBG in turn requires a strong and unambiguous firewall between the professional journalists and editors at BBG, and others in the U.S. Government whether at the White House or the State Department. I recognize this to be a fundamental requirement of effective international broadcasting.

The BBG is an independent agency but the Secretary of State holds a seat on the Board, through which the Department can express its views. State also clears editorials for the VOA broadcasts. But the most effective BBG will be one at arms length from these and other government agencies.

Now is the time to review the Arab language services—they have grown in listenership in recent years, and we should review their performance and impact to determine whether Al Hurra and Radio Sawa are achieving their full potential.

We recognize that our biggest challenge is to ensure that our messages are listened to, considered and, we hope, acted upon by people in the Middle East, and Muslim societies around the world. To do this effectively, the BBG has learned that it must rely on the best market analysis to understand the unique listening habits and attitudes of the populations we seek to inform, and these conditions differ substantially from one country to its neighbor. So we must start with the market, and then devise our message accordingly, which more and more will include new digital platforms.

#### INTERNATIONAL LAW AND TREATIES

##### *Law of the Sea*

During the 110th Congress, the Foreign Relations Committee reported the Law of the Sea Convention to the the Senate with the recommendation that the Senate provide its advice and consent to ratification of the Convention. The full Senate did not consider the Convention prior to its adjournment.

*Question 143.* Do you support U.S. accession to the Law of the Sea Convention? If so, what U.S. interests do you believe U.S. accession to the Convention would advance?

Answer. Yes. The President-elect has expressed his support for the Convention, and voted in favor of it as a member of this committee in the 110th Congress, and I strongly support it as well.

I agree with the Chief of Naval Operations, and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of whom endorsed the Convention during the 110th Congress. Joining the Convention will advance the interests of the U.S. military and the United States more broadly. As the world's leading maritime power, a nation with

the world's largest Navy, an extensive coastline, an expansive continental shelf, and substantial commercial shipping and marine environmental interests, the United States has as much as any nation to gain from joining the Convention.

*Question 144.* Do you urge Senate action on the Convention during the 111th Congress? If so, what steps would you plan to take as Secretary to promote Senate action?

Answer. As I said above, the President-elect and I have expressed our support for the Convention. When the administration takes office, it will promptly initiate a review of all treaties pending in the Senate and provide the committee with a Treaty Priority List as expeditiously as possible.

#### *ICC*

*Question 145.* Does the Obama administration support the United States becoming a party to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court?

Answer. Now that it is operational, we are learning more about how the ICC functions. Thus far, it has acted with professionalism and fairness—pursuing perpetrators of truly serious crimes, like genocide in Darfur, and atrocities in the Congo and Uganda. At the same time, we must also keep in mind that the United States has more troops deployed overseas than any nation. We need to make sure that they have maximum protection.

I will work with the President-elect and other members of the Cabinet to consult thoroughly with our military commanders and other experts. We will examine the full record of the ICC before making any recommendations or reaching any decision on joining. If confirmed, I look forward to consulting closely with this committee as we consider our approach. Whether we work toward joining or not, we will end hostility toward the ICC and look for opportunities to encourage effective action in the ICC in ways that promote our interests by bringing war criminals to justice.

*Question 146.* Do you believe the United States should seek to assist the ICC in its investigation and prosecution of crimes under the Rome Statute? If so, what sorts of assistance do you support and what principles should govern decisions about providing such assistance?

Answer. I commend the Bush administration for its announced willingness to cooperate with the ICC in the Darfur investigation. The President-elect and I believe we should support the ICC's investigations, including its pursuit of perpetrators of genocide in Darfur.

#### *Trade Agreements*

*Question 147.* During the Presidential campaign you advocated efforts to renegotiate aspects of NAFTA, and "telling Mexico and Canada that we will opt out" of the agreement unless it is revised.

- a. Does the Obama administration intend to seek to renegotiate NAFTA? If so, what changes in the agreement does it intend to seek?
- b. What changes to other aspects of NAFTA would you expect Mexico and Canada to seek in any such negotiations?
- c. Apart from NAFTA, will the Obama administration seek to renegotiate other Free Trade Agreements to which the United States is currently a party? If so, please indicate any such agreements and what changes the administration intends to seek.
- d. Given that NAFTA and other Free Trade agreements have been approved by the Congress will you commit to consult with the Congress in advance of any negotiations to change the terms of such agreements, and to submit any changes to Congress for its approval?

Answer. I cannot speak to specific aspects of the new administration's trade policy, but I can provide my general views on the questions presented about NAFTA. President-elect Obama and I consider Mexico and Canada among our closest allies and friends and we approach the issue from that perspective. We have consistently supported modernizing NAFTA so that it works for Americans and working people and the environment for our partners in North America. The Obama administration will work with the governments of Canada and Mexico to achieve this objective. Improving the agreement will benefit workers and the environment in all three North American countries by ensuring that workers are not mistreated and the environment not despoiled by firms seeking a trade advantage. President-elect Obama also believes that there is also a broader cooperative agenda that the three NAFTA countries should pursue in the economic area, including such matters as energy management, improved border infrastructure and environmental cooperation.

*Question 148.* What effects would the failure of pending Free Trade Agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea have on relations with those nations? How would successful ratification impact relations with those nations?

Answer. If confirmed, I look forward to building even stronger bilateral relationships with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea in the years to come. If confirmed, I also look forward to working with the United States Trade Representative, the Treasury Secretary, the Secretary of Commerce, and others on the President-elect's economic team on these issues. All of these nations have expressed a strong desire to see these FTAs ratified. We will communicate forthrightly with each of them, explaining that our past and present concerns with the FTAs are discrete and specific and have no bearing on the many collaborative dimensions of our alliance and friendship. We will also work to resolve these concerns to the satisfaction of all parties. Obviously, these nations would be pleased by ratification, but I believe that we have—and can continue to have—productive friendships even without FTAs in force.

*Question 149.* What in your view will be the impact of the recent collapse of the World Trade Organization's Doha Development Round of trade negotiations? As Secretary, will you support efforts to revive the Doha Round?

Answer. We still do not know the prospects for the Doha Round. They depend in part on the impacts of last-second decisions of the Bush administration concerning the December WTO Ministerial—impacts that are still playing out globally. I know that the new administration will assess those impacts carefully. As a general principle, the President-elect believes that U.S. negotiators must not accept a bad deal just for the sake of an agreement. But it would certainly be disappointing if the WTO cannot make progress toward a successful Doha Round agreement that would increase American exports, support American jobs, strengthen the rules-based multilateral system, and advance development of the world's poorest countries. President-elect Obama supports, and as Secretary I would support, a successful conclusion of Doha—one that comports with his trade priorities and objectives.

#### *ILO*

In a 2007 article in *Foreign Affairs*, you wrote “We can strengthen the International Labor Organization in order to enforce labor standards, just as we strengthened the World Trade Organization to enforce trade agreements.”

*Question 150.* Is it the position of the Obama administration to pursue a binding mechanism under the auspices of the International Labor Organization to resolve disputes related to labor standards?

Answer. The position of the Obama administration is to ensure that basic international labor standards are respected and enforced in the countries with which we establish our closest commercial relationships. We need to construct a process for evaluating and bringing to dispute resolution cases where producers abroad are violating these basic worker protections in order to gain an unfair advantage in trade. There is an interagency process at USTR that can access the resources and partnership of the Department of Labor and the State Department to initiate a new level of attention to labor issues in trade agreements and to enforcement of the agreements we have signed. And we will work closely with the ILO on the best mechanism for resolving disputes. There are numerous questions by labor experts about the adequacy of the current interagency process. We intend to have close cooperation of USTR, State, and Labor to assess and respond to these questions.

*Question 151.* Will you commit to consult with the Foreign Relations Committee about the details of any proposal for such a mechanism before engaging in discussions of such a proposal internationally?

Answer. Yes.

#### *Medellin*

On February 28, 2005, President Bush determined that the United States would comply with the judgment of the International Court of Justice in the Case Concerning *Avena and Other Mexican Nationals (Mexico v. United States)*. To achieve such compliance President Bush issued a memorandum directing state courts to review and reconsider the convictions and sentences of the Mexican nationals at issue in the case, who were not advised in a timely fashion of their rights under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations to have Mexican consular officials notified of their arrests in the United States on state criminal charges. In March, 2008 the U.S. Supreme Court held in *Medellin v. Texas* that President Bush lacked the authority to compel the States to take such actions.

*Question 152.* What further actions, if any, do you believe the federal and/or state governments should take to give effect to the ICJ's *Avena* judgment? As Secretary, what steps would you plan to take with respect to this issue?

Answer. All nine justices on the Supreme Court recognized in the *Medellin* case that the United States had an international legal obligation under the *Avena* judgment. The question is how to achieve that. I understand that the Governor of Texas has indicated in a letter to Secretary Rice and Attorney General Mukasey that he would be willing to support review and reconsideration in the cases of those Mexican nationals affected by the *Avena* decision if the sentence and conviction has not already been reviewed. We will work with the State of Texas, and the other states involved, on a way forward in these cases that gives effect to the *Avena* judgment. I would also support an interagency review of how the United States can best give effect to the *Avena* judgment.

*Question 153.* How would you plan to address Mexican concerns in the event that death sentences are carried out for any individuals at issue in the *Avena* case whose convictions and sentences had not been reviewed and reconsidered?

Answer. The United States has an obligation under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations to provide consular notification whenever a foreign national is arrested in the United States. Foreign governments likewise have a reciprocal obligation to provide notification to U.S. citizens detained overseas. We must comply with our obligations if we expect other countries to comply with theirs. We will redouble our efforts to work with state and local law enforcement to ensure that the United States fully implements the Vienna Convention's consular notification provisions.

#### GLOBAL HEALTH AND RELATED MATTERS

*Question 154.* Worldwide, it is estimated that 132 million children are orphaned due to AIDS and other causes and millions more are highly vulnerable. Without protection and support, these children are susceptible to HIV and other diseases, recruitment by militias and violent extremist groups, sex trafficking, and other abuses. The Assistance for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children in Developing Countries Act of 2005 (P.L. 109-95), required our government to devise a single, comprehensive strategy for addressing critical needs among the developing world's highly vulnerable children. Even though the bill was signed into law over 3 years ago, up to now, there has been no clear strategy of how to the U.S. Government should ensure programs to address the needs of orphans and vulnerable children are administered as Congress intended. Will you ensure that the plight of orphans and vulnerable children be a priority for the U.S. Government and the Department of State in particular?

Answer. Addressing the plight of orphans and vulnerable children is a priority of the U.S. Government. Under the USG Strategy for Orphans and Other Vulnerable Children (submitted to Congress in June 2006), in 2007-08 the USG spent almost \$6 billion on foreign assistance programs to improve the lives of children and their families.

If confirmed, I will ensure that orphans and vulnerable children continue to be a priority during the Obama administration. Six U.S. Government agencies and departments currently manage a range of programs that help children in dire need due to natural disasters, conflict, orphanhood, disease, abandonment, displacement, exploitation, abuse, or deep poverty. An interagency group is currently updating and refining the strategy to refocus our programs in light of the current global economic crisis that is making more children more vulnerable.

*Question 155.* Last summer, Congress enacted the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008. This legislation authorizes up to \$48 billion over the next 5 years for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs, and includes \$5 billion for malaria and \$4 billion for tuberculosis. Given the current budget situation, should these programs be fully funded at the authorized levels?

Answer. Congress sent a clear message to our partners around the world that the United States would remain committed to combating these three diseases by reauthorizing our programs to address them. As you noted, the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 authorizes up to \$48 billion to combat the three diseases. The bill was passed with strong bipartisan majorities in both houses.

Each year beginning with FY 2010, we will assess our progress toward our goals for each program and the larger budget context, and of course we will consult with Congress in formulating the President's budget request.

*Question 156.* The Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008, includes language directing the United States to participate in negotiations for future Advanced Market Commitments for the purchase of futures vaccines to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, malaria, and other infectious diseases. The first advance market commitment (AMC) of \$1.5 billion, funded by Canada, Italy, Norway, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, was announced on February 9, 2007, and is scheduled to launch later this year. This AMC will go to purchasing a vaccine for pneumococcal disease, an illness that kills around 1.6 million people—most of them children. The commitment itself has no cost unless and until a vaccine is developed. It is estimated that by 2030, a successful AMC project will prevent 5.4 million deaths. However, the United States did not participate in these negotiations and is not a part of this lifesaving initiative. Are you committed to upholding the Tom Lantos and Henry J. Hyde United States Global Leadership Against HIV/AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria Reauthorization Act of 2008 by directing the U.S. to show leadership by participating in future Advanced Market Commitments negotiations?

Answer. It is my understanding that while the U.S. Government did not provide funding for the AMC pilot for pneumococcal disease, the outgoing administration supported the concept of the AMC pilot for pneumococcal disease. I will work closely with the Treasury Department, which the legislation tasks with leading negotiations on establishment of advanced market commitments, and other appropriate U.S. Government agencies, in monitoring the results of the AMC pilot for pneumococcal disease and discussing next steps with respect to AMCs for other infectious diseases.

*Question 157.* Last Congress, I was the lead cosponsor of Vice-President-elect Biden's legislation to address and combat international violence against women. It includes language to create a coordinator at the U.S. Department of State, with the rank of ambassador, to oversee all U.S. Government programs that pertain to combat violence against women and girls internationally, and to integrate programs that address gender-based violence already in existence. Do you support this bill, and how can the U.S. Government improve its ability to address the issue of gender-based violence?

Answer. As you know, I was a cosponsor of the International Violence Against Women Act (IVAWA) in the last Congress. The advancement of women's concerns and issues has always been a high priority for me throughout my career. If confirmed by the Senate, that commitment will continue as I begin my work as Secretary of State. I will direct my staff to review the IVAWA and will work cooperatively with the Senate to ensure that we move quickly and diligently to end violence against women and girls around the globe.

I know that within the State Department the office that addresses violence against women (VAW) also promotes the economic and political empowerment of women and the education of girls. It advocates for the mainstreaming of gender issues into broader policy concerns, against harmful traditional practices, and it opposes the social attitudes that hinder women's full equality. These efforts, too, are a crucial part of fighting the root causes and perpetuation of VAW. I will welcome the opportunity to discuss ways to improve and expand our work.

#### TRANSPARENCY IN EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRIES AND RELATED ISSUES

*Question 158.* The Senate Foreign Relations Committee staff report entitled "The Petroleum and Poverty Paradox: Assessing U.S. and International Community Efforts to Fight the Resource Curse" recommended that "the Secretary of State should exercise more effort on transparency issues, and build on international momentum for extractive industry transparency at the United Nations, at the EITI (Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative) secretariat and through our embassies."

- a. Do you agree with this statement? If so, what steps do you expect to take to support extractive industry transparency?

Answer. I support a lead role for the State Department in advancing resource transparency at the United Nations, and through our leadership role in the EITI process. Our embassies continue to play an active part in promoting resource transparency and good governance in their host countries.

- b. Do you agree with those who say that one of the most effective ways for the U.S. to show its commitment to extractive industries transparency, and to encourage more transparency by developing countries, would be for the United States to sign on as an EITI implementing country and submit its oil and gas revenues to independent audit? If so, would you commit to taking this step early in the administration?

Answer. Domestic agencies, including many at the state and local levels of government, would have to examine this issue before the U.S. Government could make such a commitment. U.S. markets and systems for reporting revenues from resource extraction are already among the most transparent in the world. Oil and gas and minerals revenues from domestic production are subject to oversight by national, state, and local levels of government as well as the scrutiny of financial markets and our free media.

*Question 159.* How can the administration better engage with China, India, and other emerging markets on issues around extractive industry transparency?

Answer. The U.S. Government has been engaging with China, India, and a number of other governments on the benefits of supporting the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI). Increased transparency will lead to more reliable suppliers of energy and other raw materials. As the countries with the fastest-growing energy consumption, China and India have an interest in expanding global energy supplies and raw materials access from stable countries. If confirmed I will direct State Department staff to continue to engage with China, India, and other emerging economies on EITI bilaterally and multilaterally, including through the United Nations.

*Question 160.* The Senate Foreign Relations Committee report, “The Petroleum and Poverty Paradox: Assessing U.S. and International Community Efforts to Fight the Resource Curse,” asserts that “U.S. bilateral assistance in extractive countries should be focused on good governance, transparency and building civil society.” How do you think U.S. bilateral assistance, through USAID, OPIC, MCC, the U.S. Export Import Bank, and other agencies, should be prioritized in extractive countries?

Answer. In economies dominated by extractive industries, good governance, transparency, and building civil society are critical to providing an environment conducive to sustained poverty reduction and democratic development. The United States and other donors should and do support those efforts with a range of assistance programs, including rule of law and governance reforms, public sector capacity-building, and strengthening of independent media and civil society checks and balances. For these efforts to be successful, the countries themselves must bear primary responsibility for leading this process.

U.S. assistance programs rarely provide direct support to the development of extractive industries. When they do, it is important that we promote and support transparency and accountability in the public sector oversight, revenue collection, and other critical areas of good governance. I am committed to working with my colleagues at OPIC, MCC, the U.S. Export Import Bank, and other relevant agencies to ensure that the United States provides consistent, constructive policy leadership on this issue.

*Question 161.* During the Presidential campaign, you expressed the view that sovereign wealth funds need to be more transparent and that “we need to have a lot more control over what they do and how they do it.”

- c. Will the Obama administration seek to expand transparency of sovereign wealth funds?

Answer. The IMF, in conjunction with the OECD, and other relevant international bodies has articulated the Santiago Principles, which lay out the current thinking on the standards of best practice with regards to sovereign wealth funds. Increasing transparency is a central aim of the Principles. Accordingly, we will seek to increase transparency of sovereign wealth funds.

- d. What role do you expect to have as Secretary with respect to sovereign wealth funds and what steps do you intend to take in this area?

Answer. As Secretary, I will work with the President-elect and the economic team to ensure that U.S. workers reap the benefits of foreign investment while making sure that the investment goals of these funds are transparent and in the broader national interest.

## INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

*Question 162.* The United States provides foreign assistance directly through bilateral agencies and programs as well as multilaterally through the development banks and international organizations. How would you describe oversight of U.S. bilateral and multilateral development funds? Are there steps that should be taken to better monitor U.S. development financing thereby ensuring that our money reaches the intended recipients?

Answer. It is critically important that we put in place a mechanism for transparency and accountability for bilateral and multilateral development funds.

*Question 163.* The United States has committed to promoting transparency at the G-8 and other international venues. What part of the administration should have the lead on promoting transparency? What should be the role of the State Department?

Answer. President-elect Obama has put a high priority on promoting transparency in government more broadly. I look forward to working with the President-elect and the Treasury Department to promote greater transparency at the G-8 and now G-20 as well.

*Question 164.* The United States has participated in multilateral debt relief for the poorest countries so that they can spend their money on poverty reduction and development rather than debt repayment to the international community. Reportedly, some of these countries are now taking loans from emerging creditors such as China. How should the United States respond?

Answer. It would clearly undermine the intended purpose of our multilateral debt relief if the beneficiary countries were to be incurring greater indebtedness from emerging bilateral donors such as China.

I will make it a priority to work with China and other emerging bilateral donors to support the same set of donor practices and principles that have been agreed among the traditional bilateral donors in recent years including on policies intended to reduce indebtedness.

## HUNGER AND FOOD SECURITY

*Question 165.* Precipitous food price increases that occurred in 2007 and 2008 created havoc in many parts of the world, causing riots, often violent, in some 19 countries, and plunging approximately 75 million more people into poverty and increased vulnerability to malnourishment. It is estimated that nearly 1 billion people are presently food insecure. The United States is uniquely situated to help the world feed itself, and has the opportunity to recast its image by making the eradication of hunger one of the most prominent centerpieces of U.S. foreign policy.

- a. Do you agree that hunger should be a more prominent focus of U.S. global engagement?

Answer. Yes. Alleviating hunger is a particular interest of mine and if confirmed, I intend to make it a more prominent focus of U.S. global engagement.

- b. As Secretary, how would you address food insecurity?

Answer. Over many years, we have tended to react to food crises in an ad hoc fashion, waiting for obviously deteriorating situations to turn to crises before reacting. Such delayed reactions are necessarily more costly in human and monetary terms. I intend to make food security a priority in our development programs so that we can invest up front in food production, affordability, security, education, and technology.

*Question 166.* It is predicted that the world's population will grow to such an extent that by 2050, current food demand will double. If we are to avoid further deforestation by increasing land under cultivation, the world will need to rely on technological advances including biotechnology and genetically modified seed. Yet many countries, including those that are chronically food insecure, resist turning to this technology, largely due to European sentiment. What can the United States do to promote agricultural technology in general, and the benefits to be gained from biotechnological advances and food products derived from biotechnology?

Answer. Agricultural biotechnology is a proven but underused tool available to increase crop yields, reduce pressure for agricultural land conservation, and help ensure that people have adequate supplies of nutritious food.

The United States can help developing countries build the capacity to grow more food domestically, and assess and manage potential risks-posed by biotech crops to increase confidence that such technology may be employed in a manner that pre-



serves the health of their people and the diversity of their environment. I also believe that imposition of a global carbon cap when Kyoto expires in 2012 will help incentivize sound agricultural processes and reforestation.

If confirmed, I will examine the issues surrounding these issues and consult with other agencies including the Department of Agriculture over the best way to proceed.

*Question 167.* During the 110th Congress, I introduced S. 3529, the Global Food Security Act, to strengthen and bring greater focus to a range of United States programs designed to promote global food security through long-term investments in agriculture, higher education, and technology. Do you support the objectives and approach of this legislation?

Answer. I support the objective of strengthening and bringing greater focus to U.S. programs designed to promote global food security. If confirmed, I look forward to working with Congress to develop legislation that will achieve these goals.

---

The MOU between the Clinton Foundation and the Presidential Transition Team provides that during your service as Secretary, the Foundation “will publish annually the names of new contributors.” I believe that the interests of transparency and public confidence would be best served if this annual publication also included the amounts contributed by each contributor during the year covered by the report (or the amounts within a dollar range).

*Question 1.* Will you urge the Clinton Foundation to include this information in its annual reporting?

Answer. The Foundation has committed to reporting the amounts contributed by each contributor during the year covered by the report within the dollar ranges consistent with how it published its contributors in December 2008.

\* \* \*

Under the MOU between the Clinton Foundation and the Presidential Transition Team, President Clinton personally will not solicit funds on behalf of the Clinton Global Initiative, but he retains the right personally to solicit funds on behalf of other initiatives of the Clinton Foundation.

*Question 2.* What specific considerations do you believe warrant preventing President Clinton from fundraising on behalf of the Global Initiative during your tenure as Secretary?

Answer. The Foundation and the Office of the President-elect reached agreement on a range of steps that go above and beyond the requirements of the law and the ethics rules. Their goal was to protect against even the appearance of a conflict of interest between his work and the duties of the Secretary of State. Because CGI invites foreign government officials and dignitaries, some of whom are visiting during the annual meeting of the U.N. General Assembly, President Clinton agreed to limit his fundraising efforts on behalf of CGI to avoid any appearance of a conflict of interest.

*Question 3.* Do you believe that these considerations also apply to fundraising on behalf of other Clinton Foundation initiatives? If not, why not?

Answer. While CGI involves the participation of many foreign officials and dignitaries, the other initiatives do not convene such an event with foreign government officials and dignitaries. I also think it is important to observe that the Office of Government Ethics (OGE) and the professional career ethics officials at the State Department have advised that neither the law nor the ethics regulations require President Clinton or the Foundation to take the voluntary steps they have taken. The Foundation is a nonprofit entity—neither my husband nor I have any financial interest.

The Presidential Transition Team, the Foundation, and I also agree that not only would it be unnecessary for my husband to stop fundraising on behalf of the Foundation’s other initiatives, but also that it would be harmful to the millions of lives the Foundation has affected and will affect in the future. The Clinton Foundation, a charitable organization of over 1,100 employees and volunteers working in more than 40 countries around the world, has affected more than 200 million lives, including more than 1.4 million people in the developing world who receive life saving medicine purchased under Clinton Foundation agreements. That is nearly half of all people in the developing countries who receive treatment. If fundraising were to

stop, the Foundation's continued efforts in this and other arenas would be in jeopardy.

\* \* \*

Under the MOU between the Clinton Foundation and the Presidential Transition Team, the Clinton Global Initiative will not accept contributions from foreign governments apart from attendance fees for CGI events. The MOU contains no similar restriction on other Clinton Foundation initiatives accepting contributions from foreign governments.

*Question 4.* What specific considerations do you believe warrant preventing the Global Initiative from accepting contributions from foreign governments during your tenure as Secretary?

Answer. See response to Question 2 above. I also again want to observe that OGE and the professional career ethics officials at the State Department have advised that neither the law nor the ethics regulations require President Clinton or the Foundation to take the voluntary steps they have. Indeed, the Foundation and the Office of the President-elect agreed upon a range of steps that go above and beyond the requirements of the law and the ethics rules to ensure that even the appearance of a conflict of interest between his work and the duties of the Secretary of State was avoided.

*Question 5.* Do you believe that these considerations also apply to Clinton Foundation initiatives other than the Global Initiative accepting contributions from foreign governments? If not, why not?

Answer. See response to Question 3. The Clinton Foundation is combating climate change, childhood obesity and HIV/AIDS and it is bringing economic opportunity to people in America and around the world. NGOs like the Foundation bridge the gap between what governments can do and what is needed to be done. Since its inception foreign governments have been valuable partners of the Foundation, especially its HIV/AIDS work. For example, in the last 3 years alone, the Clinton HIV/AIDS Initiative has shown that it is possible and economically feasible to provide treatment for children. In partnership with UNITAID, an international drug and diagnostic purchasing facility, and with financial help from other governments, the Clinton Foundation now supports the treatment of approximately two-thirds of all children on HIV/AIDS treatment in the world. Governments' support is vital to this effort. All of these relationships with foreign governments were forged in advance of any consideration by President-elect Obama to nominate me to be Secretary of State and they should continue in support of such socially responsible work.

The Memorandum of Understanding provides that should an existing contributing country elect to materially increase its commitment to the Foundation, or should a new contributor country elect to support a Foundation initiative, the Foundation will share the proposed contribution with the State Department's professional career ethics officials for review, and as appropriate the State Department's ethics officials will submit the matter for review to the White House Counsel's Office. In the event the State Department or White House has concerns, those concerns will be conveyed to me and to the Foundation for appropriate action.

\* \* \*

Under the MOU between the Clinton Foundation and the Presidential Transition Team, the State Department's professional career ethics officials will review proposed contributions to the Clinton Foundation from foreign governments to identify any potential ethics concerns. The MOU provides no similar review process for contributions by foreign individuals or companies. I believe that contributions from foreign individuals and companies have the potential to raise appearances of conflicts of interest that are as serious as those raised by contributions from foreign governments.

*Question 6.* In order to minimize such risks, will you consider urging the Clinton Foundation to follow the same ethics review process for proposed contributions of more than \$50,000 from nongovernmental foreign sources that it has agreed under the MOU to follow for all proposed contributions from foreign governments?

Answer. I understand and appreciate the suggestion; however, the agreement as written already goes far beyond what any spouse of a Cabinet official has ever done in terms of both limitations on the Clinton Foundation and on my husband's own actions as a private individual. Indeed, OGE and the professional career ethics officials at the State Department have advised that neither the law nor the ethics regu-

lations require President Clinton or the Foundation to take the voluntary steps they have taken. I believe the extraordinary steps already being taken are sufficient to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest.

\* \* \*

Under the MOU between the Clinton Foundation and the Presidential Transition Team, in the event that State Department or White House ethics officials have concerns about a proposed contribution to the Clinton Foundation that are related to your service as Secretary of State “those concerns will be conveyed to [you] and to the Clinton Foundation for appropriate action.”

*Question 7.* Under this arrangement, who will make the final decision about whether the Clinton Foundation will accept a contribution about which the State Department or White House has ethics concerns?

Answer. The Clinton Foundation, as an independent entity with its own fiduciary obligations, has to decide whether to accept or decline a contribution. The Foundation has made clear that it will be guided by the advice of the State Department’s professional career ethics officials under the terms of the Memorandum of Understanding. If the Foundation does accept a contribution about which the State Department has conflict of interest concerns, it would be with the understanding that the State Department’s professional career ethics officials have recommended appropriate actions to address any such actual or perceived conflict.

*Question 8.* Do you anticipate having a personal role in deciding, in light of State Department and White House ethics advice, whether the Clinton Foundation will accept particular contributions?

Answer. No, I have no authority over or involvement in the fundraising or operations of the Foundation, so I cannot make decisions about particular contributions. The Memorandum of Understanding sets out the terms under which the Foundation and I will be guided by the State Department’s professional career ethics officials.

*Question 9.* In the event that the Clinton Foundation accepts a contribution about which State Department or White House ethics officials have expressed concerns that are related to your service as Secretary of State, do you intend to take any steps to notify the public of this fact and of the reasons the contribution was accepted in spite of the ethics concerns?

Answer. President Clinton and the Foundation have agreed to an unprecedented level of transparency and review. I know that all parties will comply with the review process. The Foundation, President Clinton, and I will be guided by the advice from the State Department’s professional career ethics officials—who may recommend recusal or other actions in response to a potential contribution, as opposed to recommending the Foundation decline it, and heed the recommendations provided. In following their guidance, I do not anticipate any publication of their guidance and the Foundation’s actions with respect to their advice. Under the MOU between the Clinton Foundation and the Presidential Transition Team, the Clinton Foundation has agreed to “publish annually the names of new contributors.”

*Question 10.* Do you believe it would enhance transparency and increase public confidence if the Clinton Foundation were to disclose large donations (e.g., those over \$50,000) at the time the donation is made, rather than waiting until the end of the year?

Answer. I understand and appreciate the suggestion; however, the agreement already goes far beyond what any spouse of a Cabinet official has ever done in terms of both limitations on his Foundation and his own actions as a private individual and the amount of transparency and disclosure that is being provided. And, OGE and the professional career ethics officials at the State Department have advised that neither the law nor the ethics regulations require President Clinton or the Foundation to take the voluntary steps they have. I believe the steps already being taken are sufficient to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest.

\* \* \*

As drafted, the MOU between the Clinton Foundation and the Presidential Transition Team would not require the Clinton Foundation to disclose pledges it receives of amounts to be contributed in the future. Such amounts would be disclosed only in the year in which the Foundation receives the funds (assuming they are received during your tenure as Secretary of State). This would appear to permit donors to pledge to contribute funds to the Clinton Foundation during your tenure as Secretary, but to avoid public disclosure of their contributions so long as funds are not

actually transferred to the Clinton Foundation until after the end of your tenure as Secretary.

*Question 11.* Do you believe it would enhance transparency and increase public confidence if the Clinton Foundation were to disclose large pledges (e.g., those over \$50,000) at the time such pledges are made, in addition to disclosing the contributions themselves in the years in which the money is contributed?

Answer. I understand and appreciate the suggestion; however, the agreement already goes far beyond what any spouse of a Cabinet official has ever done in terms of both limitations on his Foundation and his own actions as a private individual and the amount of transparency and disclosure that is being provided. And, OGE and the professional career ethics officials at the State Department have advised that neither the law nor the ethics regulations require President Clinton or the Foundation to take the voluntary steps they have. The MOU already provides for the professional career ethics officials at the State Department to review proposed contributions from foreign countries; as pledges are synonymous with proposed contributions in this instance, they will review such pledges as well. I believe the steps already being taken are sufficient to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest.

---

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RUSSELL FEINGOLD

*Question.* Iraq. Our top national security concern must be the global fight against al-Qaeda and its affiliates, as well as the related struggle to prevent the expansion of safe havens or recruiting opportunities for our enemies around the globe. How we allocate our resources—the tools used in this struggle—are key to winning this fight and without a more global and comprehensive approach, we will be unable to make our country, or the world, a safer place. The current administration's decision to focus resources on Iraq has been a tragic mistake. Accordingly, please share your vision of how will you follow up on President-elect Obama's pledge to redeploy the bulk of our troops from Iraq in 16 months? What steps do you expect the State Department will take to help ensure that transition occurs as safely and as smoothly as possible?

Answer. The incoming administration will proceed with the following overall strategy and core principles, which we will bring to this set of security challenges. First, as we all know, Iraq is a sovereign country, and the steps we take on security matters moving forward will have to be taken in consultation with the Iraqis. We will certainly do our best to press the Iraqi Government to combat sectarianism in their security forces—and we will tie future training and equipping resources to progress on this front. Improved Iraqi security forces cannot fully replace U.S. forces in protecting reconstruction personnel, but they can certainly help, if the Iraqis step up. And our residual force will play a continued force protection role. Second, we will take additional steps to help the Iraqi Government consolidate the security gains that have been made in the past 2 years—gains that have facilitated more intensive and effective rebuilding and aid efforts. That will include an intensive diplomatic and political strategy, including an effort to forge a comprehensive compact with Iraq's neighbors. Third, we will pay particular attention to the humanitarian crisis in Iraq, which risks destabilizing parts of the country, including an aggressive effort to assist displaced Iraqis. But these are serious challenges, and much of this turns on the capacity and willingness of the Iraqis themselves.

*Question.* Chief of Mission Authority. Over the past 8 years we have seen our military take on a broader role in counterterrorism operations around the world. Vital to the State Department's ability to maintain the helm of our foreign policy agenda, however, is a commitment from all U.S. departments and agencies to uphold Chief of Mission authority. Unfortunately, I have come across instances in which that authority has been challenged, or even compromised. What steps would you take, as Secretary of State, to ensure this authority is upheld and enforced, with regard to the military as well as to the Intelligence Community?

Answer. I believe that the authority of the President's Chiefs of Mission overseas must be unambiguous and sacrosanct. In individual Letters of Instruction to each Chief of Mission (COM), the President gives the Chiefs of Mission full responsibility for the direction, coordination, and supervision of all U.S. Government employees within the host country or in the relevant mission to an international organization, with limited exceptions. National Security Decision Directive (NSDD) 38 gives Chiefs of Mission full responsibility for the size, composition, and mandate of overseas staffing.

Chief of Mission authority is essential to ensuring that there is unity of effort in implementing the President's policies and pursuing our national interests overseas.

As Secretary, I would do everything in my power to support Chiefs of Mission in exercising the authority and fulfilling the responsibilities that the President gives them. Such steps may include conducting periodic reviews of interagency operations and providing revised guidance, as appropriate.

*Question.* Great Lakes. The situation in the Great Lakes region of Africa continues to be very dire—with already troublesome humanitarian crises exacerbated by renewed fighting in eastern Congo and the recent massacres by Lord's Resistance Army in Congo and Sudan. As Secretary of State, what will be your strategy to bring lasting peace and stability to this region of the continent? What further steps can be taken by the United States, key regional actors, and the international community to help address illegal armed groups in this region and end these ongoing crises?

Answer. The situation in Congo is deeply disturbing. The President-elect and I have both supported efforts on behalf of a lasting solution to Congo's political disputes. The Obama administration will work to support disarmament and demobilization in the Congo, recognizing the challenges that persist there.

*Question.* Middle East Peace Process. Many experts believe that in order to have real progress on a Middle East Peace Process the United States must play a leading role, but it is essential to have greater participation and the support of Arab countries in the region. Do you believe this is an accurate reflection of what needs to happen and if so, in light of the recent conflict in Gaza, what steps will the State Department take to make this possible?

Answer. I believe the Arab states have an important role to play in advancing efforts to achieve peace between Israelis and Palestinians. Their chief means to do so are providing political and economic support to the Palestinian Authority, and taking steps toward normalization with Israel. The Arab Peace Initiative contains some constructive elements which could be important bases for negotiations and for proactive steps to give the initiative a more operational character. I look forward to discussing these opportunities with Israeli, Palestinian, and Arab leaders and encouraging progress in these efforts.

*Question.* More generally, what framework do you envision for future negotiations? Do you expect to have a special envoy and if so, what would be the mandate and how would that person work with the current envoys currently in the region—including General Jones, General Dayton, and Tony Blair?

Answer. General Jones, General Selva, and General Dayton have each played important and constructive roles in advancing U.S. efforts to promote peace between Israel and the Palestinians. Former Prime Minister Blair has also made an excellent contribution as the Quartet's special envoy, promoting economic development and institution-building in the Palestinian areas. No decisions have been made about the personnel structure we will use to implement our Middle East peace efforts, but each of the important functions carried forward by the generals and Prime Minister Blair will need to be continued in whatever structure we ultimately decide upon.

*Question.* LGBT. There is widespread recognition of the need to build a more robust and effective diplomatic and development corps. As part of that effort, it makes sense to consider ways to address challenges faced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) employees, particularly relating to domestic partner benefits and State Department policies that make it difficult for the partners of Foreign Service officers to travel and live at overseas posts. What would you do as Secretary of State to address these concerns? Will you support changes to existing personnel policies in order to ensure that LGBT staff at State and USAID receive equal benefits and support? What steps will you take to ensure that LGBT issues are taken into consideration in both organizational and policy decisionmaking?

Answer. As we discussed in the hearing, this issue was brought to my attention during the transition, I've asked to have more briefing on it because I think that we should take a hard look at the existing policy. I know that many other diplomatic services, including those of our closest allies, have gone much further in providing training, protections, and benefits to the partners of LGBT employees. I will consult with you and keep you informed of the decisions we make going forward on this issue.

As to ensuring that LGBT concerns are addressed in policy decisionmaking, President-elect Obama said during the campaign that human rights violations based on sexual orientation must "be part and parcel of any conversations we have about

human rights.” If confirmed, I will work to ensure that our country stands on principle against human rights abuse or prejudice of any kind.

*Question.* Local Health Systems. Despite the massive investment the United States has made in global health over the years, many health systems in the developing world remain unable to meet local and national needs. How can the State Department do more to ensure that our global health assistance programs are strengthening local health care delivery systems and infrastructure, as well as increasing the numbers and capacity of local health care workers?

*Answer.* The President-elect and I agree that we need to invest even more in local health care delivery systems and infrastructure, and we intend to make this a priority. As one example, the new administration will work to more effectively coordinate PEPFAR with programs to strengthen health care delivery and address other global health challenges. It will work with developing nations to help them build the health infrastructure necessary to get sick people treated—more money for hospitals and medical equipment, and more training for nurses and doctors.

*Question.* Nuclear Weapons. You have endorsed the view of Henry Kissinger, Sam Nunn, and other prominent nuclear and global experts—including Secretary General Ki-moon—that we must reinvigorate our commitment to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in order to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and the potential for nuclear terrorism, including in countries like Iran. They have argued that one of the key barriers to countering those threats is that nonnuclear weapons states have “grown increasingly skeptical of the sincerity of the nuclear powers” efforts to divest themselves of nuclear weapons, as required by that treaty. While I concur that for the time being we must maintain a reliable deterrent, please share your view on whether reductions are needed to rebuild faith in the NPT. If so, what steps would you pursue to make this a reality? What impact would the pursuit of new nuclear weapons by the United States have on our ability to realize these objectives?

*Answer.* The Obama administration will have no higher national security priority than preventing nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism. Achieving those vital goals will require close cooperation with a wide range of international partners on such matters as strengthening the IAEA verification system, tightening controls on the transfer of sensitive nuclear technologies, and adopting effective means of enforcing compliance with nonproliferation obligations. To gain the support of those international partners for measures to reinforce the global nonproliferation regime, it is important that the United States and other nuclear weapon states party to the NPT demonstrate that they are serious about fulfilling their own NPT obligation to pursue nuclear disarmament.

The Obama administration will therefore set a new direction in nuclear weapons policy, a direction headed toward the ultimate elimination of all nuclear weapons worldwide. An early priority will be to work with the Russians on a new, verifiable agreement to replace the START Treaty. We will reach out to the Senate to secure the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and then launch a diplomatic effort to bring the treaty into force. We will seek to get negotiations underway on a verifiable treaty to prohibit the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons. As long as nuclear weapons exist, the United States must retain a strong, safe, secure, and reliable nuclear deterrent. But the Obama administration will not authorize the development of new nuclear weapons. By restoring America’s leadership role in reducing and eventually eliminating nuclear weapons, we will increase our leverage to build broad international support for measures needed to prevent nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism.

*Question.* Will pledges for future contributions to the Clinton Foundation from domestic donors be subject to the same review process as those from foreign governments? If not, please provide an explanation as to why such pledges for domestic contributions would not raise the same issues, and should not trigger the same review process applied to foreign contributions under the Memorandum of Understanding.

*Answer.* Should I be confirmed as Secretary of State, the Memorandum of Understanding between the Clinton Foundation and the Office of the President-elect provides that all future contributions to the Clinton Foundation—both domestic and foreign—will be subject to annual disclosure by the Clinton Foundation. Additionally, proposed new contributions from foreign governments or a proposed material increase in the contribution from a current foreign government donor to the Clinton Foundation will be reviewed by the State Department’s professional career ethics officials who will advise me and the Clinton Foundation of any concerns as they relate to my service as Secretary of State. As I was not a party to MOU discussions

between the Clinton Foundation and the Office of the President-elect, I am not in a position to address why specific decisions were made, but I do know that they were focused on avoiding even the appearance of a conflict of interest given the unique issues regarding foreign government contributions.

Ultimately, however, there is no conflict between the foreign policy or domestic policy of the United States and the efforts of the Clinton Foundation seeking to reduce human suffering and increase opportunity for people in need. That has been demonstrated quite clearly in President Clinton's and former President Bush's efforts to raise relief funds, including from foreign governments and others, after Katrina and the tsunami.

*Question.* While the Clinton Global Initiative will no longer accept contributions from foreign governments, the other initiatives that comprise the Clinton Foundation will continue to accept contributions from foreign governments. Please provide an explanation as to why these initiatives will still receive such contributions. In addition, while the Memorandum of Understanding does seek to address this issue, it notes that "appropriate action" will be taken if there is a concern about a proposed contribution. Please describe, under these circumstances, what you think "appropriate action" might entail.

*Answer.* The Clinton Foundation and the Office of the President-elect reached agreement on a range of steps that go above and beyond the requirements of the law and the ethics rules. Their goal was to avoid even the appearance of a conflict of interest between the Foundation's work and the duties of the Secretary of State. In that regard, they took into account that CGI invites foreign government officials and dignitaries to its annual event, some of whom are visiting during the annual meeting of the U.N. General Assembly, in reaching agreement that CGI would no longer accept contributions from foreign governments.

With respect to all of the other initiatives, any relationships with foreign governments were forged prior to any consideration by President-elect Obama to nominate me to be Secretary of State and they should continue in support of such socially responsible work. These initiatives involve programs that combat HIV/AIDS, climate change, childhood obesity, and bring economic opportunity to people in America and around the world. Foreign governments have been valuable partners in these Foundation initiatives since their inception, particularly with respect to its HIV/AIDS work. For example, in partnership with UNITAID, an international drug and diagnostic purchasing facility, and the financial help from other governments, the Clinton Foundation now supports the treatment of approximately two-thirds of all children on HIV/AIDS treatment in the world.

To avoid any appearance of conflict concerns, the MOU specifically provides that should an existing contributing country elect to materially increase its commitment to the Foundation, or should a new contributor country elect to support a Foundation initiative, the Foundation will share the proposed contribution with the State Department's professional career ethics officials for review. In the event the State Department or White House has concerns, those concerns will be conveyed to me and to the Foundation for appropriate action based on consideration of all the facts and guidance from the professional career ethics officials. The Foundation is unlikely to pursue an opportunity that presents a conflict unless the State Department's professional career ethics officials recommend recusal, or taking some other appropriate actions to mitigate any perceived conflict. I will be guided by their advice.

---

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR BARBARA BOXER

*Question.* In a speech at the United States Institute of Peace, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates recently spoke of a problem that has continued to plague U.S. efforts in Afghanistan—the failure of many NATO allies to remove restrictions on their forces.

Specifically, Secretary Gates said: "NATO's operations are hamstrung by national caveats, where different countries impose different rules on where their forces can go and what they can do. A number of our allies and partners have stepped forward courageously—showing a willingness to take physical risks on the battlefield and political risks at home. But many have defense budgets that are so low, and coalition governments that are so precarious, that they cannot provide the quantity or type of forces needed for this kind of fight."

- Are you satisfied by the troop commitment from our NATO allies and with the flexibility they have given their forces to perform various missions?

- If confirmed, how will you work to ensure that our NATO allies are committed to our effort, both politically and militarily?

Answer. The Obama administration deeply appreciates the continued commitment of our NATO allies and other partners to the international mission in Afghanistan. These countries provide over 31,000 troops, accounting for over half the strength of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). Our allies and partners recognize that securing Afghanistan against the threat posed by extremists and terrorists and providing a better future for the Afghan people is in our common interest.

Troop shortfalls and caveats that limit the flexibility of ISAF forces remain a challenge in Afghanistan. While there has been some limited progress in this area recently, the United States continues to impress upon our allies and partners the importance of providing the commanders on the ground the forces they need and allowing them maximum possible flexibility in the employment of those forces.

If confirmed, I look forward to consulting with our allies and partners to seek their views on the situation in-country as we review our Afghanistan strategy and make changes where necessary. As President Obama has made clear, if the United States increases our civilian and military presence in Afghanistan, we will look to our allies to join us in providing the resources necessary to help the Government of Afghanistan secure its country against violent extremists.

*Question.* What is President Obama's strategy for Afghanistan, and what is your definition of victory?

Answer. There have been several reviews of our strategy in Afghanistan in recent months. One is being conducted under the direction of General Petraeus, through CENTCOM, another by the Joint Staff, and a third by the National Security Council. The administration will review these reviews. We will also consult with our allies and partners, who have contributed a great deal to the efforts in Afghanistan, to solicit their thoughts on the way ahead. This process will take some time, but it will lead to our identifying a clear set of discrete goals that we are trying to achieve.

Afghanistan is going to be a long and difficult effort, but as Secretary Gates stated, we can attain our strategic objectives—for Afghanistan to be a reliable, stable ally, capable of effectively governing its territories and borders, and no longer providing an operating base for al-Qaeda.

*Question.* How do we ensure that we are using our military in the proper way, particularly as we commit more Americans to Afghanistan, and ask their families for further sacrifice?

Answer. There is broad agreement that there can be no purely military solution to the war in Afghanistan. However, to date there have not been enough troops—neither international nor Afghan—on the ground to create the security conditions necessary to allow for an effective counterinsurgency strategy to take hold. This has particularly been the case in southern and eastern Afghanistan, where the void is increasingly filled by the Taliban. The United States is considering a further increase in our military presence, and we will look to our NATO allies and the Government of Afghanistan to do more as well. Additional troops will not only improve security, but they will also help train the Afghan National Police and the Afghan National Army, which will dramatically increase in size over the next 2 years.

Over the coming year we will see improvements in the security situation, better civil-military coordination, and more effective counterinsurgency efforts. The impact of both our military and rebuilding efforts will be felt more concretely by the Afghan people, who will ultimately be responsible for the future of their nation.

*Question.* How long do you foresee a substantial U.S. presence in Afghanistan?

Answer. The situation in Afghanistan is extremely difficult and complex, and it will not be solved easily or quickly. The border region in Pakistan, where al-Qaeda leaders remain in hiding, is the central front in the fight against terrorism. We will use all the elements of our power—diplomacy, development, and defense—to work with those in Afghanistan and Pakistan who want to root out al-Qaeda, the Taliban, and other violent extremists.

There have been several reviews of our strategy in Afghanistan in recent months. One is being conducted under the direction of General Petraeus, through CENTCOM, another by the Joint Staff, and a third by the National Security Council. The administration will review these reviews. We will also consult with our allies and partners, who have contributed a great deal to the efforts in Afghanistan, to solicit their thoughts on the way ahead. This process will take some time, but it will lead to our identifying a clear set of discrete goals that we are trying to



achieve and help us to determine how long there will be a substantial U.S. presence in Afghanistan.

*Question.* Do you think the United States should take a leadership role in the world in fighting global warming?

If so, how do you believe we should change course?

*Answer.* Yes. Climate change is a complex, urgent, and global threat. The United States will take the lead in addressing the climate crisis by making commitments of our own and engaging other nations to do the same.

We recognize that feasible solutions will require all major nations joining together. Special Envoy for Climate Change Todd Stern will be the administration's chief climate negotiator, leading our efforts with the United Nations negotiations and those at the subglobal, regional, and bilateral level.

*Question.* I have consistently said that an end to the violence in Darfur and a lasting peace in Sudan will require a negotiated solution between the Government of Sudan and rebel groups in Darfur. The United States led the efforts to broker a historic agreement—the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA)—which ended a 20-year civil war between the Government of Sudan and Southern Sudanese rebels. That civil war had claimed over 2 million lives. The Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA), in contrast, has fallen apart.

President Bush's first special envoy for Sudan, Senator John Danforth, played a critical role in forging the CPA. Will the Obama administration appoint a high-level special envoy for Sudan to lead American efforts end the genocide in Darfur?

What diplomatic actions is the Obama administration prepared to take to forge a lasting peace in Sudan?

*Answer.* I believe that the Darfur conflict requires a political solution that must be achieved through an inclusive negotiated settlement. There is no military solution to this conflict.

U.S. special envoys have in the past aided peace in Sudan. As you mentioned, Senator Danforth was instrumental in bringing the parties together to negotiate the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). Ambassador Natsios and Ambassador Williamson both made crucial efforts to bring the Darfur parties to a negotiated settlement to that conflict. This administration will consider the appointment of a new special envoy for Sudan.

The United States will continue to lead diplomatic initiatives aimed at helping the parties to reach a negotiated agreement to end the conflict in Darfur and to push for continued implementation of the CPA. The United States supports the ongoing efforts of United Nations/African Union (AU) joint chief mediator Djibril Bassole to quickly reach a framework agreement outlining the next steps in the Darfur peace process, and appreciates the facilitating efforts of the Government of Qatar. The United States will continue to work with the parties in Sudan, the U.N., the AU, and key members of the international community, including members of the U.N. Security Council and Sudan's neighbors, to push for a resolution to the conflict in Darfur and implementation of CPA provisions, including North-South border demarcation, resolution of the Abyei dispute, and the holding of national elections in 2009 and a Southern referendum in 2011.

*Question.* What steps will you take to reinvigorate the international community's efforts to provide protection to Darfuri and other Sudanese civilians who are at risk?

*Answer.* The United States has led the international response to the protection of civilians throughout the Sudan. In 2005, we led the United Nations Security Council on the creation of the U.N. Mission in the Sudan (UNMIS); UNMIS has assisted the parties in North and South Sudan to implement the terms of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and enabled the delivery of humanitarian assistance as well as the protection and promotion of human rights. We will continue to work with UNMIS and with the Assessment and Evaluation Commission (AEC) to ensure that the CPA remains on track, particularly with Sudan's 2009 national elections and with the need to find a lasting solution to the disputed North-South border region. Additionally, we will continue to urge the U.N. and UNMIS to ensure the presence of adequate security forces and resources to protect vulnerable citizens in the UNMIS area of operations, particularly Abyei.

To protect Darfuri internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees, the United States also led efforts in 2007 at the Security Council to get a Chapter VII-mandated force for Darfur. We remain committed to seeing this 26,000-troop United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) deployed as quickly as possible. To this end, we are airlifting containers of peacekeepers' equipment and supplies into Darfur this month. In addition to reinforcing the Darfur peacekeeping operation, we will keep pressure on all parties to the Darfur conflict to commit to the

peace process led by Joint Chief Mediator Bassolé and to participate in talks to be hosted by Qatar. The recent violence in North and South Darfur has reportedly claimed civilian lives and must stop. We will continue to lead at the Security Council to preserve the integrity of its resolutions on Darfur in the quest for a political solution to the crisis.

In addition, USAID is saving lives in Darfur by supporting the basic needs of people living in IDP camps and other underserved areas, including food, water, sanitation and health. Our initiatives help to mitigate the effects of conflict, protect vulnerable people and support nascent efforts to promote a peaceful resolution to the crisis. USAID has provided displaced women with skills and resources to pursue income-generating activities that reduce the risk of sexual violence, expanded monitoring of human rights violations in Darfur and supported precedent-setting prosecution of sexual violence cases.

*Question.* The Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 established the position of Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues in the State Department. It is currently posted at the Under Secretary level in Democracy and Global Affairs.

- Do you intend to appoint a Special Coordinator at a high level, with adequate resources and access, to signal the Tibet issue's importance to the U.S. Government?

*Answer.* We are still looking at the issue of personnel appointments, but I can assure you that I take Tibetan issues seriously and plan to appoint a well-qualified coordinator, and I will ensure the coordinator has the resources to do the job.

We are disappointed with China's human rights record, including with regard to its respect for human rights and religious freedom in Tibet. We will raise our concerns about this issue at the highest levels with the Chinese Government and press for progress. The Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues will sustain our focus on these issues and will promote substantive dialogue, directed at achieving meaningful results, between the Dalai Lama and his representatives and the Chinese Government. We believe such talks provide the best hope for resolving longstanding tensions in Tibetan areas and for safeguarding the distinct ethnic, cultural, and religious identity of the Tibetan people.

---

#### RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR BILL NELSON

##### HOLOCAUST RESTITUTION ISSUES

*Question.* The Office of the Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues serves a critically important task of developing and implementing U.S. policy with respect to the return of Holocaust-era assets to their rightful owners, compensation for wrongs committed during the Holocaust, and Holocaust remembrance.

What will you do as Secretary of State to encourage those countries to take action, given that the countries were unjustly enriched when they nationalized insurance companies that never paid their policies to Holocaust victims and their surviving relatives?

*Answer.* Compensation for wrongs committed during the Holocaust will be a priority for the State Department. If confirmed, I will continue to work to ensure that Holocaust survivors and the heirs of Holocaust victims obtain compensation for stolen property. In cases where nationalized insurance companies failed to pay claims or provide compensation to victims or heirs, I will instruct, if confirmed, the U.S. Special Envoy to work vigorously toward a resolution of the matter.

*Question.* Will the United States be an active participant in the international conference on Holocaust issues, including assets, that is being held in Prague in June 2009 as part of the Czech Republic's European Union Presidency?

*Answer.* My understanding is that the United States plans to participate very actively in the Prague Conference and is working closely with the Czech Republic to ensure that this Conference conducts a review of what progress has been made on Holocaust era assets issues and what additional steps should be taken. The U.S. Special Envoy for Holocaust Issues was in Prague January 26 to discuss the Conference and hosted a Czech delegation in Washington in November. I understand that the specific issues that the conference will address include the restitution of, or compensation for, confiscated property (real and movable); Jewish religious items displaced during the war; implementation of compensation programs established in 2000 and 2001; and Holocaust education.

*Question.* If confirmed as Secretary of State, how will you work with your counterparts at the Defense and Justice Departments to create improved cooperation,

coordination and accountability to confront the problem of sexual assault against contractors in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere?

Answer. Last year, the Department of State's Bureau of Diplomatic Security established a dedicated special investigations unit in Washington, DC, staffed with trained and experienced investigators for the purpose of responding to and investigating sexual assaults and other violent crimes involving Chief of Mission personnel and contractors throughout the world. The investigators in this unit routinely liaise with their counterparts in the Justice and Defense Departments, as well as with host country authorities, to pursue the successful investigation and prosecution of sexual assaults involving U.S. Government personnel and contractors. As Secretary, I will ensure that the Department of State continues to pursue sexual assault violations that fall within our purview to the full extent of the law, and pledge to assist and work closely with DOD and DOJ elements where appropriate.

*Question.* How will you pursue the issue of contractor accountability more generally if confirmed as Secretary of State?

Answer. I strongly support efforts to achieve legal accountability for unlawful acts that the Department's contractors may commit abroad. As Secretary, I will ask my legal and legislative staffs to promptly review available options in this regard and to consult with the Department of Justice and other federal agencies.

#### SUDAN

*Question.* Since the United Nations Security Council imposed a full arms embargo on all belligerents in Darfur in 2005, it has been violated frequently.

- What steps will you take to pressure countries such as China and Russia to suspend arms shipments to Sudan?
- What other measures—within a unilateral, bilateral, or multilateral framework—will the U.S. Government adopt to ensure that arms are not transferred to Darfur, a region where mass atrocities are taking place?
- The U.N. panel of experts that monitors the embargo has recommended that the embargo be expanded to cover all of Sudan, Chad, and northern parts of the Central African Republic. Do you support expansion of the embargo?
- If confirmed as Secretary of State, what measures can the United States take to ensure that the embargo is enforced?

Answer. The United States remains committed to finding a lasting political solution to the situation in Darfur through the exercise of every tool available, whether diplomatic, economic, or security related.

The presence of weapons, despite the existence of a U.N. arms embargo covering the shipment of weapons into that area, is a significant contributing factor to the violence in Darfur. The willingness of some parties to overlook the implications of their engagement with the Government of Sudan (GOS) and contribution to the proliferation of weapons into Darfur is unfortunate. At this time we are examining the best and most productive method by which to address the situation in Darfur, including the possible expansion of an arms embargo to cover all of Sudan. While this approach presents obstacles to other areas of our assistance, including our efforts to support the Southern Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA), we are reviewing policy options.

I can assure you of my enduring commitment to maintaining U.S. support for U.N. actions to strengthen the arms embargo. My efforts will include a commitment to the ongoing support of the UNSC Sudan Sanctions Committee's Panel of Experts (POE) and its mandate to monitor the implementation of the arms embargo and the targeted sanctions.

---

#### RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS BY SENATOR ROBERT MENENDEZ

##### CUBA POLICY

Family travel and remittances to Cuba are specifically addressed in section 112 of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act, which stresses the will of Congress that the President:

(1) Before considering the reinstatement of general licenses for family remittances to Cuba, insist that, prior to such reinstatement, the Cuban Government permit the unfettered operation of small businesses fully empowered with the right to hire others to whom they may pay wages and to buy materials necessary in the operation of the businesses, and with such other authority and freedom as are required to foster the operation of small businesses throughout Cuba.

(2) Before considering the reinstatement of general licenses for travel to Cuba by individuals resident in the United States who are family members of Cuban nationals who are resident in Cuba, insist on such actions by the Cuban Government as abrogation of the sanction for departure from Cuba by refugees, release of political prisoners, recognition of the right of association, and other fundamental freedoms.

I understand that 59 of the 75 independent journalists and democratic opposition leaders that were arrested in the spring of 2004 and arbitrarily given 20–30 year sentences remain in prison in isolated, deplorable conditions. In addition, thousands of others arrested before and since that time also remain in prison.

*Question.* Do you have any intentions of recommending changes to Cuba family travel policy or remittances policy beyond the 2004 regulations? If so, please specifically outline the changes to Cuba policy that you would recommend.

*Answer.* There are many ways that we can send a message to the Cuban people that the United States intends to play a positive role in their future. The President believes that Cuban-Americans especially can be important ambassadors for change in Cuba. As such, he believes that it makes both moral and strategic sense to lift the restrictions on family visits and family cash remittances to Cuba. The administration will consult with Congress as we prepare these changes.

President Obama also believes that it is not time to lift the embargo on Cuba, especially since it provides an important source of leverage for further change on the island.

*Question.* President-elect Obama pledged to double foreign assistance by 2012 and stated that he would ensure that it focuses on bottom-up development. Exactly how will this goal be met? Specifically, how do you see resource levels for foreign assistance in the coming years? Given our critical economic problems, it is inevitable that efforts will be made to limit or reduce our spending on foreign assistance—how will you resist those efforts?

*Answer.* President Obama remains committed to his goal of doubling foreign assistance, and intends to do so in a responsible manner. He recognizes that the budgetary constraints resulting from the current economic crisis may extend the timeframe for realizing this increase. Working in partnership with Congress, we are prepared to make smart, strategic budget choices that deal with our problems here at home while also continuing our investment and where appropriate increasing support for effective programs that save lives, strengthen our security, and restore America's position in the world.

President Obama plans to put forward a robust FY 2010 budget request. The President and I will fight for these resources by investing them wisely with strong accountability measures and ensuring they are directed toward strategic goals. I hope that Congress will work with us in meeting the goal of doubling foreign assistance, and fully fund the President's budget request.

*Question.* Who would control Foreign Assistance in your State Department? What would be the role of Deputy Secretary of State Jack Lew vis-a-vis USAID? Who will have budget authority over USAID? Do you see this as an elevation of stature over the current structure?

*Answer.* These are important strategic issues. Jack Lew will be responsible for assisting me in the comprehensive management of the operations and resources of the Department. I intend to review closely all options, including those of authority and structure, and will look forward to consulting with the Congress as we move forward.

#### DEPUTY POSITION AT THE NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

*Question.* If there were a Deputy position created for International Development at the National Security Council, how would the position interact with the Deputy Secretary of State and who would be setting budget and funding priorities for USAID?

*Answer.* President Obama and I are committed to elevating development in U.S. foreign policy. The administration will be promptly reviewing whether fulfilling that objective will necessitate changes such as the creation of positions at the National Security Council. We look forward to hearing your thoughts and consulting with the Congress as we move forward.

#### MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION (MCC)

*Question.* The MCC has had some problems getting started—the goals were too ambitious, the disbursements were slow, the money was not “additive” as promised. However, I believe the MCC will offer some important learning and may very well

turn out to be an effective component of our overall foreign assistance toolkit and should by no means be “scrapped.”

- What do you see as the future of the MCC?
- Will the USAID Administrator have oversight responsibility of the MCC?

Answer. The State Department will continue to support MCC and its underlying principle of greater accountability in our foreign assistance programs. The MCC’s mission of sustainable poverty reduction through long-term development is an important asset in America’s smart power toolbox, and its focus on country ownership and accountability has helped build local capacity, encourage broad civil society consultation, and advance policy reform. The MCC’s resources have proven to be a powerful incentive for countries to demonstrate their commitment to strengthening good governance, economic freedom, and investments in people. As I review our development assistance framework and goals, I will consider how best to build on the promise of MCC within the administration’s overall development assistance strategy.

We intend to review how the MCC programs can best be coordinated and leveraged, and we look forward to consulting with the Congress as we move forward.

#### INSTITUTION-BUILDING

*Question.* I supported President Bush’s PEPFAR and Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) initiatives. However, I was concerned that funding for those initiatives would come at the expense of long-term development programs that, at their core, focus on building up the institutions of governance overseas that will ultimately need to take over and provide basic services to their people.

In many cases, this is exactly what happened.

- If confirmed, how would you prioritize long-term development programs in the context of initiatives like PEPFAR and the MCC to make sure that we are still investing in long-run welfare of the institutions of governance overseas?

Answer. President Obama has emphasized the importance of development assistance to America’s foreign policy and national security. And we are both committed to doubling foreign assistance. The totals have to grow.

Clearly, PEPFAR has experienced much success. MCC represents a worthy new approach to reducing poverty and sustaining economic growth in low- and middle-income countries that are committed to good governance and investing in their people. As you note, however, increases in those programs within the existing totals for foreign assistance impact the resources available for traditional development and foreign assistance programs. We must, therefore, increase assistance resources overall. At the same time, we must ensure that all foreign assistance programs work together to maximize their effectiveness and achieve measurable, sustainable results.

As for the prioritization of long-term development programs, we intend to evaluate, in close consultation and cooperation with Congress, every spending priority based on what works and what doesn’t, and what impacts America’s national security and economic interests. We know, however, that long-term development programs play a vital role in our national security and we want to reinforce that linkage.

We will work to ensure that these programs are efficient and effective, as we also advocate strongly for the appropriate level of resources for foreign assistance programs, both within the administration and to the Congress.

*Question.* In your view, what changes need to occur in order to make USAID a principal player in U.S. foreign policy?

Answer. The President’s commitment to a strengthened and enhanced role for development in our foreign policy means a reinvigorated USAID, leading the formulation and implementation of U.S. development strategies and articulating the role of development in national security. We have to strengthen USAID so that it has greater capacity to respond quickly to changing requirements, is less reliant on contractors doing work that ought to be carried out by our own government professionals, and is better able to report the results achieved with taxpayer dollars. We are still in the process of thinking through the precise organizational design, and I look forward to the advice of the committee and Congress as we consider our approach. In moving forward with this process, my goal, and the goal of the President, is to enhance USAID’s capacity and standing to carry out its vital mission.

*Question.* Within the State Department, will there be a Director of Foreign Assistance? Will there be a USAID Administrator? Would the current F Bureau fall within the line of authority of the Deputy Secretary for management and resources? Or, would the Director of Foreign Assistance report directly to the Secretary of State?

Answer. There will be a USAID Administrator. As for positions internal to the Department of State, I intend to closely review the issue of structure and reporting relationships, and will look forward to consulting with the Congress as we move forward.

#### STAFFING AT USAID

*Question.* There needs to be more flexibility at USAID to hire the technical expertise they need—both mid-level and high-level officials. The institutional culture needs to change to reflect an increased sense of accountability for programs, and this culture starts with the people. The last administration proposed increasing the number of Foreign Service officers. While this is positive, a much more thorough look at the overall workforce needs to take place to make sure we have the people we need, where we need them, when we need them.

Do you have any specific plans to address staffing at USAID in broad terms? How would you handle Personal Services Contractors? Foreign Service Limited (FSL) appointments, and the loss of senior leadership in the Foreign Services due to retirement and minority recruitment and retention?

Answer. The continued rebuilding of USAID staff is one of my highest priorities. While USAID's program budget has increased significantly in the last two decades, its direct-hire Foreign Service officer levels have dropped. USAID's strength has always been the quality and size of our field presence and I will diligently work to reestablish the leadership role we held in the past. Additionally, and based on a comprehensive study of almost every office and bureau in Washington by the USAID's Office of Human Resources (OHR), I plan on increasing USAID's Washington-based technical workforce. I want USAID to use permanent career staff to address its mission, as appropriate, and to begin to reduce its dependency on its multitude of nonpermanent hiring mechanisms which can be expensive and don't build institutional capacity.

The various hiring mechanisms used by USAID provide the agency with flexibility to meet a variety of programmatic and administrative needs. These mechanisms are often used simply because USAID does not have the permanent staff to fulfill its mission. As USAID grows and trains its permanent staff through the DLI, it will rely less on nonpermanent mechanisms to meet its staffing need. These mechanisms, including FSL appointments and Personal Services Contracts, will and should continue to be used, however, for short-term and highly technical needs or where there is no need for permanent staff.

Recognizing that USAID is facing the critical situation of an aging workforce that has been more than a decade in the making, USAID began a program of targeted mid-level career Foreign Service hiring. This hiring will help fill its "missing middle" and provide an essential cushion while the more DLI junior officers are hired, trained, and deployed. USAID must have a reasonably distributed Foreign Service by experience including entry, mid, senior, and executive level. I will continue to support USAID's mid-level hiring initiative while it rebuilds its junior ranks. It is essential that USAID has the ability to place experienced permanent employees in its field missions.

Additionally, where possible, USAID should continue to use its various legal authorities to employ and reemploy Foreign Service officers wherever gaps exist. This approach will be necessary for the near term as newly hired employees under the Development Leadership Initiative (DLI's) and those hired since 2000 gain the specific USAID experience to perform at the higher level.

*Question.* I know you are very familiar with the concerns that DOD is taking too large a role, particularly in Iraq and Afghanistan but in other countries as well, in programs that are better managed by our civilian agencies like USAID and the State Department. I know that the weakened condition of USAID is one major reason for this.

- How do you intend to build up our civilian agencies so they can win the inter-agency battles on foreign assistance-related policy, strategy, and implementation?

Answer. President Obama and I understand that we cannot counter insurgent and terrorist threats without civilian counterparts who can carry out economic and political reconstruction missions. We intend to strengthen these civilian capacities, recruiting our best and brightest to take on this challenge, and to increase both the numbers and capabilities of our diplomats, development experts, and other civilians who can work alongside our military. This increased capacity is important in the implementation of programs, but also, as you note, in policy and strategy discussions and decisionmaking.

We will need to invest additional resources in the Department and USAID. The 25-percent increase in Foreign Service staffing that President Obama has called for would do much to address these needs for the State Department. In addition, USAID also needs additional capacity and, with the support of Congress, has started to increase its Foreign Service ranks. I look forward to working closely with Congress in order to obtain the funding needed to realize these personnel increases as a high priority.

FUNDING FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

*Question.*

- As Secretary of State, would you pay down our debt at the United Nations?
- Will you recommend that the President request sufficient funding to meet our obligations to the United Nations, peacekeeping operations, and other United Nations programs and agencies?

Answer. Since FY 2000, the United States has built up approximately \$250 million in new arrears to the United Nations, consisting mainly of U.N. peacekeeping arrears due to the 25-percent peacekeeping cap and U.N. regular budget arrears due to shortfalls and exchange rate losses that occurred in FY 2007 and FY 2008. In addition to these arrears, the United States continues to delay its U.N. regular budget payments due to our deferral practice, which consists of paying our calendar year bill with funds from the following fiscal year.

I will work to reverse our U.N. arrears and to ensure that our funding requests fully reflect our financial obligations so that the United States can pay its dues in full and on time. When we fail to do this, we undermine our credibility and effectiveness in working to achieve our objectives at the U.N. We support having a U.N. that is adequately resourced to carry out activities that are in our national interest.

*Question.* Rising food prices have swelled the ranks of the world's hungry by tens of millions, with women and children bearing the brunt of the crisis. The U.N. Secretary General rallied the U.N. and Bretton Woods institutions to develop a comprehensive framework of action, and donor nations made bold pledges. The international community, however, has fallen woefully short in meeting those commitments.

- What will the Obama administration do to address the global food crisis?
- Do you plan to send a senior delegation with robust positions to the January 26–27 international conference organized by the Spanish Prime Minister to take stock and give renewed impetus to the U.N. comprehensive framework initiative?

Answer. President Obama has made clear that alleviating hunger worldwide is a top priority of his administration. As he said on the first day of his Presidency, “to the people of poor nations, we pledge to work alongside you to make your farms flourish and let clean waters flow; to nourish starved bodies and feed hungry minds.” The President and I intend to focus new attention on food security so that developing nations can invest in food production, affordability, accessibility, education, and technology. We are committed to building a new partnership among donor states, developing nations, U.N. agencies, NGO's, the private sector and others to better coordinate policies, with a view toward achieving the Millennium Development Goals agreed to in 2000.

I am sending a strong team composed of senior officials from across the U.S. Government to the Madrid Conference to convey the President's message. They will be emphasizing the need for action in three major areas. First, we must invest in agricultural research to improve potential crop production. Second, we must also invest in infrastructure related to agriculture in order to spread the benefits of new technology to all farmers, and improve the efficient delivery of food to markets. And third, we have to make markets themselves more efficient, both locally and globally. I also propose to send a videotaped message to the Conference to underscore my personal commitment to ending world hunger.

*Question.* During the Bush administration, the United States decided not to seek a seat on the Human Rights Council.

- Do you feel the U.S. tactic of disengagement has worked to promote U.S. interests at the Council or to promote U.S. leadership on the issue of human rights?
- As Secretary of State, would you support—and put the necessary diplomatic effort into—the United States seeking a seat on the Human Rights Council?

Answer. The administration is reviewing and considering the issues and policy options you raise in your question. This is an unfolding process and we look forward to engaging with you as our review progresses.

## THE SITUATION IN SUDAN

*Question.*

- Under what circumstances, if any, would Article 16 be considered for the case of Sudan? Would the United States be prepared to veto Article 16 at the Security Council?
- What steps should be taken to reinvigorate UNAMID?
- Who will have the Sudan portfolio and to whom will that person report to?
- Despite an international arms embargo, there is evidence that weapons from other countries are being used in Darfur by the Government of Sudan. What steps will you take to ensure that the arms embargo is enforced?
- Given its dependence on Sudanese oil, China has an interest in a peaceful Sudan. What steps will you take to work with China to ensure that the Comprehensive Peace Agreement holds, and that the crisis in Darfur is ended through a negotiated solution?

*Answer.* At this point, the ICC's Pre-Trial Chamber has not yet ruled on the Prosecutor's application for an arrest warrant, and there is not currently an Article 16 resolution before the Security Council. We support the ICC's investigations into the matter and its pursuit of perpetrators of genocide in Darfur.

The United States will continue to vitally support the United Nations/African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) through U.N. dues, as well as through in-kind and personnel assistance to UNAMID. We will maintain a partnership with U.N. and diplomatic officials in New York, Sudan, and foreign capitals to help ensure UNAMID receives the personnel, material, financial, and political support it needs. In addition, we will continue to pressure the Government of Sudan to cooperate with UNAMID and will pressure UNAMID to pursue its mandate aggressively to protect civilians, facilitate humanitarian operations, and create conditions conducive to a lasting political settlement to the Darfur crisis.

The Department is reviewing next steps in our approach to the situation in Sudan, including Darfur and implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA).

The presence of weapons, despite the existence of a U.N. arms embargo covering the shipment of weapons into that area, is a significant contributing factor to the violence in Darfur. There are several countries that are supplying arms to Sudan, and illicit arms transfers come across the border of neighboring countries, possibly with the knowledge or assistance of the governments. At this time we are examining the best and most productive method by which to address the situation, while we also review the impact of these efforts on our assistance to the Sudan People's Liberation Army (SPLA).

Sudan plays a special role in China's energy diplomacy because a Chinese parastatal energy company—the China National Petroleum Company (CNPC)—is the dominant foreign actor in Sudan's energy industry, and China receives the majority of Sudan's oil exports. Therefore, although Sudan is only China's sixth-largest petroleum provider, Sudan's oil industry is largely dependent on Chinese support. Given China's significant economic participation in Sudan, the United States continues to encourage China to use its influence with the Government of Sudan constructively to help implement the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and bring peace and security to Darfur. The United States frequently communicates with the Chinese Government, including the Chinese special envoy and the Chinese mission to the U.N., on Sudan-related issues. The United States has repeatedly asked China to exert additional pressure on the Government of Sudan to reduce violence in Darfur, provide additional support to UNAMID, and halt Chinese arms sales to Khartoum.

China has shown some willingness to engage with Sudan and the international community on the issue of Darfur. China provided the first non-African personnel to the U.N./AU Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), consisting of a battalion of combat engineers, and provided \$500,000 to the U.N. Trust Fund to support the AU/U.N. Darfur mediator. They also have a large troop contingent deployed to the U.N. Mission in Sudan (UNMIS). Given their longstanding policy of nonintervention, China is often reluctant to weigh in as heavily or punitively with the Sudanese as we would like, though they do raise certain issues with the Sudanese privately.

## DARFUR

*Question.* I was pleased that the U.S. Government has finally provided some additional air support to help facilitate the peacekeepers' arrival in Darfur. I believe this is a signal of the greater engagement that the United States can and should be doing in Darfur. However, this is not enough, we need to do more.



- How do you intend to step up these efforts in the next administration?
- What specifically can and should the United States be doing in Darfur?
- What steps will you take to reinvigorate the United Nation's Hybrid Force in Darfur (UNAMID)?

Answer. The United States has provided over \$400 million of in-kind support to Darfur peacekeeping above and beyond its assessed U.N. dues. From 2004 through 2007, the United States was the African Union Mission in Sudan's (AMIS) largest donor. In December 2007, the United States assisted AMIS transition to the U.N./AU Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), and obtained a Presidential waiver of reimbursement to gift the U.N. with 34 troop camps, vehicles, and communications equipment capable of supporting 9,000 Darfur peacekeepers.

From 2007 to today, the United States has provided UNAMID Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs)—including Rwanda, Senegal, Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, and Tanzania—with over \$100 million in training and equipment to deploy over 7,000 new peacekeepers to Darfur. Several of these newly trained and equipped units will deploy in 2009, and further increase UNAMID's capacity. The United States has recently added to this ongoing training and equipment assistance by providing the U.N. and its Member States with over \$17 million in airlift assistance to and within Darfur. This airlift moved key UNAMID equipment from Rwanda, Ethiopia, the U.N. and other TCCs to and within Sudan. The United States also provides active-duty military officers to serve as staff in UNAMID's Darfur headquarters.

In 2009, the United States will continue providing U.N. dues, in-kind, and personnel assistance to UNAMID. The United States will work closely with U.N. and partner staff in New York, Sudan, and foreign capitals to help ensure UNAMID receives the personnel, material, financial, and political support it needs. The United States will continue to pressure the Government of Sudan to cooperate with UNAMID and will pressure UNAMID to aggressively pursue its mandate to protect civilians, facilitate humanitarian operations, and create conditions conducive to a lasting political settlement to the Darfur crisis.

*Question.* Tough Actions on Darfur? Ambassador Richard Williamson recommended a series of tough actions to compel better behavior from the Government of Sudan. They included jamming radio communications in Khartoum, blockading Sudan's port to interrupt its oil sales and targeting its military aircraft that violate U.N. bans on offensive flights. Williamson was largely ignored by the current administration.

- What is your position on these actions?

Answer. It is critically important that the United States consider the full range of tools at our disposal as we work toward the full deployment of the United Nations/African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), a resolution to the conflict in Darfur and implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). These issues are difficult ones that mandate careful deliberation and serious focus. At this time we are examining a number of options to determine the best and most productive methods by which to address the situation.

#### CHINA/DARFUR

*Question.* Given its dependence on Sudanese oil, China has an interest in Sudan.

- What steps will you take to work with China to ensure that the Comprehensive Peace Agreement holds and that the crisis in Darfur is ended through a negotiated solution?

Answer. Sudan plays a special role in China's energy diplomacy because a Chinese parastatal energy company—the China National Petroleum Company (CNPC)—is the dominant foreign actor in Sudan's energy industry, and China receives the majority of Sudan's oil exports. Therefore, although Sudan is only China's sixth-largest petroleum provider, Sudan's oil industry is largely dependent on Chinese support. Given China's significant economic participation in Sudan, the United States continues to encourage China to use its influence with the Government of Sudan constructively to help implement the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and bring peace and security to Darfur. The United States frequently communicates with the Chinese Government, including the Chinese special envoy and the Chinese mission to the U.N., on Sudan-related issues. The United States has repeatedly asked China to exert additional pressure on the Government of Sudan to reduce violence in Darfur, provide additional support to UNAMID, and halt Chinese arms sales to Khartoum.

China has shown some willingness to engage with Sudan and the international community on the issue of Darfur. China provided the first non-African personnel to the U.N./AU Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), consisting of a battalion of combat

engineers, and provided \$500,000 to the U.N. Trust Fund to support the AU/U.N. Darfur mediator. They also have a large troop contingent deployed to the U.N. Mission in Sudan (UNMIS). Given their longstanding policy of nonintervention, China is often reluctant to weigh in as heavily or punitively with the Sudanese as we would like, though they do raise certain issues with the Sudanese privately.

*Question.* During your time in the Senate, you cosigned letters to President Bush in 2005 and 2006 urging him to recognize the Armenian genocide. As a Presidential candidate, you pledged that you would recognize the killings as genocide if you were elected.

- As you know, I have been an advocate of changing the U.S. policy of not officially recognizing the Armenian genocide. Will you advocate to the President the formal recognition of the Armenian genocide?

*Answer.* The Obama administration will be looking closely at this challenging issue to address the concerns that have been raised. No decision has yet been made. Our focus will be on how the United States can help Armenia and Turkey come to terms with these tragic events in a way that honors and recognizes the victims, and helps clear the way for a future of peace and prosperity between the two countries.

- What other steps would you take to expand and improve United States-Armenian economic, political, and military relations?

*Answer.* In terms of the United States-Armenia relationship, we seek to help Armenia strengthen the security, prosperity, and freedom of its citizens. Specifically, we hope to see normalized relations and open borders between Armenia and Turkey, a just and lasting peace settlement of the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, and advancement of democratic and economic reform in Armenia. We hope to see Armenia fully integrated into East-West energy and other transportation networks.

*Question.* More than 25,000 Turks recently added their names to an online statement apologizing for Ottoman war crimes committed against the Armenians during World War I. Intellectuals and politicians around the world—who have all accepted the incontestable fact of the Armenian Genocide—hailed this as an important step forward, noting an irreversible trend has commenced in Turkey. Unfortunately, freedom of speech is not a guaranteed right for citizens of Turkey. Article 301 of Turkey's penal code deliberately strangles free speech and can be and often is used to persecute and prosecute those who attempt to exercise this universal right, especially as it pertains to discussion of the Armenian Genocide.

- How do you seek to address the inability of the Turkish Government to allow this most basic freedom to its citizens and bring an end to the use and misuse of Article 301?

*Answer.* Clearly, there is much more to be done to expand freedom of expression in Turkey. Nevertheless, Turkey's recent amendments to Article 301, which had previously criminalized "insulting Turkishness," mark a step forward; the amendments reduce the possibility for imprisonment and require the Minister of Justice to determine whether to accept a case for prosecution. While the amendments do not go far enough to meet European and American standards for free speech, the Justice Minister's new role should help reduce the number of cases brought by overzealous prosecutors for political and ideological motives.

If confirmed as Secretary of State, I will continue to press the Turkish authorities to further this progress by ending legal action against citizens for expressing their views, whether under Article 301 or other laws used to prosecute individuals for their speech. I will also coordinate with our European allies to encourage further expansion of freedom of expression in the context of Turkey's EU accession process.

#### TIBET POLICY

*Question.* The Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 established a Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues in the Department of State. Do you intend to appoint a Special Coordinator at a high level, with adequate resources and access, to signal the Tibet issue's importance to the U.S. Government? If so, when might I expect such an appointment to take place?

*Answer.* I can assure you that I take Tibetan issues seriously and plan to appoint a well-qualified coordinator at the earliest opportunity. I will ensure the coordinator has the resources to do the job.

We are disappointed with China's human rights record and the lack of progress during eight rounds of talks between the Chinese Government and the Dalai Lama's representatives. We are also very concerned about the increased repression in Tibetan areas over the past year. We will raise our concerns about these issues at

the highest levels with the Chinese Government and press for progress. The Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues will sustain our focus on these issues and will promote substantive dialogue, directed at achieving meaningful results, between the Dalai Lama and his representatives and the Chinese Government. We believe such talks provide the best hope for resolving longstanding tensions in Tibetan areas of China and for safeguarding the distinct ethnic, cultural, and religious identity of the Tibetan people.

#### DETAINED TIBETANS

*Question.* In 2008, the United States and China resumed their bilateral human rights dialogue, but with little concrete progress. Will your Department raise political prisoners and human rights, including the cases of hundreds or thousands of detained Tibetans, with the Chinese outside of the dialogue process?

*Answer.* Promoting greater respect for human rights and religious freedom is among our key foreign policy objectives in China. We document our concerns about these issues in our annual Human Rights Report. We take every opportunity to press China to uphold the fundamental human rights of the Chinese people, consistent with China's own constitution and international human rights standards. We will continue to monitor individual human rights cases of concern closely and to raise them regularly with the Chinese Government, urging the release of all who have been imprisoned for the peaceful expression of their political, social, or religious views.

With respect to individuals detained and tried in connection with the unrest in Tibetan areas last spring, we are concerned about reports that these individuals were not afforded basic protections of due process. The United States Government will continue to seek information about the whereabouts and well-being of these individuals, and to call on the Chinese Government to ensure that all legal and administrative proceedings against such persons are conducted in a manner that is both transparent and consistent with Chinese law and international human rights standards.

#### DURBAN II

*Question.* An issue you will have to focus on quickly is the World Conference Against Racism, commonly known as Durban II, which is scheduled for this April.

- Will you work to try and ensure a positive agenda for the conference?
- If it appears that Durban II would follow an anti-Israel agenda, will the United States refuse to attend the conference?

*Answer.* The administration is currently reviewing our position on the Durban Review Conference. We have not made a decision with respect to U.S. participation in the conference, but we will consider in our deliberations the ongoing negotiations in Geneva on the Review Conference's outcome document.

*Question.* Last year, the Bush administration submitted to Congress a peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement with Russia in accordance with section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act, despite the troubling behavior of Russia in relation to Iran's nuclear ambitions. While the agreement was later pulled in light of the situation in Georgia, its initial submission raised serious questions of priorities. Beyond Russia we have seen expanded nuclear cooperation and interest throughout the Middle East.

- Do you believe a 123 agreement with Russia should be linked to changes in Russia's policy toward Iran?
- How do you view the spread of nuclear technology in the Middle East? Should the United States cooperate on civilian nuclear projects in the region? How can we make certain we do not inadvertently contribute to nuclear proliferation in the Middle East?

*Answer.* The administration will seek to cooperate with Russia on issues that are in our mutual interest—including efforts to halt and reverse nuclear proliferation. We seek Russia's cooperation on Iran, for example, because it is in our interest to work together to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability. The proposed United States-Russia Agreement for Peaceful Nuclear Cooperation (123 Agreement), signed at Moscow May 6, 2008, can be an asset to our nonproliferation efforts. Russia's policy with respect to Iran will be one of the important factors taken into consideration as the administration considers whether to proceed with the proposed United States-Russia 123 Agreement again. But the decision to submit the agreement to Congress once again for review, and bring it into force, cannot be made in isolation from the larger question of our overall relationship with Russia.

With regard to the spread of civil nuclear technology in the Middle East, the administration's goal is to ensure that any expansion of the means to produce peaceful nuclear energy in the region, and indeed globally, and any U.S. cooperation to help further such expansion, will apply the highest standards for safety, security, and nonproliferation. The most important measure we can take to prevent the expansion of nuclear energy from inadvertently contributing to weapons proliferation will be to discourage countries from seeking to acquire sensitive technologies, such as enrichment or reprocessing, that could be used to make a nuclear weapon.

*Question.* You have been a strong advocate of compensation for persons who have been the victims of acts of terrorism and torture. During the Bush administration, such justice was denied to American citizens who had been seized by the Saddam Hussein regime in the period before the gulf war, and used as human shields.

- As Secretary of State, would you support a resolution of this situation, by calling on the Iraqis to compensate those Americans who were seized and held as human shields?

*Answer.* I intend to review this matter with a view to developing an effective approach for facilitating a resolution with Iraq, which includes making the claims of U.S. victims of terrorism a priority. The Department has engaged a range of involved parties, including officials in the Iraqi Government and the claimants' counsel, and will continue to engage with Iraq to encourage it to develop a resolution of these victims' claims.

Iraq committed to work to settle existing claims and debts from the Saddam era, which would include claims from victims of acts of terrorism, in its request to the Security Council to extend the protections for an additional year for the Development Fund for Iraq (DFI) and Iraqi oil and gas exports and revenues, including protections from legal attachment. The United States supported U.N. Security Council Resolution 1859 (2008), extending the previous protections. Foreign Minister Zebari also affirmed that the Government of Iraq was fully committed to resolving all legitimate claims and complying with its obligations under international law.

#### MINE BAN TREATY

*Question.* The record now shows quite clearly that the United States does not need antipersonnel mines to fight its battles. The United States has not used these weapons in any of the numerous military operations it has undertaken since the treaty was opened for signing in 1997. It has not used landmines since the 1991 gulf war; has not exported them since 1992; and has not produced them since 1997. It is in de facto compliance with the treaty's key provisions, except the ban on stockpiling.

Korea has been cited as a reason for keeping antipersonnel mines, but current policy is to ban use of "dumb" mines in 2010, including in Korea. It is also our understanding that most U.S. mines in Korea have been, or will be, removed as a part of the end of the War Reserve Stockpile for Allies, Korea (WRSA-K) program.

- What is your position about bringing the United States into the Mine Ban Treaty?

*Answer.* The incoming administration has not taken a position on the landmine treaty. We are committed to working with our friends and allies around the world to reduce the threat posed by landmines.

#### CLUSTER MUNITIONS TREATY

*Question.* Unlike most of its allies, the United States has not signed the Convention on Cluster Munitions. The Bush administration did acknowledge that cluster munitions are of grave humanitarian concern, and in June 2008 Secretary Gates articulated a new U.S. policy which states that in 10 years, the military would stop using and begin destroying its arsenal (which consists of over 700 million submunitions). In so doing, Secretary Gates recognized both the problem with the weapons, and the eventual solution—but in a way that delays the implementation of this solution until 2018 and leaves the United States standing apart from most of its NATO allies.

The Obama administration has made clear that it is committed to restoring our diplomatic alliances, and reengaging on matters of international humanitarian law. A spokeswoman for the Obama transition team told the Chicago Tribune on December 3 that the next President would "carefully review the new treaty and work closely [with] our friends and allies to ensure that the United States is doing everything feasible to promote protection of civilians."

- Will the administration conduct a review of U.S. policy regarding the use of cluster munitions? What are your views about the United States signing onto the Convention on Cluster Munitions?

Answer. The incoming administration has not taken a position on the new cluster bomb treaty. I look forward to working with the President-elect and the rest of the national security team on this issue in order to develop a policy that upholds our moral obligations while protecting our troops. The new administration will carefully review the treaty in consultation with military commanders and work closely with our friends and allies to ensure that the United States is doing everything feasible to promote protection of civilians—especially children.

*Question.* As you know, I have long been an advocate for greater engagement in our hemisphere.

- What are your ideas on how the United States can increase its engagement with our neighbors in Latin America?

Answer. One of the most significant aspects of our relationship with the Western Hemisphere is how multifaceted it is and how interconnected the United States is today with our neighbors in North, South, and Central America, and the Caribbean. I think it is important to recognize that our links are first and foremost human connections—involving shared cultures, languages, values, and aspirations. These are often ties between families, and civil society, that transcend borders. We have vitally important economic, energy, and trade links, that have grown enormously over the last two decades, as well as unique geographic ties that give us all a special stake in each other's well-being.

All of this underscores the huge opportunities, and responsibilities, we have today to build stronger and more effective partnerships with our neighbors on the issues that matter most to all our peoples. The most important of these priorities are widely shared—they include social and economic opportunity, access to quality education, citizen safety, public health, and protecting the environment.

Good, pragmatic partnerships that work also have to be founded on mutual respect, a real sense of shared responsibility, and the imagination to move beyond old ways of looking at each other. They also need to be able to marshal all the tools and resources we have, collectively, at our disposal—for truly common efforts that can achieve big results.

This is the approach we want to bring to our engagement in the region. It will order how we organize ourselves internally for that task, how we seek to allocate our resources, and how we reach out to our partners in the region.

It will also shape the priority we give to initiatives that use new media, and people-to-people exchanges, to strengthen further the ties between our societies. This is especially important in the area of science, where more exchanges and sharing of expertise can help all of us build capabilities that will better enable us to tackle big common challenges.

In short, while I am mindful of the many challenges we face in the Hemisphere, I am enthusiastic about the many opportunities we have to strengthen ties with the people in our region.

#### IRAN

*Question.*

- How would you describe the urgency of dealing with the Iranian threat? How high on the agenda is it for you and the Obama administration?
- What concrete steps would you expect the new administration to take regarding Iran early in the year? Do you believe sanctions should be imposed against the Iranian Central Bank?
- Will you reach out to our allies and seek to establish with them a timeline for talks with Iran?
- Would you also seek the agreement of our allies to a regime of sanctions should it become clear that progress through talks is not possible?

Answer. We are still reviewing policy and consulting on our initial steps on Iran. However, this administration places Iran high on its agenda, and sees great urgency in dealing with the Iranian threat, while also remaining open to opportunities for a more constructive path forward in United States-Iran relations.

Over the next several months, we will be laying out our general framework and approach regarding Iran. And as the President said during his inauguration speech, if countries like Iran are willing to unclench their fist, they will find an extended hand from the United States.

We continue to monitor Iranian financial institutions' attempts to evade international financial sanctions, but I cannot comment further on our internal processes.

The President has publicly stated that he supports tough and direct diplomacy with Iran without preconditions, but I cannot offer additional details regarding any specific timeline for this process.

Now is the time to use the power of American diplomacy to pressure Iran to fully meet its UNSC, NPT and IAEA obligations on its nuclear program, end support for terrorism, uphold its international human rights obligations, and cease threats toward Israel. President Obama and Vice President Biden will offer the Iranian regime a choice. If Iran addresses the international community's serious concerns about its nuclear program and ends support for terrorism, we will offer incentives like supporting membership in the World Trade Organization, economic investment, and a move toward normal diplomatic relations.

However, if Iran continues its troubling behavior, we will explore additional diplomatic options. In carrying out this diplomacy, we will coordinate closely with our allies and proceed with careful preparation. Seeking this kind of comprehensive settlement with Iran is our best way to make progress.

#### PERSECUTION OF PERSONS FOR SEXUAL ORIENTATION AND GENDER IDENTITY

*Question.* Despite advances around the world, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people continue to face persecution, imprisonment, and even death at the hands of their governments, simply for being who they are. Homosexual activity remains subject to criminal penalty in more than 80 countries, in some cases punishable by death. Just last week, a group of AIDS activists in Senegal were sentenced to 8 years in prison under the country's sodomy statute, and publicity around their procedurally questionable trial has created an atmosphere of extreme animosity to LGBT people. This is just one example. Yet, the United States refused last month to join a nonbinding U.N. General Assembly resolution calling on Member Nations to end discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Our Nation can, and must, be a leader in calling for respect of human rights around the world, including the rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender people.

- How will you work to advance these issues at the Department of State?

*Question.* We join those countries that deplore the jailing and execution of individuals because of their sexual orientation or gender identity.

You can expect that I, my Deputies, Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries will raise LGBT issues in countries whenever it is appropriate to do so.

In addition, I have asked that when a new Assistant Secretary for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor is appointed and confirmed that he or she consult with the LGBT community to hear their views regarding effective reporting on issues of concern to them in our country reports.

On the statement issued by the Government of France, the administration is reviewing the issues and policy options. This is an unfolding process and we look forward to engaging with you as our review progresses.

*Question.* At the Fourth Women's Conference in Beijing in 1995, you declared that women's rights were human rights. Do you believe that family planning assistance is a necessary component of women's, and therefore human, rights?

Answer. Yes, and as I have said previously, women must not be denied the right to plan their own families. I look forward to working with the President, Members of Congress, my colleagues in the administration, and the NGO community to promote programs and policies that ensure women and girls have full access to health information and services.

#### "GLOBAL GAG" RULE

*Question.* On January 22, 2001, the 28th anniversary of the landmark U.S. Supreme Court decision *Roe v. Wade*, President George W. Bush issued an Executive order reinstating the global gag rule. This restriction prohibits overseas organizations that receive U.S. international family planning funds from providing abortion services, and from advocating for changes in abortion policy—even with their own private funds. The gag rule also limits the free speech by these organizations, prohibiting them from making public statements, drafting and distributing material, and sponsoring conferences pertaining to abortion law and policy. In September 2003, President Bush issued an Executive order expanding the gag rule into all programs—reproductive health or otherwise—that the United States funds, which has meant that even more women worldwide are denied basic health care services and access to family planning. Under the expansion, foreign NGOs that receive U.S.

HIV/AIDS funds are not able to provide legal abortion information to women who are at risk for or have HIV/AIDS, even when such information could be life saving.

- Do you support rescinding the global gag rule in its entirety? If so, do you believe the best course of action is via legislative or administrative means?

Answer. As I stated on January 23, 2009, “President Obama’s repeal of the global gag rule, which has prevented women around the world from gaining access to essential information and health care services, is a welcomed and important step taken during the first days of the administration.”

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

*Question.* According a CNA Corporation report entitled, “National Security and the Threat of Climate Change” authored by a distinguished group of retired generals and admirals, climate change is a security “threat multiplier”—meaning that as climate change begins to foment conflict over scarce natural resources, it destabilizes developing nation’s economies. Vulnerable countries are already facing growing water scarcity, severe weather events, and increasing health risks.

- How can the United States address these immediate challenges, not only by reducing global greenhouse gas emissions, but by helping the most vulnerable countries to prepare for and adapt to the consequences of global warming?
- Do you plan to support proposals in international climate negotiations to provide innovative financing and other support to developing countries to help them cope with climate impacts?

Answer. USAID has been a leader in advancing climate, clean energy, and conservation activities in the developing world, drawing the clear and important link between solving the climate problem and promoting sustainable development globally. We are committed to building on this work to help developing nations build efficient and environmentally sustainable energy infrastructures through technology development, adaptation assistance, and support for environmental mitigation so that nations have the tools and the means to address this crisis.

The United States will also actively pursue innovative approaches to providing financial, technical, and institutional support to developing countries, especially the most vulnerable.

We look forward to working with Congress as we develop our thinking on these critical issues.

*Question.* Tropical deforestation and degradation is responsible for 20 percent of the world’s greenhouse gas emissions. To what degree will you address tropical deforestation as a key goal of our foreign and domestic policies on reducing global warming?

More specifically:

- Do you support providing resources to help build the capacity of tropical nations to
  - Reduce the rate of tropical deforestation and
  - Eventually earn credits through international carbon markets?
- Would you ensure that U.S. climate change negotiators urge support for tropical deforestation in international climate agreements?

Answer. Deforestation and forest degradation are important to the administration and we are committed to finding multiple ways to reduce deforestation and promote sustainable forest management, including through international climate agreements.

The United States is committed to addressing all causes of climate change, including deforestation. The United States supported specific inclusion of “reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation” (REDD) in the Bali Action Plan.

We also support exploring new ways to assist, and incentivize, developing countries actions to address land use practices that result in GHG emissions, or encourage those that sequester carbon. We believe that doing so will not only have a positive impact on global warming, but also on biodiversity, ecosystem services, and sustainable development.

We will be examining, as part of the UNFCCC negotiations, a range of options to incentivize “REDD” activities, including the use of carbon credits, in close consultation with Congress as it develops comprehensive legislation on climate change.

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROBERT P. CASEY, JR.

## GRAND STRATEGY AND U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

*Question.* Historically, the United States has adopted one of four grand strategies, or some combination of the four: Neoisolationism (avoidance of foreign entanglements), selective engagement (traditional balance of power realism that works to ensure peace among the major powers), cooperative security (a liberal world order of interdependence and effective international institutions), and primacy (American unilateralism and continued hegemony).

Which grand strategy, or combination of strategies, do you think best describes how you would seek to promote U.S. national security today?

*Answer.* I appreciate that the members of the committee, the American people, and many others around the globe are interested in how the Obama administration will protect our security, advance our interests, and promote our values in the world. The President-elect has promised a new direction for our foreign policy, and while we must always take into account the lessons of history, it should not be surprising that the paradigms of the past neither adequately describe our present realities, nor provide a comprehensive guide to what we should do about them. In my prepared statement, I will explain why today's world requires that we practice what some have called "smart power," which entails leading with diplomacy, and marrying principles and pragmatism to advance our security and interests in an increasingly complex and interdependent world.

## GLOBAL EDUCATION FOR ALL

*Question.* In the 110th Congress, you introduced the Education for All Act, an important piece of legislation to invest up to \$10 billion, over 5 years, as part of an international effort to enroll in school the 75 million children in poor and conflict-affected countries that have been left behind. During the course of his campaign, President-elect Obama committed to erasing the global primary education gap by 2015 and capitalizing a "Global Education Fund" with at least \$2 billion in funding toward the goal of universal access.

As Secretary of State, will international basic education remain a priority for you? If so, please describe what policies you would like to design and implement to support it, how would you envision Congress supporting your efforts, and how this significant investment will benefit the recipients, and the United States?

*Answer.* The United Nations developed the Millennium Development Goals to help reduce the crippling burden of global poverty. One of those goals is to achieve universal primary education by the year 2015. The United States joined other U.N. Member States in adopting the MDGs in 2000, and I applaud our Government's commitment to reaching all of these goals, including universal primary education. I look forward to implementing President-elect Obama's vision and ensuring that the U.S. remains a leader in efforts to help all girls and boys access quality basic education. We should coordinate our efforts with others, including the World Bank's Fast Track Initiative, in order to maximize our investment in global education.

I know there are many ideas as to how the United States can best contribute to the global efforts to achieve universal basic education, and, if confirmed, I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress and education experts to develop a comprehensive strategy for education assistance.

I believe that any strategy should include the following components:

- Adequate access to at-risk children: Our efforts to achieve universal education must reach all children, particularly those who are most likely to be out of school. We must ensure that children in conflict areas or disaster sites have the opportunity to continue their education. We must ensure that often-marginalized populations, such as children with disabilities and indigenous or minority ethnic groups, have access to education. And it is imperative that our global education efforts include increasing enrollment of girls, who currently account for a majority of children that lack access to education.
- Quality education: Our efforts to achieve universal basic education cannot simply be measured by enrollment figures. Rather, we must ensure that every child has access to a quality education, and is in an environment that is conducive to learning. Specifically, we must ensure that we have adequate resources, including a trained teacher workforce and educational materials, and an environment that is free from violence.
- Accountability: We must ensure that our increased investment comes with a plan for coordination, so that we are complementing, not duplicating, other efforts. It is also important to have strong management within our Government



to oversee these efforts, facilitate cooperation among agencies and other partners, and ensure that we are making continued progress toward universal basic education.

#### WEAPONS IN SPACE

*Question.* The Bush administration refused to engage in multilateral talks regarding any constraints on the testing or deployment of antisatellite weapons. China conducted one such test in 2007 that produced tens of thousands of pieces of space debris that will last for a century or more. Space debris can be lethal to satellites upon which American citizens, our Armed Forces, and the American economy depend. What is your view toward diplomatic initiatives to increase space security?

Please outline your broad views on whether or not the deployment of new weapons in space enhances or undermines U.S. national security. Under your leadership, will the State Department pursue diplomatic initiatives to enhance space security?

*Answer.* During the campaign, President-elect Obama outlined his view that weaponizing space was not in America's interest. That remains his view and my view.

#### LAND MINE BAN TREATY

*Question.* More than 10 years ago, President Clinton was a leader in the global effort to ban antipersonnel landmines, being the first head of state to call for the "eventual elimination" of these weapons in 1994. The world community rallied, and 122 governments signed the Mine Ban Treaty in December 1997. The United States did not sign, as objections were raised by the Pentagon about the possible continued need for these weapons. At that time, President Clinton set out a policy that would have the United States developing alternative technologies and joining the treaty by 2006. The Bush administration then undertook a review of this policy and announced in February 2004 that the United States new policy was to never join the treaty.

Please outline whether or not you intend to revisit the U.S. position on the Land Mine Ban Treaty as Secretary of State.

*Answer.* The incoming administration has not taken a position on the landmine treaty. We are committed to working with our friends and allies around the world to reduce the threat posed by landmines.

#### CLUSTER MUNITIONS TREATY

*Question.* On December 3, 2008, 94 nations, including some of the United States closest military allies such as Great Britain, France, and Australia, signed a treaty in Oslo, Norway, banning the production, stockpiling, transfer and use of cluster munitions. The Bush administration did not participate in the negotiation of the treaty and did not sign it. However, the U.S. Government did acknowledge that these are weapons of grave humanitarian concern, and in June 2008 Secretary Gates articulated a new U.S. policy that in 10 years, the military would stop using and begin destroying its arsenal of cluster munitions.

A spokeswoman for the Obama Transition Team was quoted on December 3 in The Chicago Tribune that the next President would "carefully review the new treaty and work closely [with] our friends and allies to ensure that the United States is doing everything feasible to promote protection of civilians."

Can you confirm that this policy review will take place? If so, what is the time-frame for the policy review? Please outline the broad principles that are likely to guide the Obama administration's policy review on cluster munitions.

*Answer.* The incoming administration has not taken a position on the new cluster bomb treaty. I look forward to working with the President-elect and the rest of the national security team on this issue in order to develop a policy that upholds our moral obligations while protecting our troops. The new administration will carefully review the treaty in consultation with military commanders and work closely with our friends and allies to ensure that the United States is doing everything feasible to promote protection of civilians—especially children.

#### CHINA

*Question.* By 2025, China is expected to have the world's second largest economy and be a leading military power. It also could be the world's largest importer of natural resources and the biggest polluter. Many believe that the United States-China relationship is the most important bilateral relationship in the world. While the United States and China have fundamental differences on key issues, including the

future status of Taiwan, it also has common areas of cooperation, such as securing the peaceful nuclear disarmament of North Korea.

Please outline how the United States will view China under President Obama. Will the Obama administration view China as a national security threat to the United States, a cooperative partner for a common security agenda, or some combination of the two?

Answer. It is difficult to put a label on a complex relationship. We have to find ways to work cooperatively with China on issues of shared concern—including climate change, North Korea, and proliferation—while we also candidly and frankly express our views when and where we disagree—as on democracy, human rights, for example. With American leadership and this pragmatic approach, we can improve our relationship with China and advance our shared interests. That is the approach that I will take into my job if I am fortunate enough to be confirmed.

#### THE ROLE OF SPECIAL ENVOYS

*Question.* Numerous press reports indicate that you are looking at the appointment of a series of regional envoys to manage such hotspots as the Middle East, Iran, South Asia, North Korea, and other crises.

Can you describe your thinking behind this approach of appointing a series of special envoys to help manage the key foreign policy hotspots for the next administration?

How will these special envoys coexist with the regional Assistant Secretaries; e.g., for Near Eastern Affairs, for South Central Asian Affairs, etc.? Do we run the risk that these regional Assistant Secretaries will be marginalized?

How will you ensure that the interagency process will be respected as these special envoys carry out their duties? That the equities of the Defense Department, the National Security Council, and other key executive branch components are not ignored or brushed off?

Answer. If confirmed, I am committed to using the full range of tools and resources at my disposal to ensure that the State Department carries out its vital mission during this challenging time. I hope to bolster the Department's senior ranks by becoming the first Secretary to fill the second Deputy Secretary position. I've asked Jack Lew to join me at the State Department, so that we can tap into his expertise in budgeting and management to ensure that the Department has the resources it needs to carry out its mission, and that those resources are deployed effectively. And like Secretaries of State have in the past, I anticipate using envoys as additional means to achieve the President-elect's goals for America's foreign policy. No specific decisions have been made about specific envoys, but I can tell you that these envoys will work in tandem with the Department's existing structures—and collaboratively through the interagency process—to bring additional focus and resources to a given issue or area.

#### IRAN

*Question.* Iran is likely to be the most serious foreign policy challenge that confronts President Obama. Over the past 3 years, despite the passage of a series of United Nations Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions, Iran has continued to steadily move forward on its nuclear program, drawing closer and closer to mastering the uranium enrichment cycle that can provide the fissile material for a nuclear weapon. For the past 2 years, I have encouraged the Bush administration to take a look at the utility of placing further pressure on Iran by assembling an embargo on exports of reprocessed gasoline products to Iran. As you know, despite its vast oil resources, Iran does not have sufficient refining capacity to supply its consumers and economy with sufficient gasoline, leaving it to import refined gas.

Should the United States lead an international effort to ban the export of reprocessed gasoline products, an essential ingredient for Iran's industrial economy, to increase the pressure on Iran's leadership to end its nuclear activities in defiance of the United Nations?

Answer. We are closely monitoring this situation, and remain cognizant of potential pressure points with Iran. We will examine a range of options to apply pressure to the Government of Iran to end its illicit nuclear program, and preventing Iran from importing refined gasoline will be one such option we examine. The incoming administration will work with our international allies to persuade the Iranian regime that verifiably abandoning its nuclear weapons efforts is in its best interest.

## JUBILEE ACT AND DEBT RELIEF

*Question.* The current financial crisis is having impacts all around the world and it threatens to reduce progress toward meeting global poverty reduction goals in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. In the last Congress, working with the ranking member, Senator Lugar, Senator Dodd, and 23 other Senate cosponsors, I introduced the Jubilee Act for Responsible Lending and Expanded Debt Relief, to build on previous rounds of debt cancellation to make all impoverished nations with accountable governments eligible for bilateral and multilateral debt relief. I look forward to introducing the legislation again this spring.

What should be done to alleviate the impact of the global economic crisis on the world's most impoverished countries? What is your view on the role of debt relief as a tool to help poor countries free up their resources to fight poverty? Specifically, do you support expanding the list of poor countries eligible for debt cancellation to include all transparently and accountably governed impoverished countries that qualify for so-called "IDA only" assistance from the World Bank?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama and I each cosponsored the Jubilee Act in the Senate, and believe that the United States and its G-8 partners must complete debt cancellation for all of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC)—a commitment the President-elect enumerated during the campaign. I have been supportive also of expanding the list of HIPC countries, and will urge that the new administration give that full consideration as part of our foreign assistance program.

## THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

*Question.* The Millennium Challenge Corporation, or MCC, has been one of President Bush's signature development programs. It has been both praised as encompassing innovative and creative ideas, as well as criticized for being too slow to disburse funds once a compact has been signed.

I am a strong backer of the MCC, as I believe the idea of linking expanded U.S. foreign assistance to governments that demonstrate a record of good governance, market-based economic stewardship, transparency in budgets, and anticorruption practices is a solid one—we should reward those governments that do the right thing by their people.

Can you describe to the committee your general views on the MCC? Is this an initiative that will continue with strong support under the Obama administration? How do you envision the MCC fitting into broader U.S. foreign assistance reform efforts this administration may pursue?

*Answer.* The MCC is a unique tool in America's foreign policy portfolio. It has the potential to incentivize poverty reduction, improve health structures, and better governance in developing countries. President-elect Obama supports the MCC, and the principle of greater accountability in our foreign assistance programs. However, there are clear challenges within the MCC, such as the pace of implementation of compacts and the danger of a lack of coordination with overall U.S. foreign assistance. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the Congress to integrate the MCC as a key part of a modernized foreign assistance architecture.

## VIOLENCE AGAINST IRAQI CHRISTIANS

*Question.* Violence in Mosul this previous fall drove away large numbers of Iraqi Christians. This violence is emblematic of a larger pattern of severe persecution by extremists that threatens to deprive Iraq of her non-Muslim citizens. It also highlights the possibility of increased violence ahead of provincial elections.

For over 1,000 years, Iraq has been home to people of many faiths who have lived and worshipped side by side, including Shiites, Sunnis, Jews, Yazidis, and Christians. This long and proud tradition has made Iraq a cradle of human civilization.

How do you intend to work with the Iraqi Government to ensure that Iraqi Christians are not singled out for persecution and violence?

*Answer.* Religious persecution is anathema to Americans. We believe in the freedom to worship, and there is an office in the State Department that is committed to religious freedom. I will work with our international allies to speak out strongly against discrimination and oppression in any form—in Iraq and elsewhere—because it violates not only American values, but also American security interests throughout the world.

## RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR GEORGE VOINOVICH

## SPECIAL ENVOY TO COMBAT ANTI-SEMITISM

In 2004, I was fortunate to have you join me as a cosponsor of the Global Anti-Semitism Review Act of 2004 (P.L. 108-332). As you know, this legislation created the Office of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism at the State Department. This office, housed in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor (DRL) is tasked with the development and implementation of policies and projects to support efforts to combat anti-Semitism.

*Question.* Jewish communities throughout the world cannot afford a gap in coverage. Can you assure members of the committee that the special envoy position will be expeditiously filled by a competent and capable individual?

Answer. President-elect Obama and I are strongly committed to combating global anti-Semitism, and all forms of hate and prejudice. The Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism is a key post in enabling the United States to fulfill this mission, and it will be filled by a strong individual.

## RELATIONSHIP WITH U.N. AMBASSADOR

I understand that President-elect Obama has decided to elevate the position of U.N. Ambassador to Cabinet-level status. I also understand that the Ambassador's staff and policy apparatus is housed within the State Department bureaucracy that technically reports to the Secretary of State.

*Question.* What is your vision for your relationship with Susan Rice and the U.N. Ambassador's office in terms of policy formulation, messaging, and management?

Answer. I look forward to a very close and cooperative relationship with Dr. Rice, the Permanent Representative designee. In elevating the position to Cabinet rank, the President-elect intended, in part, to demonstrate to the U.S. people and the rest of the world the importance of global engagement. This is an arrangement that has substantial historical precedent, and I am confident that this structure will serve the President-elect and his entire foreign policy team well.

## DEFENSE TRADE COOPERATION

International arms sales help to sustain U.S. jobs, reduce the cost of weapons procurement by the Department of Defense, help to grow small businesses, and support the national security and foreign policy objectives of the U.S. Government. It is important that the Obama administration continue to support arms sales as an important foreign policy tool.

*Question.* Senator Clinton, does the committee have your commitment to support critical arms sales to our partners and allies around the world?

Answer. As you know, controlling the export of commercial defense items is a significant Department responsibility. I am very much aware that the committee has long been concerned about the efficiency and effectiveness of the export licensing process. I am just getting up to speed on these issues but am committed to work closely with Congress as we consider international sales.

*Question.* Does the incoming administration intend to pursue ratification of defense trade cooperation treaties with the United Kingdom and Australia?

Answer. The proposed defense trade cooperation treaties would permit the export of certain U.S. defense articles and services to the United Kingdom and Australian governments, and select British and Australian companies that meet specific requirements—without U.S. export licenses or other approvals. I know that the committee leadership has expressed support for the objectives of the treaties, but that there were unresolved questions that ultimately precluded committee action on the treaties in the previous Congress. I look forward to consulting with the Foreign Relations Committee to discuss the appropriate way to address these treaties.

## GREAT LAKES WATER QUALITY AGREEMENT

*Question.* The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) with Canada is now up for renegotiation. What will be your priorities in changes to the agreement?

Answer. The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) with Canada, which was last updated in 1987, has made a significant, continuing contribution to the health of the Great Lakes and to the quality of life of people in both countries. An interagency working group cochaired by the State Department and the Environmental Protection Agency is now reviewing U.S. positions on what changes to the

agreement, if any, we should seek going forward. I look forward to receiving its recommendations at an early date.

*Question.* What mechanisms will you put into place to ensure that the GLWQA with Canada is implemented and legally enforceable in the U.S.?

Answer. This issue will be considered as part of the ongoing review.

---

RESPONSE TO QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR LISA MURKOWSKI

*Question.* President Bush signed legislation that supports Taiwan's observer status in the World Health Organization (WHO). As Secretary of State, you would be working with health leaders in other countries to improve the international health security network. The SARS epidemic, the catastrophic tsunami that ravaged Southeast Asia, and the threat of avian flu all demonstrate the importance of international cooperation in fostering global health security. Along those lines, how will you work to improve Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization?

Answer. I commend Taiwan's President Ma and China's President Hu Jintao for seizing the opportunity created by President Ma Ying-jeou's election this past March. I sincerely hope they will continue this progress, as the United States gains from peaceful, stable cross-Strait relations, including development of economic ties and cross-Strait security. In this context, and consistent with the "one China" policy, I believe that it is appropriate for the United States to support Taiwan's efforts to expand its international space, such as observer status at the World Health Assembly. It is important for Beijing to demonstrate to the people of Taiwan that the practical and nonconfrontational approach taken by President Ma toward the mainland can achieve positive results. As you note, there are myriad public health issues that result from Taiwan's continued exclusion from appropriate participation in the World Health Organization, and like you I believe that the United States should work with Taiwan to see that situation rectified.

---

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JIM DEMINT

FOREIGN POLICY PHILOSOPHY

*Question.* Much has been made of the Bush administration putting military preemption on the policy table as a possible option against states hosting terrorists or adversarial states on the verge of developing weapons of mass destruction. Yet, in the mid-90s, the Clinton administration considered undertaking a preemptive strike against North Korea in light of its nuclear weapons program and its unwillingness to return to the strictures of the NPT. Will the Obama administration keep the possibility of military preemption as a policy option and, if so, what will be the parameters guiding its use?

Answer. As the President-elect has said many times, there is no greater duty for any President than keeping the American people safe. He has made clear that he will use all tools of American power to do that. Decisions about ordering military force rest with the President, and as such I cannot comment on it.

*Question.* Do you believe that tensions between Iran and the international community result primarily from misunderstandings or from conflicting objectives? If the latter, how will increased diplomatic engagement with Iran help reduce these tensions?

Answer. The Iranian regime's stated objectives and practices—such as supporting terrorist groups like Hamas and Hezbollah, pursuing a nuclear program in defiance of the international community, and calling for the destruction of Israel—are directly counter to U.S. national security and interests. That is why the new administration will present the Iranian regime with a clear choice: Abandon your nuclear weapons program, support for terror and threats to Israel, and there will be meaningful incentives; refuse, and we will ratchet up the pressure, with stronger unilateral sanctions; stronger multilateral sanctions in the Security Council; and sustained action beyond the U.N. to isolate the Iranian regime. By exhausting diplomacy, we will be better able to rally the world to our side, strengthen multilateral sanctions, and to convince the Iranian people that their own government is the author of its isolation.

*Question.* What is your view regarding the status within the international system of the independent, sovereign state in general, and the importance of preserving and

protecting American sovereignty in particular? Do you ascribe to traditional views of national sovereignty or to the theory of “global governance”?

*Answer.* The overriding duty of our foreign policy is to protect and advance America’s security, interests, and values. If confirmed, my first priority as Secretary of State will be to promote policies to keep our people, our Nation, and our allies secure. Our world has undergone an extraordinary transformation in the last two decades. The clear lesson of the last 20 years is that we must both combat the threats and seize the opportunities of our interdependence. And to be effective in doing so we must build a world with more partners and fewer adversaries. America cannot solve the most pressing problems on our own, and the world cannot solve them without America.

*Question.* What are your views regarding several controversial multilateral treaties and efforts by the United Nations that, if supported or ratified by the United States, would erode American sovereignty?

*Answer.* The new administration has not made any decisions on the timing of submission of treaties to the Senate. As in the case of any treaty that the President may support, the administration will work closely with this committee and the Senate leadership on devising and implementing a strategy for successful approval of by the full Senate.

The President-elect and I have both supported ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention and he has publicly committed to working actively to ensure that the U.S. ratifies the Convention. The Convention remains an important piece of unfinished treaty business.

The incoming administration agrees with the Chief of Naval Operations, and the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, all of whom endorsed the Convention during the 110th Congress. Joining the Convention will advance the interests of the U.S. military. As the world’s leading maritime power, the United States benefits more than any other nation from the navigation provisions of the Convention. Those provisions, which establish international consensus on the extent of jurisdiction that States may exercise off their coasts, preserve and elaborate the rights of the U.S. military to use the world’s oceans to meet national security requirements.

Joining the Convention will enhance, not restrict, our ability to interdict shipment of weapons of mass destruction on the ocean. The Convention’s navigation provisions derive from the 1958 law of the sea conventions, to which the United States is a party, and also reflect customary international law accepted by the United States. As such, the Convention will not affect applicable maritime law or policy regarding interdiction of weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery, and related materials.

Like the 1958 conventions, the LOS Convention recognizes numerous legal bases for taking enforcement action against vessels and aircraft suspected of engaging in proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including exclusive port and coastal State jurisdiction in internal waters and national airspace; coastal State jurisdiction in the territorial sea and contiguous zone; exclusive flag State jurisdiction over vessels on the high seas (which the flag State may, either by general agreement in advance or approval in response to a specific request, waive in favor of other States); and universal jurisdiction over stateless vessels.

Nor will the Convention undermine the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). PSI requires participating countries to act consistent with national legal authorities and “relevant international law and frameworks,” which includes the law reflected in the Law of the Sea Convention. Finally, nothing in the Convention impairs the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense (a point which is reaffirmed in the Resolution of Advice and Consent proposed by the committee in the 110th Congress).

#### MIDDLE EAST

##### *Iraq*

*Question.* It no longer requires a willing suspension of disbelief to imagine the emergence of a peaceful, stable, democratic Iraqi state that is an ally in the war on terror. Such a development, as Deputy Prime Minister Barham Salih recently noted, creates a remarkable opportunity to integrate a normal Iraq that can contribute to regional security into the Arab world for the first time in decades. What steps do you propose to take to accelerate and facilitate this integration? What larger regional opportunities do you see in the prospect of such a reintegration? In particular, what measures are you prepared to take to persuade the Saudis to reopen their Embassy in Baghdad?

*Answer.* The President-elect and I are committed to active regional diplomacy to assist in consolidating Iraq’s security gains. In recent months, there have been hope-

ful signs that Iraq's neighbors are beginning to more fully engage the Iraqi Government, including high-level visits by foreign officials and commitments by Bahrain, Jordan, Syria, and the United Arab Emirates to open embassies in Baghdad. Although Saudi Arabia has not yet committed to following suit, the Kingdom has dispatched a delegation to inspect the situation in Iraq and examine the possibility of opening an embassy. The State Department will work to build on this momentum to assist in fully reintegrating Iraq into the region and fostering cooperative relationships with Iraq's neighbors, including Saudi Arabia.

*Question.* Currently, the State Department relies heavily on contractors to provide security for U.S. diplomatic personnel and facilities aboard. Considering the substantial improvements in the accountability, transparency, and government oversight of security contractors in Iraq do you feel that we are close to achieving the right balance between supervisory functions being conducted by U.S. Government personnel and the security functions carried out by contractors who employ vetted and trained U.S. military and law enforcement veterans?

*Answer.* Ensuring security for U.S. diplomatic personnel and facilities in Iraq is essential. Right now, much of the rebuilding is taking place under a security umbrella provided by the brave young men and women of our Armed Forces. Their departure from critical areas in Iraq will certainly change the security calculus. How we deal with this challenge—both generally and specifically with respect to Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs)—has been and will continue to be the subject of discussions among the national security team and with the President-elect.

Both the President-elect and I have been outspoken in calling for more oversight and accountability for private contractors and more tools to stop abuses in Iraq. I have been highly skeptical of heavily armed military contractors who have operated in Iraq without any law or court to rein them in or hold them accountable. These contractors have at times been reckless and have at times compromised our mission in Iraq.

I look forward to working with the President-elect and the Congress to establish the legal status of contractor personnel, so that we can prosecute any abuses committed by private military contractors. In addition, our experience in Iraq has shown that there must be serious oversight and effective program management—and that starts at the State Department. I will be especially vigilant about this. Finally, it is important to remember that there are many private contractors in Iraq and elsewhere who are honorable, hardworking, and patriotic. But we have seen too many abuses in the past few years to do anything less than impose a new legal regime to hold security firms and individual personnel accountable when they act outside the law.

*Question.* CBO has stated that contractors are less expensive to the Federal Government. Do you believe we should continue to utilize security contractors? If not, what are your specific plans to replace contractors in this security role? How large would Diplomatic Security have to grow in order to bring this security function in-house?

*Answer.* If confirmed as Secretary of State, I will work with the President-elect and other administration officials to determine what the appropriate staffing levels should be to pursue the President-elect's policies and priorities, and what should be the role of contractors. The protection of State Department personnel operating in areas like Afghanistan and Iraq is an important issue, and I look forward to working along with other members of the President's national security team to exploring the best way to address that issue if confirmed.

#### *Syria*

*Question.* Many believe Syria was responsible for the assassination of former Lebanese Prime Minister Rafiq Hariri and the series of assassinations of Syria's opponents in Lebanon as well. While Syria has withdrawn its troops from Lebanon, it has yet to send an ambassador to Beirut, continues to manipulate Lebanese politics, and arms the nation's most significant terror group (also a political party), Hezbollah. In addition, Syria has facilitated the traffic of extremists into Iraq to kill Americans and was for several years building a North Korean designed nuclear reactor outside its obligations under the NPT.

Rumors abound that the Obama administration intends to change the Bush administration's approach to Syria, including returning an ambassador. Do you believe that there should be any change in the United States-Syria relationship for as long as Syria refuses IAEA inspectors access to suspect nuclear sites, refuses to close its borders to terror groups, and continues to arm Hezbollah, one of the world's most potent terror groups, and fails to participate with the Hariri tribunal? What exactly

are your positions on this issue and can you commit that these will be prerequisites to any rapprochement between the United States and Syria?

Answer. The United States and Syria have profound differences on important issues, and the President-elect and I believe that engaging directly with Syria increases the possibility of making progress on changing Syrian behavior. In these talks, we should insist on our core demands: Cooperation in stabilizing Iraq; ending support for terrorist groups; cooperation with the IAEA; stopping the flow of weapons to Hezbollah; and respect for Lebanon's sovereignty and independence.

*Israel*

*Question.* As Secretary of State, how would you characterize the United States-Israel relationship? What do you see as the major challenges to the relationship?

Answer. The United States-Israel relationship is a profound and deep partnership between two democracies based on shared interests and shared values. We have strong and enduring political and security relationships, to the benefit of both countries, but our partnership extends to the economic, scientific, and cultural spheres as well. We stand together and support each other against many of the same threats. And while we may not always agree on every issue, there is no issue that can shake our fundamental commitment to Israel's security and well-being. The major challenge we face is helping Israel achieve its quest for both peace and security, which requires leaving no stone unturned in the search for peace between Israel and its neighbors, while remaining vigilant against those who seek to do Israel harm.

*Question.* With Palestinian elections for the Presidency taking place sometime in the coming year, there is the possibility that Hamas will take control. What will the Obama administration policy be if the Palestinian Authority is run or effectively controlled by Hamas?

Answer. I prefer not to speculate about the outcome of future elections in other countries. Our policy on Hamas is clear: We support the Quartet's conditions on any dealings with Hamas—recognition of Israel, renunciation of violence, and abiding by past agreements.

*Question.* Recently news outlets have reported the Obama administration intends to begin low-level discussions with Hamas. Do you support President-elect Obama's policy to talk with Hamas? If so, what role will you play in helping facilitate these conversations?

Answer. Those new reports are false. Our policy on Hamas is clear: We support the Quartet's conditions on any dealings with Hamas—recognition of Israel, renunciation of violence, and abiding by past agreements.

*Question.* Many believe there will be no enduring peace between Israel and the Palestinians until the schools in the Palestinian areas no longer use textbooks that deny Israel's right to exist. Will you commit that no U.S. foreign assistance will be used to fund education programs that use textbooks which deny Israel's right to exist?

Answer. I have worked for many years to address the problem of Palestinian textbooks that delegitimize Israel and its right to exist. I agree that ending incitement and educating children in hate is essential for peace to take hold. I am committed to working to ensure that no U.S. foreign assistance funds programs that use such textbooks.

*Question.* In view of comments you made in June 2008 that the United States will never "impose a made-in-America solution" to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, what role do you think the United States should take in helping to bridge the gaps between the two parties on sensitive issues like Jerusalem, refugees, and borders?

Answer. These issues are indeed among the most sensitive issues the parties face, which is why Israelis and Palestinians have designated them as final status issues. It is clear that no agreement on these issues can last unless the parties themselves agree to it, and it cannot be imposed upon them by any outside actor. The United States should do whatever we can to support Israelis and Palestinians in their peace efforts and help ensure they have the opportunities to reach such agreements.

*Question.* The United States has long maintained a policy-espoused by Presidents of both parties—of opposing the many one-sided Security Council resolutions that, more often than not, criticize Israel, but fail to address other issues, such as Palestinian terrorism. More than 41 anti-Israel Security Council resolutions have been vetoed by the United States over the years.



- Do you support the use of the American veto to block one-sided anti-Israel resolutions in the Security Council?
- What do you believe should be the standard employed in deciding whether to veto or not?
- How would you have advised President-elect Obama to vote on the recent U.N. resolution on Israel and Hamas? Would you have recommended a veto or voting for, against, or abstaining?

Answer. Yes. The United States has a long history of using its veto at the Security Council to ensure that it does not pass resolutions that unfairly target the State of Israel. Each proposed resolution must be judged on its merits, but the Obama administration is prepared, whenever appropriate, to continue this American role in the Security Council. I do not want to speculate on what future resolutions might look like. When it is in the U.S. interest, we will continue to use our veto as necessary.

As for U.N. Security Council Resolution 1860, we are obviously very concerned about the serious situation in Gaza and southern Israel. President-elect Obama has spoken about his deep concern for the loss of civilian life in Gaza and Israel, and I think we all agree that it is very important that a durable cease-fire be achieved. That will require an end to Hamas rocket fire at Israeli civilians, an effective mechanism to prevent smuggling of weapons into Gaza, and an effective border regime. We will work hard with our international partners to make sure all these elements happen. The cease-fire should be accompanied by a serious effort to address the immediate humanitarian needs of the Palestinian people and a longer term reconstruction and development effort. The Bush administration is in the middle of sensitive diplomatic negotiations on behalf of the United States, so I think it is best that I not comment specifically on the negotiations underway. I will say that we plan to be actively engaged on diplomacy in the Middle East in pursuit of peace agreements to resolve conflicts, and when necessary, to bring hostilities to an end. We are committed to helping Israel and the Palestinians achieve their goal of two states living side by side in peace and security, and will work toward this goal from the beginning of the administration.

#### *Iran*

*Question.* Do you think that economic, diplomatic, and political efforts to persuade Iran to abandon its nuclear weapons program can succeed in the absence of the credible threat of military force against Iran?

Answer. President-elect Obama has stated that he will use all elements of American power—political, diplomatic, economic—to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Yet when it comes to protecting America's security, he would never take the military option off the table.

*Question.* President-elect Obama has talked about direct and tough diplomacy with Iran. What steps does the administration intend to take to pursue such direct diplomacy with Iran? Do you believe that the United States should meet unconditionally at senior levels with the Iranian regime? Do you believe that the preconditions listed in several U.N. Security Council resolutions demanding Iran suspend enrichment are not preconditions to U.S. negotiations with Iran?

Answer. The Obama administration will support tough, aggressive, and direct diplomacy, without preconditions, with our adversaries. Note that there is a distinction between preparations and preconditions. For possible negotiations with Iran, there must be careful preparation—including low-level talks, coordination with allies, the establishment of an agenda, and an evaluation of the potential for progress.

The U.S. should support and participate in ongoing efforts with our European allies and assemble an international coalition that will exert a collective will on Iran so that it is in their own interest to verifiably abandon their nuclear weapons efforts.

We will carefully prepare for any negotiations—open up lines of communication, build an agenda, coordinate closely with our allies, and evaluate the potential for progress.

We will not sit down with Iran just for the sake of talking. But we are willing to lead tough and principled diplomacy with the appropriate Iranian leader at a time and place of our choosing—if, and only if—it can advance the interests of the United States.

We should be careful not to let our engagement with Iran be used by the Iranian regime in the runup to the June Presidential election—but the elections should not prevent us from starting a dialogue if we determine that there is a genuine intent to engage.

*Question.* Under what conditions would you implement sanctions under the Iran Sanctions Act?

*Answer.* While pursuing a policy of tough and direct diplomacy, the Obama administration will use various means to increase economic pressure on Iran to persuade it to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons. We will be guided by the law when it comes to applying statutory sanctions. If there are entities in violation of the Iran Sanctions Act, we will take necessary steps under that statute.

*Question.* 1. With high oil prices, several Persian Gulf nations expressed concern with an assertive Iran and sought a closer relationship with the U.S. What do you believe the role of the U.S. should be in the Middle East?

*Answer.* The U.S. should support and participate in ongoing efforts with our allies and partners in the region to assemble an international coalition that will exert a collective will on Iran so that it is in their own interest to verifiably abandon their nuclear weapons efforts.

*Question.* Last year, the Bush administration submitted to Congress a peaceful nuclear cooperation agreement with Russia in accordance with section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act. The administration and Middle East nations have also expressed interest in expanded nuclear cooperation throughout the Gulf Region. How do you view the spread of nuclear technology in the Middle East? What standards would you propose to guide cooperation on civilian nuclear projects in the region?

*Answer.* The Obama administration will carefully study cooperation on civilian nuclear projects in the region, focusing especially on its implications for our bilateral relationships and for our nonproliferation objectives in the Middle East and globally.

#### CENTRAL ASIA

Several nations in Central Asia are currently drafting religion and assembly laws. Just recently, after intense international pressure, President Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan sent his nation's religion law to the Kazakh Supreme Council for review, where it is expected to die or be changed substantially. There is serious concern that these laws in both Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan, are being used to limit faith-based organizations from being allowed to operate in-country and at the same time consolidate the power of local religious leaders.

*Question.* The freedom to assemble and religious freedom are core values of U.S. society and are building blocks of a strong civil society. How do you intend to promote these values in U.S. foreign policy as a whole and in central Asia specifically?

*Answer.* The President-elect and I believe that it is a false choice to argue that we must either pursue our interests or our values. We are most effective when we pursue in parallel and at the same time. The President-elect has expressed support for organizations such as the National Endowment for Democracy, which offer us a way to interact directly with those fighting for greater pluralism in the world, including in Central Asia.

#### *Afghanistan*

*Question.* President-elect Obama has commented frequently about the need for a "surge" in Afghanistan. Do you believe the success of the surge in Iraq can be replicated in Afghanistan?

*Answer.* If I am confirmed, designing and implementing a more effective strategy in Afghanistan will be one of my highest priorities at the State Department. We have lost ground in Afghanistan over the past 7 years. Our strategy has to acknowledge Afghanistan as it is, not as we hoped it would be 7 years ago. We also have to acknowledge that we will not see progress in Afghanistan overnight. The President-elect and the entire national security team understand Afghanistan and north-west Pakistan are the central front in the war on terror, and we know that it is critical that we make progress there.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to implement a new set of strategies that will help us confront the resurgence of the Taliban and the persistent threat of al-Qaeda in Afghanistan. Additional troops are certainly a part of that—though Secretary Gates can better speak to the military dimensions of our efforts in Afghanistan.

*Question.* Unlike Iraq, most Afghans lack the education level and the country lacks many of the basic institutions necessary to create a stable and secure government and society. How do you believe this will shape any surge strategy?

*Answer.* The President-elect and I have consistently said that our strategy in Afghanistan cannot simply be about adding more troops. He has enunciated an ap-

proach that we call “more for more”—more troops and assistance from the U.S. as we seek more from NATO allies, and more from an Afghan Government that needs to focus on improving the lives of its people. We also have to implement a coherent Pakistan strategy, one that involves more nonmilitary aid and more pressure on Pakistan to fight terror. With this set of principles, and with the resources, focus and diplomatic effort that Afghanistan deserves—and has been denied because of our entanglement in Iraq—we believe that we can make progress in supporting the people of Afghanistan and preventing al-Qaeda from staging future attacks.

Economic development is absolutely essential to Afghanistan’s stabilization and reconstruction. It is inextricably linked to security. The President-elect has proposed a “more-for-more” strategy which will provide additional nonmilitary aid each year—above and beyond what is given now. That money will be focused on initiatives dealing with education, infrastructure, human services, and alternative livelihoods for poppy farmers. And it will be accompanied by tougher anticorruption measures. We will tie aid to better performance by the Afghan national government, including anticorruption initiatives and efforts to extend the rule of law across the country. We will also work to ensure that investments are made not just in Kabul but out in Afghanistan’s provinces.

*Question.* On trips to Afghanistan, my staff and I found a glaring lack of coordination among reconstruction efforts. For instance, schools were built with no teachers to teach in them, large sums of money were spent to meet the requirements of USAID personnel in Washington without any lasting effects on the ground, and large portions of U.S. foreign aid allocated for Afghanistan stayed in the U.S., there was no comprehensive list of reconstruction projects, and PRTs do not communicate routinely to compare successes and mitigate deficiencies. What is your plan to ensure U.S. foreign aid is spent effectively and provide the oversight necessary to ensure U.S. taxpayer money is not wasted?

*Answer.* I welcome congressional oversight and ongoing consultation with this committee as key tools in ensuring efficient and effective investment of American taxpayer resources. I agree that our development and reconstruction efforts need to be better planned, coordinated, and tied to a broader strategy. If confirmed I will work with my colleagues in the Department, at USAID, DOD, and elsewhere to make that happen. In addition, any U.S. assistance to Afghanistan will be accompanied by tougher anticorruption measures. We will tie aid to better performance by the Afghan national government, including anticorruption initiatives and efforts to extend the rule of law across the country. We will also work to ensure that investments are made not just in Kabul but out in Afghanistan’s provinces.

*Question.* NATO’s International Security Assistance Force has been plagued by a lack of commitments from NATO allies and caveats they place on their forces deployed to Afghanistan. While many European leaders speak of the commitment to Afghanistan, they do not advocate the need for the mission among their own citizens and to lift their caveats. What do you believe can be done to reduce the number of caveats—especially ones that U.S. commanders have highlighted as the most egregious?

*Answer.* Afghanistan is not just a challenge for the United States—it is a critical security issue for our allies in NATO and for all countries in the region. Afghanistan’s considerable problems will not be resolved without the cooperation of these countries, which requires a regional strategic approach. That is what I will seek to implement if confirmed.

That is why we believe our NATO allies must do more. The Obama administration will seek greater contributions from them in Afghanistan. We will ask our NATO allies to reconsider national restrictions on NATO forces. The NATO force is short-staffed and some countries contributing forces are imposing restrictions on where their troops can operate, tying the hands of commanders on the ground. The Obama administration will work with European allies to end these burdensome restrictions and strengthen NATO as a fighting force.

#### *Pakistan*

*Question.* Since 9/11, the United States has given more and more assistance to Pakistan, both in FMF and in development assistance. While Pakistan has in some ways stepped up in aiding the war on terror, in many ways the government has allowed and even supported the resurgence of the Taliban and other al-Qaeda affiliated groups. Do you believe that Pakistan has done everything possible to combat extremist groups, including fighting the cross-border movement of extremists into Afghanistan? How important is Pakistani military and intelligence support for groups like Lashkar-e-Taiba, the group responsible for the recent Mumbai terrorist

attacks? Should the United States use its assistance as leverage to wean Pakistan military and intelligence away from extremist groups?

Answer. We need to ensure that we do as much as possible to engage a wide range of Pakistan's democratically elected civilian leaders. U.S. military assistance to Pakistan must be conditioned on Pakistan's efforts to close down training camps, evict foreign fighters, and preventing the Taliban and al-Qaeda from using Pakistan as a terrorist sanctuary. Nonmilitary assistance should be tripled, with a focus on the border regions, so that over the long term we are reducing the pull of the extremists.

*Question.* In your opinion, does the unilateral use of American air strikes against terrorist targets in Pakistan contribute to or detract from the development and execution of a sound American political and military strategy in the region? Would you advocate relying more on such targeted strikes, restricting them, or keeping about the same policy we have today? In general terms, do you think that a counterterrorism strategy that relies primarily on such long-range strikes into sovereign states can be successful, and what price do you think the U.S. pays for pursuing such policies over the long term?

Answer. We need a stronger and sustained partnership between Afghanistan, Pakistan, and NATO to secure the border, take out terrorist camps, and crack down on cross-border insurgents. We cannot tolerate a safe haven for al-Qaeda terrorists who threaten the American people. Pakistan and the international community must commit to a more comprehensive approach along the border—one that involves robust economic investment and development, good governance and government accountability, and enhanced security and law enforcement capacity. If Pakistan is willing to go after high-level terrorist targets like Osama bin Laden, we must give Pakistan all of the support it needs. The United States must also provide more assistance to benefit the Pakistani people directly, so that our nations forge a deeper and more sustainable partnership.

Our ability to contain and diminish the threat of international terrorism depends heavily on our ability to build partnerships among nations and deepen cooperation across a range of areas, including law enforcement, intelligence-sharing, border controls and safeguarding of hazardous materials. The United States—and the State Department in particular—has historically played a central role in this area. I strongly believe that keeping terrorists on the defensive, reducing their room for maneuver and preventing them from striking at us and our allies will require that the Department act energetically to build the international cooperation that is essential for confronting a transnational threat that no one country can successfully fight alone.

#### EUROPE

*Question.* During the 110th Congress, Senator Obama and I cosponsored legislation and strongly supported extending the Membership Action Plan (MAP) to Ukraine and Georgia. As President-elect Barack Obama has stated, "Ukraine and Georgia . . . have declared their readiness to advance a NATO Membership Action Plan . . . they should receive our help and encouragement as they continue to develop ties to Atlantic and European institutions." Do you support extending the MAP to Ukraine and Georgia?

Answer. While there are different views among allies on the best way to promote eventual NATO membership for Georgia and Ukraine, it is essential that we work closely with our allies to develop a common approach on Alliance enlargement. The NATO-Ukraine Commission and the NATO-Georgia Commission (established last summer) are other avenues available for deepening relations between the Alliance and Georgia and Ukraine. NATO's door must remain open to European democracies that meet membership criteria and can contribute to our common security. How and when new countries might join must be determined together with all our allies in the alliance.

*Question.* In the French-sponsored cease-fire agreement reached with Russia after the invasion of Georgia, the Russians agreed to return to preconflict troop positions and numbers. As yet, this has not happened. What steps will the Obama administration take to ensure the agreement's terms are fully abided by and, if not, what policy consequences can we expect to see in United States-Russia policy for Moscow not abiding its terms?

Answer. The President-elect and I have consistently insisted that Russia must fully comply with the cease-fire agreement, which means that it must return its troops in Georgia to preconflict positions. We have also made clear—both before and

after the conflict—that Russian troops must be replaced with truly independent, international peacekeepers. Russia must know that its relations with the West will be harmed by a failure to implement all the provisions of the cease-fire agreement it signed.

*Question.* In October 2008, during a television interview, Russian President Medvedev articulated a five-point doctrine that would govern Russia's foreign policy. Among other statements, he stated that "there are regions in which Russia has privileged interests. These regions are home to countries with which we share special historical relations and are bound together as friends and good neighbors." Medvedev elaborated that these countries are "the countries on our borders are priorities, of course, but our priorities do not end there."

- a. Do you believe the nations on Russia's border have a right to determine who they wish to ally themselves with? Do you think it is in America's interests to resist Russian attempts to regain de facto control over portions of the Former Soviet Union and, if so, what measures would you favor? What do you think the U.S. can do to reassure our nervous NATO allies in Eastern Europe that America will not abandon them to Russian threats, even if NATO appears unwilling to stand up to Moscow?

Answer a. The President-elect and I feel very strongly that the concept of "privileged interests" has no place in today's Europe. The democratic nations of Europe all have the right to determine what alliances they want to join, and their independence and sovereignty must be respected. We will seek to cooperate with Russia on a wide range of issues of common concern, but we cannot accept the notion that Russia or any other country has a special say over the future of its independent neighbors. The Obama administration will make this principle clear to our NATO allies, our other friends in Europe, and to Russia.

- b. In November, Russian President Medvedev called for a new Europe-wide security pact, essentially replacing the Final Helsinki Accords of 1975. Among the principles he suggests should be part of that new order is outlawing any expansion of alliance relations that can be seen coming at the expense of another country. In turn, after completion of the Russia-European Union summit in November, French President Nicolas Sarkozy stated that he was interested in there being a mid-2009 summit which could lay down a blueprint for "a future pan-European security structure." Is the Obama administration in favor of such an effort? If so, how will NATO's pledges to Ukraine and Georgia for future NATO membership be taken account of? And if the administration is not in favor of negotiations on new European security architecture, how will it signal that fact to our European allies?

Answer b. President Medvedev has not offered many details about his proposal, explained why it is needed, or explained how a new security pact would differ from the OSCE, an existing pan-European security organization. We will always be open to ideas about how European security can be ensured but, as already noted, could not accept constraints on sovereign European countries' right to choose their own alliance relationships. Whether candidates for NATO join the alliance will depend on their readiness for membership and a consensus among NATO members that they should join—not on the decisions of any third party. If confirmed I will seek to engage early on with our NATO allies and others on the best ways to promote security across the continent and around the world.

#### MISSILE DEFENSE

*Question.* It was suggested during the campaign, and during the early days of the post-election transition, that the U.S. might extend its nuclear deterrent umbrella to include Israel and other Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) states. Do you support that idea?

Before we use the threat of nuclear weapons to defend these countries, do you agree we should have nonnuclear measures in place like missile defense? Will you support deeper missile defense cooperation with all these states?

Answer. The new administration has not taken a position on extending the nuclear deterrent in the Middle East but has a commitment to stopping the spread of nuclear weapons. I look forward to working with the President-elect, the Department of Defense, and the rest of the new administration's national security team to address the issue of deterrence and what role missile defense should play in security arrangements in the Middle East.

*Question.* The NATO Alliance recently recognized in its Bucharest communiqué "the substantial contribution to the protection of allies from long-range ballistic mis-

siles to be provided by the planned deployment of European-based United States missile defence assets.” Will you stand with our NATO allies and reaffirm the importance of missile defense?

Answer. The Obama administration has been very clear that we will make a decision on whether to move forward or not with the proposed missile defense system in Europe based on an assessment of whether it works and is cost-effective.

*Question.* Russia has a significant number of nuclear-tipped interceptors surrounding Moscow as a ballistic missile shield to protect much of Russia. Additionally, Russia has hundreds of ICBMs, including many on mobile launchers, as a significant element of their nuclear deterrent. Do you believe Russia has any practical reason to fear 10 interceptors in Poland that defend the U.S. and our NATO allies against Iranian missiles?

Answer. The missile defense system with component parts in Poland would be in response to rogue states like Iran—not Russia. As stated above, the Obama administration will make a decision on whether to move forward or not, with the proposed missile defense system in Europe based on an assessment of whether it works and is cost-effective. Russia’s decision to deploy missiles in Kaliningrad or not, will not influence our decisions.

#### AFRICA

*Question.* From genocide to humanitarian crises, from military dictators to bad agriculture policy. Many of the problems in Africa have been created by poor leadership—political, military, and economic. What new policies do you believe are necessary to change the “business as usual” conditions on the continent?

Answer. In Africa, the foreign policy objectives of the Obama administration are rooted in security, political, economic, and humanitarian interests, including: Combating al-Qaeda’s efforts to seek safe havens in failed states in the Horn of Africa; helping African nations to conserve their natural resources and reap fair benefits from them; stopping war in Congo; ending autocracy in Zimbabwe and human devastation in Darfur; supporting African democracies like South Africa and Ghana—which just had its second change of power in democratic elections; and working aggressively to reach the Millennium Development Goals in health, education, and economic opportunity.

*Question.* Last year Congress passed legislation authorizes up to \$48 billion over the next 5 years for HIV/AIDS prevention, treatment, and care programs. This occurred despite the Congressional Budget Office’s projection that the U.S. Government could not spend more than \$35 billion effectively. Do you believe it is wise to authorize spending levels above our ability to spend the money—especially at a time when U.S. budget pressures are skyrocketing?

Answer. The President-elect has applauded President Bush’s efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, and pledged to continue and enhance PEPFAR. There are an estimated 33 million people across the planet infected with HIV/AIDS. We must do more to fight the global HIV/AIDS pandemic, as well as malaria and tuberculosis. The President-elect is committed to fully implementing the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief and to ensuring that best practices, not ideology, drive funding. He has committed to investing \$50 billion over 5 years to strengthen the program and expand it to new regions of the world, including Southeast Asia, India, and parts of Europe. At the same time, the new administration will work to more effectively coordinate PEPFAR with programs to strengthen health care delivery and address other global health challenges. The new administration will also increase U.S. contributions to the Global Fund to ensure that global efforts to fight endemic disease continue to move ahead through multilateral institutions as well. As part of these efforts, the new administration will work with drug companies to reduce the costs of generic antiretroviral drugs. And it will work with developing nations to help them build the health infrastructure necessary to get sick people treated—more money for hospitals and medical equipment, and more training for nurses and doctors.

*Question.* Under PEPFAR “Abstinence” and “Be Faithful” components of our ABC method have been effective tools in the fight against AIDS. However, it is important to note that these components were requested by leaders in Africa who advised a single pillar would not be a wise policy. Will you continue to support the A and B components of PEPFAR?

Answer. We will review and consult PEPFAR options.

*AFRICOM*

*Question.* The organizational structure of U.S. Africa Command is an effort to better coordinate the disparate parts of the U.S. Government that all support each other in the promotion of defense, development, and diplomacy. This command could represent a paradigm shift for interagency coordination if properly supported. Do you intend to fully support this command and the direction it is attempting to go?

*Answer.* The President-elect supports the concept of AFRICOM, as do I, but we want to make sure that it is implemented properly. I look forward to working on behalf of the President-elect, with Secretary Gates and General Jones, and with African nations on this issue. The original concept behind AFRICOM was that our engagement with Africa would be improved by streamlining our command structure so that there is a single unified command responsible for Africa, rather than three separate commands as has been the case. The President-elect has warned that we must be very careful not to overmilitarize our relations with African nations. On the other hand, there is a role to play for AFRICOM in helping train and equip African rapid response forces for peacekeeping operations. AFRICOM can also contribute to an enhanced capability of African nations to patrol their own waters.

*Question.* How will the State Department and USAID interact with AFRICOM within Africa?

*Answer.* A well-conceived AFRICOM—one that plays the traditional role of a combatant command rather than supplants the State Department’s traditional role—can enhance U.S. Government efforts to foster peace and stability on the continent. I look forward to working with Secretary Gates and others to ensure that AFRICOM complements the efforts of State Department and USAID.

## ASIA

*China*

*Question.* Under President Clinton, China was considered a “strategic partner”; however, under the Bush administration China was regarded as a “strategic competitor.” Which do you feel more accurately defines the current relationship between the U.S. and China?

*Answer.* I would note that although President Bush used the term “strategic competitor” in his first Presidential campaign, once in office he worked to build a relationship with China that he called “candid, constructive and cooperative.” The Clinton administration called for “building toward a constructive strategic partnership with China”; it did not assert that such a partnership already existed.

The fact is that the U.S. relationship with China contains elements of both cooperation and competition. We should work where possible to expand the areas of cooperation while managing the areas of competition. It is essential that China’s rise be peaceful. The United States cannot by itself ensure that result, but it can help create an environment in which China makes the right choices—choices such as contributing to global economic stability, ensuring fair trade, supporting international efforts to halt nuclear proliferation, ending support for repressive regimes such as those in Zimbabwe and Burma, protecting human rights, and combating global warming. The Obama administration will work to promote these and other important objectives in its interaction with China.

*Question.* In the December 2007 issue of *Foreign Affairs*, you wrote that, “The United States and China have vastly different values and political systems . . .” and that “we disagree profoundly on issues ranging from trade to human rights, religious freedom, labor practices, and Tibet” while still asserting that there is much we can accomplish together. In the context of this bilateral relationship, how do you propose that we make progress on these issues related to human dignity where we are at such odds? Will our Ambassador in Beijing be given clear instruction that they are to press, both publicly and privately, the Chinese Government on their human rights record?

*Answer.* Again, there are areas in which we can and do cooperate with China, and areas where we disagree. One of the areas in which we do not see eye to eye is human rights. The Obama administration will work to support movement toward democracy and greater human rights in China, including for Tibetans. Neither President-elect Obama nor I will be shy about pressing China on our concerns about human rights issues at every opportunity and at all levels, publicly and privately, both through our mission in China and in Washington.

*Question.* Given China’s increasing political, military, and economic strength in the region, how would you institutionalize a departmentwide or governmentwide

comprehensive and consistent strategy to pressure China to release dissidents and political prisoners, curtail its human right abuses, end its support of rogue regimes in places like Burma and the Sudan, and end its practice of forced repatriation of North Korean refugees?

Answer. The U.S. relationship with China is multifaceted, and our policy toward China likewise has many elements involving many U.S. Government agencies. Under the Obama administration, China policy will be directed from the top by the President and coordinated by the NSC and NEC. We will make early decisions about the precise institutional arrangements for coordinating the various strands of our China strategy and for engaging with the Chinese, but the issues you enumerated—advancing human rights in China, ending Beijing’s support for rogue regimes, and ensuring appropriate treatment of refugees—will be important objectives of our policy under any institutional framework.

#### *Taiwan*

*Question.* International Commerce and security in East Asia rests in large part with stability in the Taiwan Strait. Thirty years ago, Congress passed the Taiwan Relations Act to ensure that Taiwan possessed a credible military deterrent. The Bush administration recently reversed course on moving forward with foreign military sales to Taiwan only after intense pressure. With the Chinese military budget growing and the buildup of Chinese forces across the Taiwan Strait, do you support foreign military sales to Taiwan? Do you support the sale of F-16s and submarines specifically? As secretary do you commit to work with our allies who could support some of the equipment to Taiwan? If you do not support these sales, how do you propose Taiwan replace its aging fighter aircraft and protect its merchant shipping?

Answer. When the Bush administration announced its decision to notify Congress concerning the package of weapons systems for Taiwan this past fall, President-elect Obama welcomed that announcement. This package represents an important response to Taiwan’s defense needs, was fully consistent with U.S. obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act, and helps to contribute to Taiwan’s defense and the maintenance of a healthy balance in the Taiwan Strait. I take very seriously our responsibility under the Taiwan Relations Act to make available to Taiwan defense articles and services that will enable it to maintain a sufficient self defense capability, and for the United States to continually review and assess Taiwan’s defense needs. But I do not think it appropriate to speculate on specific weapons systems or what future assessments might hold. The Taiwan Relations Act calls for U.S. defense authorities to advise the President on Taiwan’s defense needs. I look forward to hearing their views. Like President-elect Obama, I believe that strengthening of Taiwan’s defenses consistent with the Taiwan Relations Act will not undermine the process of reduction of tensions across the Strait and can actually promote it.

*Question.* Over the years, high-level contacts between U.S. Government officials and Taiwan officials have decreased as U.S. guidelines issued by the State Department have grown more restrictive. In keeping with the requirements of the Taiwan Relations Act, do you support revising these restrictions at a time when U.S. security and economic interests continue to grow? Will you support Cabinet-level visits to Taiwan, like President Clinton?

Answer. In his letter to President Ma Ying-jeou on May 20, 2008, President-elect Obama stated that he believed the United States should strengthen channels of communication with officials of Taiwan’s Government. I share that view and believe that it is important that the United States seek to rebuild a relationship of trust with Taiwan, and support for Taiwan’s robust democracy. I support the “one China” policy of the U.S., adherence to the three U.S.–PRC joint communiqués concerning Taiwan, and observance of the Taiwan Relations Act, and on that foundation I would hope that we can both open necessary channels that have become blocked in recent years as well as resume, in an appropriate fashion, the sorts of Cabinet-level visits and exchanges that the United States and Taiwan enjoyed before the George W. Bush administration when issues in our relations warrant. These sorts of visits and exchanges—with U.S. officials traveling to Taiwan, and Taiwan officials to the United States—are positive for both the United States and Taiwan and can also contribute to greater cross-Strait stability.

#### *North Korea*

*Question.* In the past you have criticized the Bush administration suggesting they should bypass the six-party talks and negotiate unilaterally with North Korea. How do you view the current state of the six-party talks? Do you believe the U.S. should have removed North Korea from the state sponsor of terror list before North Korea



accounted for all of its proliferation activities and Japanese and South Korean abductees? Should we accept less than Libya style disarmament?

Answer. The new administration will pursue direct diplomacy bilaterally and within the six-party talks to achieve the complete and verifiable elimination of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs, and an accounting for North Korea's past plutonium production, uranium enrichment activities, and proliferation activities.

Sanctions should only be lifted based on North Korean performance. If the North Koreans do not meet their obligations, we should move quickly to reimpose sanctions that have been waived, and consider new restrictions going forward.

*Question.* Do you support China's policy of repatriating North Korean refugees? Will you pressure China to stop this practice?

Answer. We are greatly concerned about the status of refugees from North Korea who have fled that repressive regime. If confirmed, I am committed to working with relevant international organizations, our regional partners, and countries like China to ensure that refugees from North Korea are treated humanely and in ways consistent with international law.

*Question.* Do you agree that it is essential that we get to the bottom of suspicions that North Korea is working on a covert uranium enrichment capability? If confirmed as Secretary of State, will you ensure that we agree to no diplomatic solution to the nuclear standoff with North Korea that does not permit us to conduct the verification necessary to be satisfied that North Korea has shut down and dismantled not just its plutonium production capability, but also whatever uranium enrichment capability it has?

Answer. The Obama administration will confirm the full extent of North Korea's past plutonium production and its uranium enrichment activities, and get answers to disturbing questions about its proliferation activities with other countries, including Syria. The North Koreans must live up to their commitments and fully and verifiably dismantle all of their nuclear weapons programs and proliferation activities. If they do not, there must be strong sanctions. We will only lift sanctions based on North Korean performance. If the North Koreans do not meet their obligations, we should move quickly to reimpose sanctions that have been waived, and consider new restrictions going forward. The objective must be clear: The complete and verifiable elimination of North Korea's nuclear weapons programs, which only expanded while we refused to talk. As we move forward, we must not cede our leverage in these negotiations unless it is clear that North Korea is living up to its obligations.

#### *South Korea*

*Question.* President Obama talked about restoring our image and reinvigorating our presence in Asia. How will you do that if we do not move forward with the Korea FTA which Senator Obama stated he opposed during the campaign?

Answer. South Korea is an important friend and ally and if confirmed I look forward to building an even stronger bilateral relationship in the years to come. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the United States Trade Representative, the Treasury Secretary, the Secretary of Commerce, and others on the President-elect's economic team on these issues. We will communicate forthrightly and fairly with South Korea, explaining that our concerns with the FTA are discrete and specific and have no bearing on the many collaborative dimensions of our alliance and friendship. We will also work to resolve these concerns to the satisfaction of both parties.

#### WESTERN HEMISPHERE

*Question.* Despite the fact that the U.S. remains the preeminent power in Latin America, Russia, China, and Iran are actively engaged and competing with the U.S. for influence.

- Many diplomats and businessmen warned about the effects of the U.S. Congress not passing the Free Trade Agreement (FTA) with Colombia and the damage this could have on U.S. relations in Latin America. What policies do you propose to correct the damage that will be done to our relations with Latin America if the FTA is not quickly passed?
- Do you support the FTA in its current form?

Answer. Let me address both of these questions together. It is important that we not lose sight of the many aspects of the important, dynamic, and complex bilateral relationship that the United States and Colombia have when we discuss the United

States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement. I look forward to working to maintain the across-the-board vibrancy of the relationship.

With regard to the trade agreement, it is essential that trade spread the benefits of globalization. Without adequate labor protections, trade cannot do that. Although levels of violence have dropped, continued violence and impunity in Colombia directed at labor and other civic leaders makes labor protections impossible to guarantee in Colombia today.

Colombia must improve its efforts. I look forward to working with members of this committee, as well as other Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to see what the United States can do to help contribute to an end to further violence and continued impunity directed against labor and other civic leaders in Colombia.

The United States and Colombia have long enjoyed a close, mutually beneficial relationship. I am confident that through continued cooperation on the full array of bilateral issues, we can maintain and deepen that relationship. Active engagement with Colombia will be an important part of this administration's approach to hemispheric relations.

#### FOREIGN MANAGEMENT ISSUES

*Question.* It has been suggested that USAID should be elevated to an independent Cabinet agency, as in Great Britain. But the result there indicates that such a step would make it more difficult to shape development programs in a way that would advance the national interest and make for a coherent strategy. What are your views?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama, many of the leaders selected to serve in his Cabinet, and many members of this committee believe that development can and should be a prominent piece of U.S. foreign policy and our national security strategy. But, to be effective, development assistance needs to be strengthened and modernized. The President-elect has committed to enhancing our foreign assistance architecture to make it more nimble, innovative, and effective. This means a reinvigorated, empowered USAID, playing a central role in the formulation and implementation of critical development strategies. Development serves our national interest as well as improves our Nation's global image. Increasing stability and opportunity in poor countries creates new allies, but also reduces the pool of people living in desperate situations who are susceptible to being drawn toward extremist tendencies.

That said, no decisions have been made on a specific organizational design, and I look forward to working with you and the rest of this committee, as well as the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, to help improve development assistance. The goal of President-elect Obama—and my goal—is to enhance USAID's capacity and standing to carry out its vital missions.

*Question.* During the Bush administration, Foreign Service officers often complained—in public—about the necessity to work in dangerous embassies or in isolated provincial reconstruction teams. How do you intend to reform the Foreign Service to meet the needs of the 21st century? Do you believe the Foreign Service simply needs to be larger, or are there problems with the State Department corporate culture that should be addressed?

*Answer.* Based on the briefings I have received so far, I do not believe the Department has an adequate number of personnel. The men and women of the Foreign Service and Civil Service also need additional training opportunities, as well as resources, to carry out the many responsibilities assigned to the Department. If confirmed, I intend to work closely with the President and the Congress to secure the necessary resources for the Department.

The opportunities and challenges in front of all of us are both promising and daunting. The objectives that the President-elect has set forth are compelling, demanding and necessary to meet our interests. To meet these goals, I am seeking to recruit strong, experienced professionals to join the Department. I am using every position available to maximize the possibility for success and to manage an unprecedented number of responsibilities for our Nation's security and prosperity.

I intend to use both Deputy positions that are available in law—to manage the overall foreign policy agenda and to manage the operations and resources needed for success, Jim Steinberg, if confirmed, will be responsible for assisting me in the formulation and conduct of our foreign policy; Jack Lew, if confirmed, will be responsible for assisting me in the management of the operations and resources of the Department.

I also will recommend to the President-elect under secretaries and assistant secretaries who are at the top of their fields, who think strategically and are strong diplomats and managers of talent. And, I will employ a time-honored tradition to make

use of special envoys who will work in a focused fashion to address some of our most difficult challenges.

*Question.* American diplomats and diplomacy increasingly need a range of skills and knowledge that go beyond traditional limits, including the need to work more closely with U.S. military officers and officials of other agencies, to oversee large reconstruction and development projects, and to help build strategic partnerships with fragile democracies and allies. What steps do you intend to take to prepare the State Department to master these new roles? What is your plan to upgrade the training and education of State Department personnel?

*Answer.* If confirmed, I intend to be a strong advocate for resources for the Department including appropriate education and training for State Department personnel. I also plan to review the current training and education efforts and consider what changes in education and training are necessary and required. The President-elect has made it clear that he wants to strengthen the civilian capacity of the State Department and other agencies to work alongside our military, and we will pursue that goal.

*Question.* Given the expected constraints of a growing Federal budget deficit, a global financial crisis, continued commitments to conflict and crises overseas, what priorities will you establish in assistance areas to guide difficult tradeoff decisions as Secretary?

*Answer.* The President-elect has made it clear that he will review the Federal budget with new scrutiny and a commitment to initiatives that are effective, accountable, and make a real difference in the American people.

In these challenging economic conditions, we will have to make strategic budget choices—choices which increase the security of this country and strengthen our position in the world. Targeting extreme poverty and preventable global diseases like AIDS and malaria in vulnerable countries is both smart and strategic. It saves lives, builds friendships in volatile places, and creates new opportunities for America around the world. It is in America's national interest to continue to support activities that are measurable successes, are consistent with our values, and improve our security. These will be my touchstones as I prepare the development assistance budget priorities for the State Department.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

*Question.* President-elect Obama made commitments to “elevate, empower, consolidate and streamline” U.S. development programs. During your own campaign, you said you would ensure U.S. development assistance is spent in a “smart, coordinated, and efficient manner with a measurable impact on people’s lives.” With foreign assistance programs scattered across more than 20 different Federal agencies, how do you intend to address inefficiencies and incoherence within the current structure in order to help maximize the impact of U.S. assistance and instability that threaten prosperity and security globally and at home?

- What metrics should the U.S. Government use to gauge the success of U.S. foreign assistance programs? If the metrics are not met would you advocate for the elimination of a program?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama and this Congress will evaluate every spending priority based on what works and what does not, and what fits best with America's national security and economic interests. Working in partnership, Congress and the Obama administration will have to make smart, strategic budget choices that deal with our problems here at home while also continuing to support effective initiatives that save lives, strengthen our security, and restore America's position in the world.

*Question.* Over the past five decades, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961—which was originally written and enacted to confront the cold-war threats of the 20th century—has swelled into a morass of rules, regulations, objectives, and directives. Foreign policy experts on both sides of the aisle—including former USAID administrators from both Democratic and Republican administrations—have said writing a new Foreign Assistance Act is central to clarifying the mission, mandate, and organizational structure for U.S. foreign assistance. The Project on National Security Reform also recently recommended a “comprehensive revision of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.”

- How do you propose we redesign the foreign assistance of the U.S.? Do you promise to work closely with both parties in Congress to ensure reforms meet the needs of the 21st century?

Answer. The President-elect is committed to a strengthened and enhanced role for foreign assistance and development in our foreign policy, as am I. It is both right and smart for the United States to renew its leadership as a nation that seeks to promote opportunity and security around the world. To that end, the President-elect has committed to doubling U.S. foreign assistance over his first term, and I look forward to working closely with the Congress to fulfill this goal. The President-elect has said that the current economic crisis could slow increases in foreign assistance.

Our foreign assistance infrastructure must be able to meet the challenges we face today while anticipating those in the months and years ahead. We should look at areas which can be better coordinated and streamlined, and would look forward to engaging the committee on ideas for reform. The President-elect has stressed the need for clearer leadership and coordination in Washington, and continued efforts to prevent abuses and corruption among recipient countries. Similarly, we should look at those areas which have proved effective and build on those successes, while determining if poorly performing initiatives are able to be improved. I pledge to work closely with both parties in Congress on these important issues.

- Where do you believe the Millennium Challenge Corporation fits into any new restructuring?

Answer. President-elect Obama supports the MCC, and the principle of greater accountability in our foreign assistance programs. It represents a worthy new approach to poverty reduction and combating corruption. However, there are challenges within the MCC. Pace of implementation is certainly one challenge, as is the danger of a lack of coordination with overall U.S. foreign assistance. The Obama administration looks forward to working to build on the promise of the MCC as we move forward with modernizing U.S. foreign assistance programs.

*Question.* What is your position on linking U.S. foreign aid to human rights conditions? For example, Egypt, the second largest recipient of U.S. aid since 1979. They persist in major abuses of human rights and religious freedom. Would you consider conditioning aid to Egypt based on the government meeting certain benchmarks like the release of political prisoners, lifting of media restrictions, etc.

Answer. I look forward to working with you on how best to address human rights concerns in Egypt.

#### COORDINATION WITH DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

*Question.* The ability of the Department of Defense to conduct contingency planning, rapidly respond to natural disasters with humanitarian relief, and its vast experience in civil-military affairs is a cornerstone of American foreign policy and soft power projection. Important victories like the Berlin Airlift, the 2004 Tsunami Response, Pakistani Earthquake Relief in 2006, and hundreds of other humanitarian relief operations conducted by DOD provide immense credibility and benefit to America's image abroad. What do you see as the relationship between State Department and the Department of Defense in public diplomacy, humanitarian relief operations, and soft power projection?

Answer. The President-elect has repeatedly asserted that we must more effectively integrate our military and civilian tools of national power to have a successful and sustainable national security strategy. If confirmed as Secretary of State, I am committed to coordinating efforts closely with the Department of Defense in Iraq and elsewhere and to instill that culture of cooperation in the Department. Secretary Gates and I worked well together during my service on the Senate Armed Services Committee and I am confident that we can work together to ensure that we continue to close coordination gaps between the Department of State and the Department of Defense. In order to facilitate that coordination, we must strengthen our civilian capacity to operate alongside our military.

*Question.* There are several Department of Defense core competencies that are critical to the success of State Department operations; rapid global mobility (airlift operations), provincial reconstruction teams, and DOD's massive logistics system (rapidly distribute humanitarian relief via land, air, and sea). How do you foresee the State Department partnering with the DOD to increase collaboration and increase utilization of these areas of expertise? Do you support the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI)? If so, how can the capabilities of the State Department and DOD be more effectively merged?

Answer. As stated in response to the previous question: The President-elect has repeatedly asserted that we must more effectively integrate our military and civilian tools of national power in order to have a successful and sustainable national secu-

rity strategy. If confirmed as Secretary of State, I am committed to coordinating efforts closely with the Department of Defense in Iraq and elsewhere and to instill that culture of cooperation in the Department. Secretary Gates and I worked well together during my service on the Senate Armed Services Committee and I am confident that we can work together to ensure that we continue to close coordination gaps between the Department of State and the Department of Defense. In order to facilitate that coordination, we must strengthen our civilian capacity to operate alongside our military.

*Question.* As a Senator, you voted for Commander's Emergency Response Program funding, but at a lower figure than requested, and then criticized how it was being spent. According to commanders on the ground, CERP has been cited as being an invaluable tool to improve security and stability in areas of conflict. Do you support the continuation of CERP funding and at levels our commanders on the ground request? If not, how do you propose replacing this vital tool of foreign aid and diplomacy?

*Answer.* CERP funding is an important tool for military commanders. However, the President-elect and I believe that we must strengthen our civilian capacity to operate alongside our military. If confirmed, one of my priorities as Secretary will be to work with Congress to increase resources of the Department as well as to make better use of the resources the Department already has.

#### UNITED NATIONS

##### *International Atomic Energy Agency*

*Question.* Will you pledge to consult closely with the members of this committee concerning who the U.S. will support as the next Executive Director of the International Atomic Energy Agency?

*Answer.* Yes.

##### *Human Rights Council*

*Question.* In its first few months, the Obama administration will decide whether to change existing U.S. policy to attend the Durban Review Conference (Durban II) and fully participate in the United Nations Human Rights Council by seeking a seat in the upcoming May election. Would you recommend that the President continue current policy or reverse it?

*Answer.* Unfortunately, the new Human Rights Council has strayed far from the principles of the authors of the U.N. Declaration of Human Rights. It has passed eight resolutions condemning Israel, a democracy with higher standards of human rights than its accusers, but it is only with difficulty that it adopted resolutions pressing Sudan and Myanmar. The United States should seek to reform the U.N. Human Rights Council. We need our voice to be heard loud and clear to call attention to the world's most repressive regimes, end the despicable obsession with Israel. If confirmed, I look forward to working with the President-elect and the U.N. Permanent Representative and consulting with this committee as we review whether and when to run for election to a seat on the Council. Whether or not we seek election, we will certainly fully engage to make reform of the human rights system a priority of the United States.

The United Nation's 2001 World Conference Against Racism in Durban—Durban I—was a disgrace. The idea of Durban I was to have a historic global stand against racism, which this administration certainly agrees is an important undertaking. But as the President-elect has said, Durban I degenerated into an ugly display of anti-Israel and anti-Semitic outrages. The next administration will work hard in an effort to ensure that the 2009 Conference—which will take place in Geneva in April—does not once again get twisted into a forum for hatred and bias, like its predecessor. We want to review what we can do to that end but, unfortunately, there are indications that this conference will be just as deeply flawed. The President-elect and I both believe that we must stand up to prejudice in all of its forms—including the scourge of anti-Semitism. We will not throw up our hands—we'll keep working to help put the conference on a responsible path. But if those efforts fail, then the U.S. will not participate.

##### *U.N. Peacekeeping*

*Question.* U.S. taxpayers have continually seen reports of United Nations peacekeepers that have robbed from, beaten, or sexually assaulted the very people they were sent to protect. What policies will you support to ensure the U.N. peacekeepers are held to high moral standards of conduct?

Answer. United Nations peace operations play an important role in promoting peace and stability, preventing conflict, resolving conflict, and stabilizing conflict zones once war has ended. The new administration will be committed to preventing misconduct by U.N. military, police, and civilian peacekeeping personnel, with a particular focus on sexual exploitation and abuse, as well as on financial offenses such as fraud and black market activities. The U.N. has undertaken a number of preventive and disciplinary measures, such as establishing codes of conduct, training, investigative procedures, and public awareness programs. Disciplinary action by governments contributing personnel is also critical.

*U.N. Reform*

*Question.* Under the Bush administration, there was a concerted effort to improve transparency and accountability at the U.N. However, these successes were limited to the Secretariat and not the myriad other funds and agencies that make up the U.N. Do you support these efforts and what policies will you promote to improve reform of the U.N.?

Answer. Both Democratic and Republican Presidents have understood for decades that when the U.N. and related institutions work well, they enhance our influence. And when they don't work well—as in the cases of Darfur and the farce of Sudan's election to the former U.N. Commission on Human Rights, for example—we should work with likeminded friends to make sure that these institutions reflect the values that motivated their creation in the first place.

We must prioritize U.N. reform, including greater transparency, accountability, and efficiency. The U.N. needs to modernize. Outdated structures and bloated management structures continue to undermine performance. The United States has a critical role to play helping to spearhead reform efforts.

ENERGY

*Question.* According to a National Association of Manufacturers' Study, energy is the second largest cost of doing business in America. Access to affordable energy provides a competitive advantage for the U.S., vis-a-vis other countries. Will you support treaties or other types of international agreements that require an increase in U.S. Government subsidies to our energy sector or raise the cost of energy production in the U.S.?

Answer. I will consult closely with other members of the new administration's energy policy team as well as with Congress before negotiating international agreements that could impact our energy policy in the United States.

RESPONSE TO QUESTION SUBMITTED SENATOR JOHNNY ISAKSON

*Question.* Since 1997, the Republic of China (Taiwan) has pursued observer status at the annual meeting of the World Health Assembly (WHA), the supreme decision-making body of the World Health Organization (WHO). Taiwan will once again seek observer status when the 2009 meeting of the WHA begins this May in Geneva.

Taiwan has engaged in this effort because the preservation of global public health is one of the most important areas for international participation and cooperation. As witnessed in recent years, the threats posed by SARS and the avian flu did not respect national boundaries, and multilateral efforts were essential to effect preventative measures and control their proliferation. Occasional reports of outbreak of epidemic diseases demonstrate the need for active regional cooperation and global collaboration to preserve public health.

In 2004, the U.S. Congress passed, and President Bush signed, Public Law 108–235, which authorized the Secretary of State to pursue observer status for Taiwan at the annual WHA meeting.

- If confirmed, would you reaffirm U.S. policy to support Taiwan's WHA observer status? Could you describe steps that you would take to advance this objective?

Answer. I commend Taiwan's President Ma and China's President Hu Jintao for seizing the opportunity created by President Ma Ying-jeou's election this past March. I sincerely hope they will continue this progress, as the United States gains from peaceful, stable cross-Strait relations, including development of economic ties and cross-Strait security. In this context, and consistent with the "one China" policy, I believe that it is appropriate for the United States to support Taiwan's efforts to expand its international space, such as observer status at the World Health Assembly. It is important for Beijing to demonstrate to the people of Taiwan that the practical and nonconfrontational approach taken by President Ma toward the mainland can achieve positive results. As you note, there are myriad public health issues that

result from Taiwan's continued exclusion from appropriate participation in the World Health Organization, and like you I believe that the United States should work with Taiwan to see that situation rectified.

---

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DAVID VITTER

*Question.* What MOU language makes it crystal clear that future, nonattendance-fee contributions to the Clinton Global Initiative (CGI) will be publically disclosed?

*Answer.* Thank you for the opportunity again to set the record straight on this issue. The only "nonattendance-fee contributions" to the Clinton Global Initiative (CGI) are sponsorship fees. In reaching agreement on the MOU, the Transition and the Foundation took into account that CGI already publishes all sponsors on an annual basis. And to be clear: CGI will continue its practice of disclosing the names of all sponsors on an annual basis. Thus, as I said in my testimony today, CGI is not covered in the MOU for this purpose "because they already have a practice of disclosing all of their contributions. There is no need to require it."

*Question.* What MOU language makes it crystal clear that future foundation contributions from contributors will be publically disclosed?

*Answer.* The MOU provides: "In anticipation of Senator Clinton's nomination and confirmation as Secretary of State, the foundation will publish its contributors this year. During any service by Senator Clinton as Secretary of State, the foundation will publish annually the names of new contributors."

The MOU's use of "new contributors" includes all "new contributions." In my response to Senator Kerry's questions for the record, I attempted to address any lack of clarity on this matter by stating: "As I understand from the MOU, should I be confirmed, the foundation will publish annually the names of all contributors for that year."

To restate for record here, all new contributions will be reported, without regard to whether the contributor has given before.

*Question.* You have said that even the appearance of conflicts of interest must be avoided. Does the Foundation's acceptance of a major contribution from the Alavi Foundation after your nomination to be Secretary of State meet that test?

*Answer.* The appearance of a conflict of interest must be assessed based upon all the facts and circumstances. In this instance, I have confirmed with the Foundation that it has not accepted a contribution from the Alavi Foundation after my nomination. The only contribution from the Alavi Foundation was published with all the other contributors on December 18, 2008.

*Question.* Do you believe the U.S. is in violation of the text, history, practice or intent of article VI of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)?

*Answer.* No; I do not.

*Question.* Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act requires that all measures that "obligate the United States to reduce or limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States in a militarily significant manner" be undertaken with respect to article 11, section 2, clause 2 of the United States Constitution—the Treaty clause—requiring the advice and consent of Senators. Are you committed to compliance with this law?

*Answer.* Yes; I am committed to comply with that law. The Obama administration will consult closely with the Congress on the form in which any agreements are submitted to the Congress.

*Question.* Both you and President-elect Obama cosponsored legislation in the 110th Congress that would prohibit a so-called 123 civil nuclear cooperation agreement from entering into force or being carried out as long as Russia continues to provide nuclear cooperation and advanced conventional weapons sales, including advanced air defense systems, to Iran. Can we assume that the President-elect and you continue to believe that is the right policy and as a consequence, the Obama administration will not push for Russia 123 to come into force until the objectives of that legislation are satisfied?

*Answer.* Entry into force of the United States-Russia agreement for civil nuclear cooperation (the 123 Agreement) could bring significant benefits for the United States. At a technical level, an agreement could help accelerate U.S. nuclear energy research and development plans in such areas as fast neutron reactors, where the Russians possess both experience and facilities not available in the U.S. A 123 Agreement also supports U.S. commercial interests by allowing U.S. firms to sell

nuclear materials, equipment, and technologies to Russia and to team up with Russian companies in joint ventures to develop and market reactors and other products to third countries. But perhaps the most important benefit of a 123 Agreement is that it can facilitate a cooperation in preventing nuclear proliferation and nuclear terrorism—including by allowing the U.S. to contribute materially to Russia's multilateral uranium enrichment facility at Angarsk and by promoting a more promising political and legal environment for pursuing a range of cooperative threat reduction programs (e.g., nuclear security upgrades in Russia). In light of Russia's behavior in the Georgia conflict, the Bush administration decided that the timing was not appropriate last year for pursuing congressional approval of the United States-Russia 123 Agreement. The Obama administration will review this issue and decide how to proceed, taking into such factors as the potential benefits of the deal, Russia's compliance with its commitments to stop sensitive nuclear cooperation between Russian entities and Iran, and the context of the overall United States-Russia relationship.

*Question.* Senator, the question of how to halt Iran's illegal nuclear weapons program is surely the most immediate question that will confront the new administration. While the Bush administration managed to get a series of U.N. Security Council Resolutions on the matter, it is widely accepted that the sanctions agreed to in those resolutions have been insufficient. Regardless of what one thinks of the President-elect's plan for unconditional diplomatic engagement, I assume you agree that for it to be successful, the U.S. must approach that engagement from a position of strength, which means we must be using all the tools at our disposal?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama has stated that he will do everything in his power to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, beginning with the power of aggressive American diplomacy. We will use all tools at our disposal, and no options are off the table. President-elect Obama said during the campaign that his administration will present the Iranian regime with a clear choice: Abandon your nuclear weapons program, support for terror and threats to Israel, and there will be meaningful incentives. Refuse, and we will ratchet up the pressure, with stronger unilateral sanctions; stronger multilateral sanctions in the Security Council; and sustained action outside the U.N. to isolate the Iranian regime. By pursuing tough, direct diplomacy, we will be better able to rally the world to our side, strengthen multilateral sanctions, and to convince the Iranian people that their own government is the author of its isolation.

*Question.* The President-elect made the following statements during the campaign:

- a. "I will do everything in my power to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon—everything in my power to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon—everything."
- b. ". . . while we should take no option, including military action, off the table, sustained and aggressive diplomacy combined with tough sanctions should be our primary means to prevent Iran from building nuclear weapons."
- c. "Tough-minded diplomacy would include real leverage through stronger sanctions. . . . It would mean full implementation of U.S. sanction laws."
- d. "We should also pursue other unilateral sanctions that target Iranian banks and Iranian assets."
- e. In July 2007, Barack Obama was asked by a video questioner: "Would you be willing to meet separately, without precondition, during the first year of your administration, in Washington or anywhere else, with the leaders of Iran, Syria, Venezuela, Cuba, and North Korea? . . ." "I would," he answered.

Do you agree with these statements? Can we expect the new administration to promptly and aggressively use all sanctions options at the disposal of the United States?

*Answer.* The President-elect and I are committed to opening a new chapter in American foreign policy and developing new approaches to the challenges and opportunities we face. The Obama administration will support tough, aggressive, and direct diplomacy, without preconditions, with our adversaries. Note that there is a distinction between preparations and preconditions. For possible negotiations with Iran, the President-elect and I both believe that there must be careful preparation—such as low-level talks, coordination with allies, the establishment of an agenda, and an evaluation of the potential for progress.

We will carefully prepare for any negotiations. We will not sit down with Iran just for the sake of talking. But we are willing to lead tough and principled diplomacy with the appropriate Iranian leader at a time and place of our choosing—if, and only if—it can advance the interests of the United States.



While pursuing a policy of tough and direct diplomacy, the Obama administration will use various means to increase economic pressure on Iran to persuade it to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons. We will be guided by the law when it comes to applying statutory sanctions. If there are entities in violation of the Iran Sanctions Act, we will take necessary steps under that statute.

*Question.* Treasury Under Secretary Stuart Levey has been remarkably successful at isolating Iran's economy, chiefly its banks. As a Senator, did you support these efforts? As Secretary of State, will you pledge to this panel that the State Department will fully support the Treasury Department?

*Answer.* When it comes to targeting the finances of terrorists and other threats to U.S. national security, we expect to build on the efforts of the Bush administration. If I am confirmed I will look to hit the ground running on these issues, because we can't risk any delays when dealing with terrorists and dangerous regimes. At the same time, we will review all of these initiatives with an eye toward continuing what is effective, improving what should be improved, and beginning new initiatives where they are needed. I look forward to working closely with the committee in doing so.

*Question.* The President-elect made this statement on the campaign trail: "Tough-minded diplomacy would include real leverage through stronger sanctions. . . . It would mean full implementation of U.S. sanction laws." Are you familiar with the Iran Sanctions Act, which punishes companies—foreign and domestic companies—that invest in Iran's energy sector and was not used by the Bush administration?

*Answer.* President-elect Obama is committed to taking the necessary steps to have policies consistent with existing U.S. sanctions laws.

*Question.* Do you agree that sanctions legislation only deters bad actors as long as they believe there is a reasonable chance that a violation will be caught and punished?

*Answer.* The prospect of punishment can deter bad actors, which is why we must ensure that violators of sanctions legislation are held responsible for their crimes. President-elect Obama is committed to implementing U.S. sanctions laws and existing U.N. Security Council Resolutions. We need to work with our partners on the Security Council to consider additional measures to toughen penalties for violators, and strengthen enforcement tools.

*Question.* Iran is racing ahead to build its own domestic refinery capacity in order to protect itself from disruptions to its imported supply of gasoline and diesel. In one of its most recent large-scale domestic refinery projects, the Chinese firms Sinopec and China National Offshore Oil Co. and the Malaysian firm SKS Ventures are significant investors. Would you please let me know in a letter within 30 days of your taking office at State whether these firms' activities are in violation of the Iran Sanctions Act or International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA)?

*Answer.* We are closely monitoring this situation, and remain cognizant of potential pressure points with Iran. The incoming administration will work with international partners to persuade the Iranian regime that its best interest is to verifiably abandon its nuclear weapons efforts.

*Question.* As Secretary, would you commit to this committee that the Department would investigate investments in the Iranian Energy sector that appear to violate that act and promptly and completely answer any inquiries from members of this committee who ask about specific reported transactions?

*Answer.* I am committed to working with the committee on these important efforts.

*Question.* Additionally, I'm curious if you agree with the President-elect, when he said the following during the campaign: "if we can impose the kinds of sanctions that, say, for example, Iran right now imports gasoline, even though it's an oil producer, because its oil infrastructure has broken down, if we can prevent them from importing the gasoline that they need and the refined petroleum products, that starts changing their cost-benefit analysis. That starts putting the squeeze on them." (Debate, October 7, 2008) Can we expect that you'll work to target Iran's reliance on imported gasoline in order to achieve this change in the regime's "cost-benefit analysis"?

*Answer.* As stated earlier, we are closely monitoring this situation, and remain cognizant of potential pressure points with Iran including its importation of refined gasoline.

*Question.* Do you agree that it should be U.S. policy to dissuade other countries from supplying (directly or through companies that do business within their territory) refined petroleum products to Iran?

*Answer.* The incoming administration views with great concern the role that Iran is playing in the world, including its sponsorship of terrorism, its continuing interference with the functioning of other governments and its pursuit of nuclear weapons. We continue to look at the issue of Iran's importation of refined gasoline as a part of our larger foreign policy review.

*Question.* The U.S. and the EU have been negotiating with the Iranians for several years through the EU-3 (France, Germany, U.K.) with no results. The Europeans have had the precondition of a suspension of uranium enrichment before agreeing to any payoffs to the Iranian regime. There have been four U.N. Security Council resolutions that also call for the suspension of the enrichment.

Do you support the U.S. going alone and unilaterally offering Iran "negotiations without preconditions" thus abandoning our European allies and reversing course away from the U.N. Security policy currently in place?

*Answer.* We believe that our best chance to gain Iranian compliance with the demands of the international community comes through using all tools at our disposal, ranging from direct, aggressive, principled diplomacy, to tougher unilateral sanctions, to enhanced multilateral sanctions.

*Question.* President Bush signed legislation that mandates the U.S. support Taiwan's observer status in the World Health Organization (WHO) and each year the administration must report to Congress on steps taken to assist Taiwan in that effort. In an era where diseases such as SARS and Avian Influenza can travel the world at the speed of an international flight and tens of millions of lives could be at risk, a lack of participation by Taiwan in the WHO is a danger not only for Taiwan's population but our national security, and the world's, as well. Will you work with Taiwan and will the administration be engaged with the U.N. and other stakeholders to assist Taiwan in gaining Observer Status within the WHO as well as aggressively support Taiwan's entry into other international bodies?

*Answer.* I commend Taiwan's President Ma and China's President Hu Jintao for seizing the opportunity created by President Ma Ying-jeou's election this past March. I sincerely hope they will continue this progress, as the United States gains from peaceful, stable cross-Strait relations, including development of economic ties and cross-Strait security. In this context, and consistent with the "one China" policy, I believe that it is appropriate for the United States to support Taiwan's efforts to expand its international space, such as observer status at the World Health Assembly. It is important for Beijing to demonstrate to the people of Taiwan that the practical and nonconfrontational approach taken by President Ma toward the mainland can achieve positive results. As you note, there are myriad public health issues that result from Taiwan's continued exclusion from appropriate participation in the World Health Organization, and like you I believe that the United States should work with Taiwan to see that situation rectified.

*Question.* One of the most effective means of building relationships and ties between Taiwan and U.S. officials is for personal meetings and briefings. The administration has an opportunity with two new Presidents—President-elect Obama here and President Ma in Taiwan—to build these relationships through visits by Cabinet members and senior political appointees. Conversely, visits by Taiwanese Cabinet ministers and other senior officials here would be extremely beneficial to a wide-range of U.S. officials. This also fits in with President-elect Obama's desire to broadly engage the world community. Would you agree that these visits make sense for Taiwan?

*Answer.* As I noted in my response to Senator DeMint, in his letter to President Ma Ying-jeou on May 20, 2008, President-elect Obama stated that he believed the U.S. should strengthen channels of communication with officials of Taiwan's Government. I share that view and believe that it is important that the United States seek to rebuild a relationship of trust with Taiwan, and support for Taiwan's robust democracy. I support the "one China" policy of the U.S., adherence to the three U.S.-PRC joint communiqué concerning Taiwan, and observance of the Taiwan Relations Act.

*Question.* In 2007, you voted against a resolution labeling Iran's Revolutionary Guard a "terrorist" organization. Is it still your contention that Iran's Revolutionary Guard is not a "terrorist" organization?

Answer. I'm not aware of voting against any such resolution. Both the President-elect and I agree that the Iranian Revolutionary Guard should be labeled a "terrorist" organization.

*Question.* For most of the Clinton and much of the Bush administrations a great deal of effort was focused on bringing about an end to the Israel-Palestinian conflict. In spite of these efforts, it remains unclear as to whether conditions are ripe for a deal. The Palestinian leadership is weak and divided and Hamas, committed to Israel's destruction, controls Gaza.

- Do you directly support Israel's right to defend themselves?
- What are your realistic expectations for negotiations in the coming months? How ripe is the situation for resolution? Can the U.S. "force" the process?
- How would you assess Arab support for the peace process and for Mahmoud Abbas? What can you do to encourage the Arab states to make good on their pledges to Palestinians and to play a more constructive role?
- With Palestinian elections for the Presidency taking place sometime in the coming year, there is the possibility that Hamas will take control. What will the Obama administration policy be if the Palestinian Authority is run or effectively controlled by Hamas?

Answer. Israel faces many threats to its security, and President-elect Obama and I will always support Israel's right to defend itself. We also share a belief that Israel's security would benefit from peace agreements with its neighbors. President-elect Obama has pledged to work actively from the beginning of his administration to help Israel and the Palestinians achieve peace and security through a two-state solution, because this is in both parties' interests, and chiefly, because it is in the United States interests. Throughout 2008, he urged Israel and the Palestinian Authority to make as much progress as possible in their negotiations that arose out of the Annapolis conference, so that a functioning process could be continued in 2009. And indeed, the parties report that progress has been made in these talks, which they hope to build upon. Our commitment is to help them build on that progress and achieve their goal of two states living side by side in peace and security. That commitment remains, even in the face of very difficult and challenging events, such as the recent events in Gaza and southern Israel.

I believe the Arab states have an important role to play in advancing efforts to achieve peace between Israelis and Palestinians. Their chief means to do so are providing political and economic support to the Palestinian Authority, and taking steps toward normalization with Israel. The Arab Peace Initiative contains some constructive elements which could be important bases for negotiations and for proactive steps to give the initiative a more operational character. I look forward to discussing these opportunities with Israeli, Palestinian, and Arab leaders and encouraging progress in these efforts.

*Question.* With Palestinian elections for the Presidency taking place sometime in the coming year, there is the possibility that Hamas will take control. What will the Obama administration policy be if the Palestinian Authority is run or effectively controlled by Hamas?

Answer. I prefer not to speculate about the outcome of future elections in other countries. Our policy on Hamas is clear: We support the Quartet's conditions on any dealings with Hamas—recognition of Israel, recognition of Israel, renunciation of violence, and abiding by past agreements.

*Question.* The Financial Action Task Force (FATF) is an intergovernmental body whose purpose is the promotion of national and international policies to combat money laundering and terrorist financing. FATF has a list of 40 recommendations and 9 special recommendations it uses to test whether financial institutions are taking necessary precautions to avoid terror financing, money-laundering, and other illicit activities.

Will you commit to protecting the U.S. taxpayer from inadvertently funding such things as genocide in Burma or weapon sales to terrorists by North Korea by prohibiting U.S. funds from going to any U.N. system entity or other foreign development organization that transfers funds to banks within states that are not certified by FATF?

Answer. This is an important issue. Your proposal is one that I have not yet had the opportunity to review or consider. I look forward to conducting that review and consulting with you as we move forward. The United States, in coordination with allies and partners, has made great strides in preventing terrorism supporters from misusing the formal financial sector. I will work with the President-elect and my fellow Cabinet members as the United States deploys all the tools of national power

to continue cracking down on terror-funding, including military action, law enforcement investigations, prosecutions, and diplomatic and intelligence activities.

*Question.* The Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act (FFATA), co-authored by President-elect Obama, requires all Federal funding to be put on the public Web site, [USAspending.gov](http://USAspending.gov). This includes all contract, subcontract, grant, and subgrant data such as the amount of award, source of funds, and the intended purpose of the funds.

Despite this law, the State Department has failed to comply by not listing all its contributions to entities within the U.N. system, such as the U.N. Development Program, UNICEF, or UNESCO. Other U.S. agencies that transfer U.S. funds to U.N. entities—such as the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Treasury, Interior, Energy, and Education—have either ignored FFATA or only have submitted partial information for their U.N. funding.

Shouldn't the U.S. taxpayers know where their money is going at the U.N., and if you are confirmed, what will you do to ensure compliance at the State Department and other U.S. agencies with the FFATA re U.N. system funding?

Why should the U.S. fund a U.N. entity or any other grantee or subgrantee of the State Department if it does not comply with U.S. law as found in the FFATA, and supply subgrant information to be posted on [USAspending.gov](http://USAspending.gov)?

*Answer.* I have not been fully briefed on the FFATA, but I look forward to reviewing this issue and consulting with you on it as we move forward. I take very seriously my responsibility to the U.S. taxpayer to ensure that our U.N. contributions are well-spent and well-managed. I also take very seriously my commitment to complying with the law. If I am confirmed, I intend to work closely with Congress and the members of this committee on this and the entire range of issues pertaining to the United Nations.

