

Daily Press Briefing: Discussion on India

Contents

July 15, 2014	3
July 10, 2014	4
July 2, 2014	5
June 27, 2014	7
June 26, 2014	8
June 20, 2014	10
June 13, 2014	11
June 11, 2014	12
June 6, 2014	13
June 5, 2014	17
May 27, 2014	18
May 23, 2014	20
May 22, 2014	22
May 21, 2014	23
May 20, 2014	24
May 19, 2014	26
May 13, 2014	29
May 12, 2014	31
April 7, 2014	33
April 4, 2014	35
April 1, 2014	36
March 31, 2014	38

March 28, 2014	41
March 17, 2014	43
March 7, 2014	44
March 3, 2014	47
February 28, 2014	48
February 27, 2014	52
February 14, 2014	55
February 6, 2014	57
January 16, 2014	62
January 13, 2014	63
January 9, 2014	65
January 8, 2014	67
January 6, 2014	73
January 3, 2014	77
January 2, 2014	81
December 30, 2013	88
December 20, 2013	93
December 19, 2013	98
December 18, 2013	116
December 17, 2013	136
September 30, 2013	149
September 17, 2013	151
September 13, 2013	152
August 22, 2013	156

July 15, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

MS. PSAKI: I have one item at the top. I think you all saw the announcement by Foreign Secretary Hague, and I think you all know what an excellent working relationship Secretary Kerry has had with Foreign Secretary Hague, which exemplified the U.S.-U.K. special relationship. You'll recall that the United Kingdom was the first country Secretary Kerry visited as Secretary of State, and Foreign Secretary Hague was the first foreign minister to receive him.

Secretary Kerry is immensely grateful for the close collaboration they've enjoyed on the full range of bilateral and global issues. In addition to the critical work on the peace and security challenges of our time, Foreign Secretary Hague has been instrumental in global efforts to improve the condition of humanity, to protect those who would become victims of trafficking and sexual violence and promote the rights of women and girls. He's been a stalwart supporter of these working to give the voice to the voiceless and creating opportunity that empowers people to reach their potential.

Mr. Hague is and will continue to be a dear friend of the United States and of Secretary Kerry's. We wish him the very – the very best to his successor, Phillip Hammond, as he assumes the duties of the office of foreign secretary. As friends and allies, the United States and the United Kingdom will continue to stand together for freedom and for liberty and to work for a more secure and prosperous world.

July 10, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: How do you address the fears that are raised in the Indian subcontinent about the Pakistani nuclear weapons after this Iraq incident?

MS. PSAKI: After the Iraq incident?

QUESTION: Yes, the insurgents --

MS. PSAKI: Can you play this out a little bit more for me? What are the --

QUESTION: Yeah. You just answered that the Iraqi insurgents took the nuclear material, but that was not --

MS. PSAKI: We don't have any confirmation of who the source of taking the material was.

QUESTION: Yeah, but in Pakistan, there -- which is nearly a failed state, are you confident of the security of their nuclear weapons?

MS. PSAKI: We've obviously been -- we have a range of dialogues with Pakistan. We work closely with them on counterterrorism issues and a range of issues. I'm not aware of any new concern in this case.

July 2, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Yesterday, The Washington Post put out a story and based on some documents it also put out on its website, according to which U.S. has been spying on several political organizations across the world, five or six. One of them is BJP from India, which is now the main ruling party in India. What do you have to say on that?

MS. PSAKI: Well, as has been the case consistently, we're not going to comment publicly on every specific alleged intelligence activity. As you know, since January 17th, the President has made clear that he's instructed his national security team as well as the intelligence community to work with foreign counterparts to deepen our coordination and cooperation in ways that rebuild trust moving forward. I can confirm that diplomats from our embassy have met with their MEA counterparts on this issue, but I'm not going to get into the substance of our private conversations.

QUESTION: But can you say what's the status right now? Is BJP still in that list or is off the list?

MS. PSAKI: I'm just not going to have any more details I can lay out for you, other than to convey that we have a deep and broad partnership with India. We will discuss any concerns that are – we need to discuss through our private diplomatic channels. And obviously, that is already ongoing, including as it relates to these specific reports.

QUESTION: But I believe the State Department is always consulted on these issues by NSC and the White House. What is the need for such kind of activities within political parties in India? You always have a robust engagement with the BJP. I have seen several of its leaders coming here, diplomats from here going and having regular meetings with the BJP. So what is the need for that?

MS. PSAKI: What is the need for the meetings or --

QUESTION: No, not – for the activities that the U.S. was doing in 2010.

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, I think we've spoken to this extensively as it relates to reports from around the world. I would point you to the President's speeches and remarks on this issue and steps we've taken to change our policies. And beyond that, I'm not going to have a further comment on these reports.

QUESTION: Do you think this would have an impact on your relationship with India now since that the prime minister is from that party?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we certainly hope not. We look forward to continuing discussion on a full range of bilateral and regional issues. As you know, there's been an invitation issued for a visit, and we're looking forward to that, hopefully in the fall.

QUESTION: Following the meetings that your diplomats had in New Delhi yesterday on this particular issue, have they given any assurance to the Indians that this will be not be done in the future?

MS. PSAKI: I'm just not going to have anything else to read out. There'll be continuation of private diplomatic conversations, and I'm not going to read out those out publicly.

QUESTION: Thank you.

...

QUESTION: The news reports from India are saying that the Secretary will be traveling to New Delhi for the next round of strategic dialogue with India on July 30th. Do you confirm this date?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any trips to announce and I'm not aware of plans at this point to travel in the coming weeks to India --

QUESTION: And also --

MS. PSAKI: -- but we look forward to going at some point.

QUESTION: But is it going to be late this month or next month?

MS. PSAKI: I'm not aware of plans to travel this month.

QUESTION: The same news report is saying that Deputy Secretary Burns will travel into India next week. Do you have --

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any details on his schedule in front of me. We can check, and as you know, we will put out an announcement whenever he was travel planned.

QUESTION: Okay. Thank you.

June 27, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India/Iraq
Washington, DC

QUESTION: At least two Indian nurses were beheaded by the ISIL and they were serving (inaudible) and the sick and needy in hospitals and around the country. And at least 40 Indians are still being held, and if Indian Government has asked any help from the U.S. or what's --

MS. HARF: Let me check on that. I don't know the answer to that. Obviously, both of the incidents you just mentioned really underscore the brutality of ISIL. This is a group that al-Qaida has even deemed to be too brutal for it, which I think is saying something.

So clearly we know there's huge challenges here. I can check on that specifically.

...

QUESTION: A quick question on India. Today is the 30 days, first one month the new Government of India --

MS. HARF: (Laughter.)

QUESTION: -- finishes. And Prime Minister Modi said that his government has accomplished more than what the congress did in last 60 years. What my question is: What do you think about this one month, if anything has been accomplished between the U.S. and India?

MS. HARF: Well, I don't think I have any political analysis about comparing his tenure to anyone else's. Look, the Indians are close partners no matter who's in charge.

June 26, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Madam, yesterday the Carnegie experts were discussing about the new government of Narendra Modi in India and the U.S.-India relations. What they were discussing was that India and the new government now needs a massive investment to go forward and move forward the country because the 60 years, corruption and all those things were going on.

My question is here: So many things going on between the two countries; official visits to India and all that. During these visits, have you been discussing about the massive investment in India?

MS. HARF: Well, we've certainly – and I think this is what you're asking about. We certainly talk quite a bit about the economic relationship with India, whether it's investing in certain parts of its economy; whether it's increasing exports and imports and private sector trade. That's certainly been a key part of our discussions with the Government of India, not just since Mr. Modi has been in office, but before that for a long time as well.

...

QUESTION: Today in Lahore, JUD chief Hafiz Saeed said that if U.S. can do whatever it wants, don't care, they should prove if they have proof. And then the foreign – Pakistani foreign office spokesperson Tasnim Aslam said that Pakistan is not under any obligation, because it's from U.S. and not from UN.

MS. HARF: Are you referring to the --

QUESTION: Yesterday's --

MS. HARF: Yesterday's – well, the – or the designations that we've had on LET have been in place for some time now, for years. And yesterday what we did was add additional aliases to make sure that we can increasingly cut off the funding and support to LET through other – these other aliases that they use for their activities as well. And look, we've been very clear about the threat LET poses.

QUESTION: I know, but --

MS. HARF: And we have shared information from our assessment about the attack in Herat with the Indian Government.

QUESTION: No, but --

QUESTION: Marie, the UN has also imposed sanction on LET and Hafiz Saeed.

MS. HARF: Yes. Yes.

QUESTION: So Pakistan is under obligation to implement --

MS. HARF: I'm happy to check with our UN team about those specifics.

QUESTION: No, but when the foreign -- foreign office spokesperson says that no obligation from the U.S., it's a partner state. So what have you spoken --

MS. HARF: Well, I haven't seen those comments, and I don't want to get into a tit-for-tat with my counterpart in Pakistan without seeing them. So let me check. Obviously, we've made very clear our concern about LET. That's why we put them on our designation list; that's why we try to cut off funding and support to them. Let me check on those comments, and I'm happy to see if there's more to share.

June 20, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Well, yeah. Just a quick one on India. There are reports that India is significantly expanding the capacity of a covert nuclear facility. Do you have any comment on that?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we've seen the article. But we're not – it's one report, I believe – we're not in a position to speculate on its conclusions. We remain fully committed to the terms of the 123 Agreement and to enhancing our strategic relationship. Nothing to be provided – nothing we provide to India, under the civ-nuke agreement, may be used to enhance India's military capability or add to its military stockpile. But we don't have enough information or confirmation of the report to speak to that.

QUESTION: Great. And I'm sorry, you're right. It was one report, the Jane's report, that I was referring to.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Am I not correct though in understanding that such military facilities were explicitly excluded from the Indian civil nuclear agreement? So in other words you have no right or ability to – the Indian civil nuclear agreement doesn't apply to such military facilities, correct?

MS. PSAKI: Well, my understanding of it, Arshad, is that nothing provided to India can be used to enhance their military capability. I'm not certain – obviously, that would be high speculative about this, given there's only one external report that's not --

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. PSAKI: -- a reflection of a U.S. Government report. So --

June 13, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: One, madam, if you have any update on the Assistant Secretary Nisha Biswal's visit to India?

MS. HARF: I don't. I'll see if I can get you one from our folks. I don't have one.

QUESTION: And second, Ambassador Kathleen Stephens in Delhi, and she said that her mission is to foster relations between the new government and the U.S. and that trade and others. What will be her designation there? Charge d'affairs or the new ambassador of --

MS. HARF: I'm not sure. Let me check. I'm happy to check.

QUESTION: And -- but can you also confirm that will -- still U.S. has no new ambassador in Delhi?

MS. HARF: I don't think there's been any change. Let me double-check and see where we are on that.

QUESTION: Can we stay in the region?

QUESTION: Finally --

MS. HARF: Yes. Just for a few more. Yeah, but just for a few more.

June 11, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Yeah. On India, Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asia Nisha Desai Biswal has just returned from her India trip.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: And following her trip, there are reports in Indian media about the strategic dialogue taking place in Washington in the month of August. Do you have a confirmed date now?

MS. PSAKI: We don't yet have a confirmed date. I know there have also been reports of when a trip by Mr. Modi will take place. We don't have a confirmed date of that either. Obviously we're working through that with authorities in India.

QUESTION: And how was --

QUESTION: Can I follow up with that, a quick follow-up?

MS. PSAKI: Sure. Go ahead, Goyal.

QUESTION: Thank you, Madam. One, as far as Madam Nisha Biswal's visit and other high-level visits are concerned, would you think that big explosions are coming between the two countries as far as economic relations are concerned, trade and -- I've been hearing that so much visits coming between the U.S. and the Indian -- new Indian Government.

MS. PSAKI: You are right. Trade and our economic partnership is an incredibly important part of our relationship, and I expect that will continue.

June 6, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on India/Pakistan/China
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: Today is the 30th anniversary of Operation Blue Star in which the Indian army butchered hundreds, we can say – we don't have a number – in the holy city of Amritsar of the Sikhs. And the Sikhs are now asking for a international UN investigation into the – what is the U.S. take on it, and do you support, or what's your take on it?

MS. HARF: So as you know, religious freedom and religious tolerance are fundamental pillars of U.S. society, and broadly speaking we support religious pluralism and tolerance in India, as we do everywhere around the world, but certainly also in India. In terms of any potential investigation, I'd refer you to the United Nations for comment on that potential. And again, as I said, strongly support religious tolerance and religious freedom everywhere.

QUESTION: No, but on a human rights, humanitarian point of view, and hundreds were massacred and there is no – it's 30 years and nothing has been done, no investigation, nothing. And so is this statement not – is it strong enough?

MS. HARF: I don't think I can be any stronger about our belief that people should not be in any way put in danger or discriminated against for their religion. I think I was just very clear about that.

In terms of, again, a potential investigation by the UN, I'd leave the UN to speak to that.

QUESTION: And --

...

QUESTION: And this is just a technical question. There's a map of Asia that the Department of Defense issued along with that report on China yesterday, and that shows parts of the occupied Kashmir of – as parts of Pakistan. And this – same thing had happened something like that in a map of the State Department which was later removed. Now, is there a connection between, like, the Department of State providing any maps or anything to the Department of Defense?

MS. HARF: To the Defense Department? Well, I think the Defense Department can probably explain their own maps. I'm happy to check with my colleagues there. You know our position hasn't changed. I'll check with them and see. I have no idea what happened with that map.

QUESTION: Thank you.

...

QUESTION: My – I had different question on India. Some reports have been going on throughout the news media in India – two reports: One that Prime Minister Modi will meet with the President at the United Nations on September 30th or between 25th and 30th, and another report yesterday that changed, that the two leaders will meet in Washington. So what I'm asking you: Which report is clear and true, and second, if you have any update, madam, on the visit of Madam Nisha Biswal, who was in India – if she had updated on this visit or --

MS. HARF: I do.

QUESTION: -- anything she may have discussed.

MS. HARF: I have updates galore for you today on these issues.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. HARF: So on Prime Minister Modi's possible travel to the United States – nothing to announce on dates. As President Obama and Secretary Kerry have both said, we look forward to welcoming the prime minister to Washington, just don't have any dates yet. I know there are a lot of reports out there about dates, but we don't have dates yet.

QUESTION: But --

MS. HARF: Uh-huh?

QUESTION: -- we don't get any updates from madam's visit. She – last time she went to Nepal and then she went to – she had travelled several places --

MS. HARF: I have information about her travel. I was getting there. I promise.

So Assistant Secretary Biswal just concluded a trip – her first part of her trip, which was to China, where she met with a wide range of government officials to discuss an array of regional issues, including economic engagements. While in Beijing, she also meant with scholars and think tank representatives to discuss opportunities for enhancing both north-south but also east-west regional trade linkages. She will arrive soon in New Delhi, where she will meet with Foreign Secretary Singh and a range of officials from the Ministry of External Affairs and other Government of India ministries. We'll also meet there with strategic thinkers and business leaders.

QUESTION: And if I had one more, maybe.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: As far as this new foreign minister of India, madam, she had – the Secretary Kerry and she spoke, both of them, I believe, recently. Secretary called her – and my question is that she mentioned that with Pakistan, there cannot be peace or talks unless until there are some terrorists – especially Ibrahim Dawood must be given to India or some of those peace

agreements between the two countries. So where do we stand on this as far as U.S. is concerned or Secretary is concerned? Is he --

MS. HARF: Well, broadly speaking, we believe that India and Pakistan should continue steps to improve the relationship between the two countries. Obviously, it's incredibly important for them to do so. I don't have more specifics about what that should look like or what it might entail.

QUESTION: I just wanted to mention quickly -- as far as the two prime ministers are concerned, India and Pakistan, they have good relations already and they are exchanging gifts and all that for their mothers. And I think -- I hope that things will be better in the future.

MS. HARF: I couldn't agree more.

QUESTION: Thank you, madam.

...

QUESTION: Assistant Secretary Biswal -- you said she was going to meet the foreign secretary as well as --

MS. HARF: MEA officials.

QUESTION: Yeah, other -- yeah. Is she going to meet the minister?

MS. HARF: The prime minister?

QUESTION: No, the minister of external affairs.

MS. HARF: I don't -- I say -- have "a range of officials" here. I can get more details. I don't know if that --

QUESTION: I don't know that she -- that the assistant secretary normally does. I'm just asking. Yeah.

MS. HARF: I don't know either. I'm happy to check and see if there are more details to share about her schedule.

India, yes.

QUESTION: Yeah. The spokesperson from Ministry of External Affairs today said at a news conference that Prime Minister Modi will be coming to Washington the month of September. That you confirm?

MS. HARF: I think I just made very clear that I have no dates to confirm about the prime --

QUESTION: That's not dates – month.

MS. HARF: I think the month could be considered a date range also. I have nothing to confirm in any way on timing of the prime minister's visit to Washington. We look forward to welcoming him here.

QUESTION: Can you confirm that he is coming to Washington, as opposed to meeting the President in New York?

MS. HARF: As I said, we look forward to welcoming the prime minister to Washington.

QUESTION: Okay. Sorry. Yeah, yeah.

MS. HARF: We'll figure out a date.

QUESTION: He also said that the next round of Strategic Dialogue would be held in Washington.

MS. HARF: I can check. I'm not sure.

June 5, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Media reports in New Delhi are saying that Prime Minister Modi is coming to the U.S. in September. Can you confirm that?

MS. HARF: Well, as we said at the time – as President Obama and Secretary Kerry both said, we look forward to welcoming the prime minister to Washington; nothing to announce on timing at this point.

QUESTION: And since that, a little time has passed. The government is in action. How the State Department is looking forward to welcome him, or what kind of negotiations will take place?

MS. HARF: About him coming here?

QUESTION: Yes.

MS. HARF: I don't have any more details. We said we look forward to welcoming him.

QUESTION: And Secretary Biswal is going to be in India tonight, and so – and do you have any update? Is she going to meet the prime minister or the external affairs minister?

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. We're still putting together her schedule of meetings, and when it's finalized we'll share it with folks.

QUESTION: Are there some hiccups? Because tonight six – she's going to be there, so --

MS. HARF: Schedules get – as you all know, get put together at the last minute. We just don't have a finalized one yet. I'll be happy to share it when we do.

May 27, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on India/Pakistan
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: Today, Pakistani and Indian prime ministers, they met in New Delhi, and the U.S. has been encouraging them – both countries to revive their dialogue for a resolution of outstanding issues. What is your reaction? And are you hoping that this meeting will lead to resumption of the composite – the comprehensive dialogue between the two countries?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we welcome the news of Prime Minister Sharif's visit to India for Prime Minister Modi's inauguration and their subsequent bilateral meeting. I would point you to both of their governments on the substance of the meeting between them, but broadly speaking, we continue to welcome any and all steps India and Pakistan take to strengthen and deepen their dialogue and cooperation, and we applaud any efforts between India and Pakistan to create economic opportunities for the people of both countries that can contribute to a more secure, stable and prosperous region. So we certainly support and applaud the news of the weekend.

...

QUESTION: As far as this meeting is concerned, if U.S. played any role before or during or anything in the future?

MS. PSAKI: Not that I'm aware of, no, Goyal.

QUESTION: And second, since Mr. – Prime Minister Modi is the new prime minister of India now, anybody attended from this building or from the U.S. Embassy as far as swearing-in ceremony was concerned?

MS. PSAKI: Our charge on the ground represented the United States at the inauguration.

QUESTION: And just a couple more on India. The first business of the new prime minister and the new government was to bring from outside the standing billions of dollars of Indian black-market money sitting by the corrupt Indian politicians. If – U.S. is going to help the new government to bring that money into India? I've been asking this for the last 15, 20 years, this same question.

MS. PSAKI: Well, as soon as we have our next bilateral meetings planned, we'll talk about what's on the agenda.

QUESTION: Thank you.

QUESTION: Can I ask why there wasn't a higher-level delegation to the president's inauguration? I mean, I look at some of the other inaugurations around the world, they've been --

QUESTION: Prime minister.

MS. PSAKI: Prime minister.

QUESTION: Prime minister, sorry.

MS. PSAKI: Because typically with India inaugurations, there isn't a high-level U.S. official sent or necessarily invited, so it's typically attended by someone on the ground.

QUESTION: That's keeping up with tradition? Is that what you're saying?

MS. PSAKI: It is. That's right.

...

QUESTION: Well, thank you, Jen. I'm just referring to my two colleagues' question on Pakistan and India's overture for a new beginning.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: My question is also related to Bangladesh because the new prime minister of India, Mr. Modi, has openly made it an overture that he wants to see Bangladesh, Pakistan on the same frontline in containing extremism, which is a very welcome sign. What is the position of the State Department in that regard, when Mr. Modi's taking the extra mile, being from the BJP and being his background well known to the rest of the world? So how would you react to this overture of Mr. Modi in coming days and weeks and months?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we'll see what happens. Obviously, we support efforts to address terrorism around the world, but I don't want to speculate on events that haven't yet happened.

May 23, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on Afghanistan/India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Seeing the terrorist attack on the Indian consulate on Herat, what do you make of – do you suspect anyone on – behind this?

MS. HARF: Do we suspect anyone behind it? I don't have anything in terms of who perpetrated this attack. Obviously, you probably saw the statement from the Embassy condemning the attack, noting that Indian and Afghan security forces performed courageously in stopping the attack. I believe that no one but the attackers was killed; there were some injured. And obviously, are concerned about these kind of situations, and we'll keep working with folks there on the security situation.

...

QUESTION: There were some reports in Afghanistan and Pakistan that those groups are sending a message to the – it will not – the new administration is not yet there – Mr. Modi, the prime minister, that their message is for him and for his administration, because he made some tough statements on the terrorism and terrorists, that when he comes he will be tough on terrorism and terrorists, and we don't want anybody to attack us and we will not attack anybody else.

MS. HARF: Well, I don't want to guess at what the motivations of terrorists like this are. I guess I'll let them speak for themselves there. I don't know what was behind the attack. Obviously, we've seen other horrific attacks like this in Afghanistan and believe that Afghanistan has a better path forward here, and we'll keep working with them on security.

QUESTION: And finally, madam, this is the third time that you – Indian mission or even Embassy had been attacked in Afghanistan, and even the civilian workers. So there's a fear now in the future for those who are there, either diplomats or even the civilian workers working there. So how they will be protected when U.S. has announced already to be out of Afghanistan?

MS. HARF: Well look, Afghanistan is still in many respects a dangerous place. We have people who serve there – both U.S. officials and also private citizens – who do so like Indian citizens do, at risk, because they believe it's important. So one thing we're focused on is, even as we transition to a different period with our efforts in Afghanistan, to keep working on security, to keep trying to build Afghanistan's own capabilities to keep their own people and people working there secure. But it's absolutely a tough place to work.

QUESTION: One more finally. In the past this question was asked that how the Indian Government will play a role in Afghanistan after U.S. withdraws and NATO. Now, since there

will be a new administration of Mr. Narendra Modi, new government, you think there will be change in the --

MS. HARF: I think I would let Mr. Modi speak for what his own policies will be in Afghanistan.

...

QUESTION: I have a quick question on India. This is going on for some time in the – some minds of the people here in the Indian American community, also in India, that – you think in somewhere, sometime, maybe U.S. had made – the U.S. Embassy made some mistakes putting all the eggs in one basket, not reaching the BJP. I'm not talking about Narendra Modi, but BJP, the number two largest party in India after Congress. But that basket was now stolen by the BJP. So --

MS. HARF: Well, I think that what you've seen, even in the run-up to the election, was our ambassador on the ground engaging with all the parties. So I would just take notion with the fact – I would take exception with the notion that we somehow picked a party or picked someone to support. That's just not the case. We engage with a broad section of Indian politics and Indian society.

QUESTION: Are we learning anything in the future?

MS. HARF: Are we learning anything in the future?

QUESTION: Not to put all the eggs in one basket?

MS. HARF: Well, I'm disagreeing with your notion that we did.

May 22, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on India

Washington, DC

QUESTION: I have quick one on India. Back – going back. Mr. Modi also said that after he becomes prime minister, his first visit as prime minister of India will be Japan, not U.S. Any comments on that, because of his business – pro-business and investment in India from the Japanese?

MS. PSAKI: Well, President Obama invited him to visit when he – sometime this year, so we'll look forward for that when that can be arranged.

QUESTION: Thank you, ma'am.

May 21, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: On India, India's incoming government has invited the leaders of seven South Asian countries to attend the swearing-in ceremony. How do you see this move?

MS. PSAKI: Well, broadly speaking, we welcome increased engagement between India and Pakistan and their leaders and other, of course, leaders in the region, and India's engagement with its neighbors leading up to the inauguration.

QUESTION: Will you encourage Pakistan leaders to attend the swearing-in ceremony?

MS. PSAKI: Will we encourage?

QUESTION: The leaders, including those of Pakistan, to attend the ceremony?

MS. PSAKI: I don't think we're going to get into that level of engagement, but certainly, the invitation has been issued, we support increased dialogue, and this is representative of that.

QUESTION: How do you see, particularly, the invitation to the Pakistani Government to attend? This is a first, I believe.

MS. PSAKI: That's true. We believe increased engagement between India and Pakistan is a positive step, so we'll see what happens.

QUESTION: Do you know if the – if an invitation's been issued to the American Government to attend?

MS. PSAKI: We don't have any plans to send a representative from the United States. It's standard for events and inaugurations in India, so it should come as no surprise.

May 20, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

Somebody asked this yesterday, so perhaps it's responsive: Ambassador Nancy Powell will depart New Delhi on Thursday, May 22nd, following her March announcement of her retirement. Ambassador Powell departs India with a deep appreciation of the Administration and the State Department for her outstanding work as ambassador to India. Under her guidance, we continued our strategic partnership across a number of important areas, such as trade, defense, space, and education. Ambassador Powell is concluding a distinguished 37-year career that has also included postings as U.S. ambassador to Uganda, Ghana, Pakistan, and Nepal, as well as service in Canada, Togo, Bangladesh, and Washington, where she was most recently director general of the Foreign Service. We offer our profound gratitude for Ambassador Powell's dedication and her inspiring career in public service, and wish her all the best in her retirement.

Ambassador Kathleen Stephens will serve as the charge until a new permanent ambassador is nominated and confirmed by the Senate. She is – Stephens is a career Foreign Service officer with the rank of career minister. She was U.S. Ambassador to South Korea from 2008 to 2011 and previously served in senior positions in Washington, Asia, and Europe. She will arrive in Delhi in early June and looks forward to working closely with the new Government of India on a range of issues.

QUESTION: She's been nominated?

MS. PSAKI: No, she's going to be serving as the charge.

QUESTION: So she's not the new ambassador?

MS. PSAKI: No, until the new ambassador – until there's a new ambassador nominated and put in and confirmed.

I'm also pleased to welcome a visiting class of Foreign Service officers today in the back. Hello, everyone. Thank you for joining us. These folks will be heading out shortly to posts around the world to serve as public diplomacy officials. We're excited to have you here and we wish you the best of luck in your new assignment.

Matt.

QUESTION: Can I just ask a very technical question --

MS. PSAKI: Yes.

QUESTION: -- on the India thing?

MS. PSAKI: Yes.

QUESTION: Is it – you don't expect someone to be – I know this is a White House thing, but you don't expect someone to be nominated before Modi has actually formed his new government, right, in terms of agreement? Would you get the --

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any information on the timing --

QUESTION: I know, but --

MS. PSAKI: -- in terms of when a nomination will be put forward.

QUESTION: Well, I just want to know if it's dependent --

MS. PSAKI: I understand what you're asking.

QUESTION: -- on the formation of the new government.

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any more information on the timing or the process.

May 19, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: The White House told us that there's going to be no person – no announcement about the new ambassador. But our ambassador is supposed to come back in May. Do you have a date when she's coming back?

And then the question – the second question is that, after she leaves, as soon as the Modi government takes over, who is the point person who will be dealing with the Modi government?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we again have an extensive team on the ground, a very large presence in India, given the importance of our relationship. So I suspect there will be a range of officials on the ground who will be in contact and run point with the new government. I don't have a specific date on her departure. We can check and see if there's more we can update.

QUESTION: So after she leaves she said there'll be a – there's a large – yeah, I agree on that. So it will be a contingent – contingent, but headless.

MS. PSAKI: Endless?

QUESTION: Headless. (Laughter.)

MS. PSAKI: Oh. No, I thought endless. No, what I was conveying is that just as is true with many, many governments where they have – we have a very important strategic relationship, there are a range of officials that interact with the government depending on the issue, whether it's the economic counselor or the political counselor, communications officials – so I expect there will be a range of officials who will be in touch with the new government and be working with them.

QUESTION: And just a technical --

MS. PSAKI: So many heads, not headless.

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. PSAKI: Go ahead.

QUESTION: So I saw your statement about that Mr. Modi as prime minister is eligible for A-1 visa. So how does it work? He has been invited by the President Obama, and so does he have to go and stand in a queue at your embassy and apply for the visa? How it works?

MS. PSAKI: I'm not going to get into the tick-tock, but heads of government and heads of state are eligible for an A-1 visa and must travel to the United States on an A-1 visa regardless of the purpose of the trip. As prime minister of India, obviously Modi would be a head of state, and you

saw the announcement from the White House this weekend, after the President's call, that they have invited him and would welcome him to the United States.

QUESTION: No, but he has to apply for the visa.

MS. PSAKI: Again, I'm not going to get into the tick-tock of the logistics, but obviously heads of state come to the United States on A-1 visas.

QUESTION: Thanks.

QUESTION: Jen, can I ask on this, there's a technical question. I don't expect you to have the answer to it.

...

QUESTION: My question is simple: Since you had many hats or many people on the ground talking with – to be the Prime Minister Mr. Modi's team in Delhi --

MS. PSAKI: Hats, not heads.

QUESTION: -- since the new guard – guard of change will be taking place this week from the Congress to BJP, from Dr. Manmohan Singh to Narendra Modi. My question is that since he – can you confirm he was – was he on a U.S. visa blacklist for 13 years? If he was, have you taken off him – has Mr. Narendra Modi no more on the blacklist of visa – U.S. visas?

MS. PSAKI: Again, as a head of state, he would be applying on an A-1 visa, so I don't have any other details for visas for you.

QUESTION: And finally, what will be the future of U.S.-India relations under Mr. Modi's government? Because since – for the last 10 years, all these things have been going on. I am sure Mr. Modi also is feeling that everybody was allowed in the U.S. to visit, but even his own party's chief, Mr. Rajnath, was here, but not him. So how you think that he will care because you will be dealing with him in this – in the future?

MS. PSAKI: Well, you saw the statement from the White House where the President invited him to visit. Obviously, we have a long, enduring partnership with India. That will continue and hopefully only grow in the future.

...

QUESTION: But finally, are you talking with his team about this issue?

MS. PSAKI: About which specific issue?

QUESTION: This visa issue problem, to forget the past but let's move in the future and --

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any other details on our conversations.

QUESTION: Thank you.

...

QUESTION: Apparently, Mr. Modi is quite a tweeter and re-tweeter, and he's tweeted his thanks --

MS. PSAKI: Social media.

QUESTION: -- to many of the heads of state who congratulated him on his victory. President Obama was one of those people who congratulated him, but somehow he didn't get around to tweeting his thanks to President Obama's congratulations. Do you ascribe anything to that?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any Twitter analysis today to share. We look forward to welcoming him to the United States when that schedule -- when that visit is scheduled.

QUESTION: Well, I mean, he has now mentioned it, but it was very, very late and it came after a whole bunch of people that you consider at the moment to be rogues, like President Putin, and others. Does it bother you at all that the President of the United States was so far down on the list of Mr. Modi's priorities to thank?

MS. PSAKI: I think our relationship between the United States and India is so strong and enduring we won't worry about the Twitter rank order.

May 13, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: It looks as if Mr. Modi may be able to declare victory as early as Friday. Given that the outgoing ambassador met with him in March before she left New Delhi, is it fair to assume that, in a phrase, “All is forgiven,” and that if he is indeed confirmed as the new prime minister, that he will get a visa to come to the U.S. to do official business?

MS. PSAKI: As you know, we don’t talk about visa applications. We’re looking forward to working --

QUESTION: Unless you want to.

MS. PSAKI: -- with the new Indian government when they’re elected. But I’m not going to speculate on that given, obviously, the results haven’t been announced yet.

QUESTION: Now, what is the policy of the U.S. Government when it comes to all fairly installed foreign leaders? Do they automatically qualify for a visa to come to the U.S. on official business? Is that U.S. policy? And if not, why not?

MS. PSAKI: Well, heads of state and heads of government are eligible for A1 visas – visa classification under the INA. No individual automatically qualifies for a U.S. visa. U.S. law exempts foreign government officials, individuals – including heads of state and heads of government – from certain – for certain potential inadmissibility grounds. I’m not going to get into any greater level of detail.

QUESTION: So you’re not suggesting that the answer to this question will be if we see – if Mr. Modi does win and become the prime minister, our – the answer to our questions will come if and when he shows up in the United States?

MS. PSAKI: I’m not speculating. Obviously, I’m not going to speak to visa applications.

...

QUESTION: Particularly because India is quite sensitive to how its diplomats and government officials are treated by the United States, is it standard practice for all foreign heads of state or heads of government to sit down with a consular official and apply and be interviewed for a visa?

MS. PSAKI: Well, anyone can apply for a visa, Roz, but beyond that, I don’t think I have more to add to your question.

QUESTION: Can you check on that, please?

MS. PSAKI: I don't think there's anything to check on. I don't have anything more to add on visa applications.

May 12, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

MS. PSAKI: I just have two items for all of you at the top. We congratulate the people of India on their participation in the largest-ever free and fair democratic election in human history. Over 500 million eligible voters peacefully went to the polls over the last six weeks, often in remote or challenging locations. These elections are an inspiring example of the power of the democratic process in action, and the United States, like so many others around the world, has great admiration and respect for the vibrancy, diversity, and resilience of India's democracy.

India continues to play a critical role in advancing prosperity, democracy, and stability across the Indo-Pacific region. Whether we're working together to educate the next generation of engineers and entrepreneurs, or combatting global challenges like climate change and violent extremism, the U.S.-India partnership is essential to securing a brighter future for both of our peoples. We look forward to working with the leaders chosen by the Indian people to advance this important partnership and to set an ambitious agenda.

...

QUESTION: The elections. Mm-hmm. The frontrunner for the – to be India's next prime minister, Narendra Modi – does he have the support of the United States?

MS. PSAKI: As you know, we don't take positions in domestic politics in India or anywhere else. As this has been election season in a large, pluralistic, multiparty democracy, it's not a surprise that it's going to take some time to, obviously, process the voting and we look forward to working with the next leader.

QUESTION: Are you aware that Mr. Modi was denied a visa in 2005 based on what happened -
-

MS. PSAKI: As you know, we don't speak to visa acceptances, applications, et cetera. So I don't have anything for you on that.

QUESTION: Does the United States view a successful election in India and successful relations with India as a counterweight to the Chinese?

MS. PSAKI: We view our relationship with India as one that's vitally important for economic, strategic reasons, and one that we look forward to continuing to grow in the future.

...

QUESTION: I'm sorry, but I have to take issue with your – well, not issue. I want to ask you: We don't take positions on domestic politics in India or anywhere else? The whole top of this

briefing was about a referendum in Ukraine, which is domestic politics, which you took a huge position on.

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think it's a different category, Matt.

April 7, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Okay. So as you I'm sure know, the BJP Party in India in its political platform says that they're going to study, revise, and update their nuclear policy. I realize that's an internal political document by one party in an election, but it's a comment that also raises questions about whether they may abandon their no-first-use policy on nuclear weapons should they come to power. Does the U.S. Government believe that it is better for the Government of India to maintain its current no-first-use pledge on nuclear weapons?

MS. PSAKI: Well, our position on this hasn't changed. We, of course, as you laid out there for us, are not going to comment on a platform of a party running for office on ongoing elections. But nothing has changed about our view.

QUESTION: And – but is it indeed your view that you think it's better for the Indian Government to have a no-first-use policy?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have anything more specific for you, Arshad. I can check with our team and see if there's more we want to lay out on this.

QUESTION: Can you tell us one more time what's your view on this?

MS. PSAKI: Again, I'm not going to outline it further. Obviously, these are discussions we have with the Indian Government. I will check and see if there's more our team would like to say.

QUESTION: Also on India?

MS. PSAKI: Sure.

QUESTION: I understand that Representative Peter King and Chuck Schumer both reached out to the Secretary about the arrest of a New York police – off-duty police officer who had some stray bullets. And I know you last week have acknowledged the arrest, but now the NYPD says it's working with the State Department. And if you can bring us up to date on --

MS. PSAKI: I don't have much more to offer you. We don't have a Privacy Act waiver. We are aware, of course, of reports of the citizen you mentioned who has been arrested in New Delhi, India. We take our obligations, of course, to assist U.S. citizens overseas very seriously, but we don't have any other additional update at this point.

QUESTION: When – but you confirmed the arrest of a citizen last week and now you're saying – are you saying that that citizen is one and the same of the citizen that was arrested? And can

you confirm that Representative King, who has published the letter, that you've received the letter?

MS. PSAKI: I can check on the letter. I didn't receive an update on that internally. I know we were looking into it. But beyond that, I just don't have any more updates for all of you since last week.

QUESTION: Do you agree with the assessment of Congressman King that arrest of this particular New York police official was in retaliation of the arrest of Indian diplomat Devyani Khobragade?

MS. PSAKI: Again, I'm not going to speculate on it, given I can't even speak to the identity of the individual.

QUESTION: (Inaudible) telling you the same thing.

MS. PSAKI: Understood. I can't speak to the identity of the individual, so I'm not going to speculate on that.

...

QUESTION: I know several State Department officials have met senior BJP leaders in the last six months. Was this issue of nuclear policy that BJP is putting up in its platform right now was discussed with them? Ambassador met – Deputy Secretary Burns met with BJP president --

MS. PSAKI: I just don't have any more details about those meetings. Obviously, we meet with a range of officials. That should come as no surprise. That's part of the job of any diplomat. But I don't have any more details about --

QUESTION: But you always discuss issues with them. Was this an issue when you discussed --

MS. PSAKI: Again, I don't have any more details for you.

QUESTION: Can you check out?

MS. PSAKI: I will, but I will probably have nothing to offer you, so I will leave you with that expectation.

April 4, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Are you aware that a New York City police officer is being held in India --

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: -- on a weapons charge? And what's the State Department's role in doing something to get him freed?

MS. HARF: We are aware of the reports, obviously, that a U.S. citizen has been arrested. We, because of privacy considerations, don't have further comment. Obviously, we provide consular service to any American citizen overseas --

QUESTION: Is there any reason to believe that the way that this -- the person is being treated by Indian authorities is not consistent with the way an American should be -- any U.S. -- like according to Geneva Conventions, I mean, meaning that -- are you afraid that this person will face any kind of retribution from the way that the Indian diplomat was treated in this country?

MS. HARF: Well, again, I can't get into the specific case because of privacy considerations. But obviously, we've said we want to get past some of the tensions that have been there over the past several months and move on. I just can't speak to this specific case.

QUESTION: How worried is the U.S. that there could be retribution against any U.S. citizen in general who's picked up by the Indian authorities?

MS. HARF: I mean, I think we feel like we've moved past this and hope the Indians have as well.

QUESTION: Have they shown that they can be trusted?

MS. HARF: That the Indians can be trusted? India is a very close partner. Yes, absolutely.

QUESTION: Is his detention consistent with prior detentions of U.S. citizens on these charges?

MS. HARF: I can't share any more about this individual because of the privacy concerns -- or considerations, not concerns.

April 1, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Yesterday, you said about the withdrawal or the resignation of the U.S. ambassador to India --

MS. HARF: Retirement.

QUESTION: Retirement, sorry.

MS. HARF: Retirement. It's an important distinction.

QUESTION: Retirement or relaxing or whatever. (Laughter.) Retreating.

MS. HARF: It's a much needed rest, yes.

QUESTION: Okay. And a lot of people realize that to many states now -- to many countries especially -- I mean, relatively big -- or, I mean, everything is important. Like, we -- U.S. doesn't have an ambassador in Russia, in Egypt, in India now, and other places. How many places now it's run -- how many embassies are run by charge d'affaires and not ambassadors?

MS. HARF: That is a very good question. I don't know the number, but I'd make a few points. I will -- so I will see if I can get you a number. And the DCM will be serving as the chief of mission when Ambassador Powell leaves India.

A couple points on that. Obviously, we believe that having ambassadors in place is incredibly important. That's why we've called on Congress where we have ambassadors nominated or other positions nominated. For example, the head -- Tom Malinowski, who's up to be our head of our DRL branch -- we want these people confirmed. So for the people that are already up on the Hill, we want Senate to confirm them as soon as possible. We are also moving forward and naming other people to key posts. You're absolutely right, and we think that's important. I would also say that the relationship is bigger than just one person and that both at the mission level -- so at the embassies we have built into place layers of relationship with the host country so that the relationship can continue if there's a lag in time between having ambassadors there.

And also we have relationships between Washington in the field with other countries as well. So the relationships are much bigger than just the ambassador, but we do believe it's important. And let me see if I can get you a number.

QUESTION: Not to argue, but just to raise a

QUESTION: A lot of places, I have been in touch with them and they are realizing that somehow when the -- when there is no ambassador that not the same diplomacy is going on smoothly and effectively and efficiently as there is an ambassador. Do you agree with this

assessment or it's just – because if you say – if we say, like, different countries, and let's say here is this – U.S. is sending ambassador to a certain place.

MS. HART: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: And the other one, other side, is the receiver, receiving of this whatever, communication, the other side of the communication. Somehow, something is missing. And I think – I don't think – and nobody thinks that this is a good way of communication or diplomacy.

MS. HART: Well, certainly our preference is to have ambassadors in place wherever we can. And that's why, even though this can be a complicated, long process, we endeavor to get people named and confirmed as quickly as possible, because we do recognize, obviously, it's incredibly important.

But we understand the realities of the fact that sometimes it takes a while for people to get confirmed. Sometimes there are logistical reasons that people have to leave post before we can get a replacement. And that's why we really do strive to have relationships that are much bigger than just one person and are really institutionalized so people can continue working on them even in the event that there's not an ambassador there. But it's certainly our preference to get people in place, absolutely.

I wouldn't agree with the premise that it means that diplomacy is not happening or isn't happening as well, but I would say it is our preference to have ambassadors in place.

March 31, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Do you have an explanation to the resignation of Ambassador Powell? Is it --

MS. HARF: Retirement. I'm going to use a different word.

QUESTION: Sorry?

MS. HARF: Retirement. Go ahead, yes.

QUESTION: Okay. So she was due to retire --

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: -- or is it related to the recent tensions between the two countries?

MS. HARF: It is in no way related to any tension, any recent situations. There's no big behind-the-scenes story here. She has announced -- she announced today that she has submitted her resignation to President Obama, as has been planned for some time, and she will retire to her home in Delaware before the end of May. This is the end of a distinguished 37-year career -- I think after 37 years, she deserves to retire -- that has included postings as U.S. Ambassador to Uganda, Ghana, Pakistan, Nepal, and India, as well as service in a number of other locations. But I want to dispel any rumors out there that this is related in any, to anything besides her long-planned retirement.

QUESTION: Can I follow up on that?

MS. HARF: You may.

QUESTION: Yeah. And the speculation that you mentioned, it's that there is a realignment of diplomatic relations between India and the U.S. -- otherwise seven days before the elections.

MS. HARF: There's no big secret to timing here. All the rumors and speculation are, quite frankly, totally false. She's retiring, again, after 37 years, returning home to Delaware by the end of May. I don't have a further insight into why she chose now, but it's not at all related to anything happening in the relationship, it doesn't indicate any realignment of the relationship. This is an incredibly key partnership that will continue under our team there and under whoever is named the next ambassador.

QUESTION: Who will be taking charge while the elections are -- it's a big step that the general elections are taking place and there will be a change of maybe of the government?

MS. HARF: Yep. And let me – well, a couple points. Let me see exactly when she's heading back and who will be stepping in to fill in her shoes. Obviously, the relationship between the U.S. and India isn't about one person, while incredibly important. It's about the whole host of officials that engage, from Secretary Kerry and others at the White House and here on down. So the relationship is much broader than our ambassador, although she's wonderful and amazing, and again, I think deserves a retirement after 37 years.

QUESTION: It's a – if you can let us know who will be the point person --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. I will. That's a fair question.

QUESTION: Yeah. And the second thing is that today the Congressional Research Service issued a report to – seven page report on Modi visa issue. And they say it would – they said that Modi is widely considered to be one of the frontrunners for prime minister. And they said that the nine-year U.S. visa ban will be automatically lifted, and he'll enjoy diplomatic immunity if he becomes prime minister. Can you – I'm not asking about the visa, if he applies now. Can you technical part of it that he – anybody who becomes the prime minister automatically gets – they say automatically gets a A-1 visa?

MS. HARF: Well, first, I don't have anything new for you on his case, and I'm not sure if that's true. So let me check.

QUESTION: No, but it's --

MS. HARF: Let me check on what you're asking, if that's true or not --

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: -- if heads of state automatically get visas. I don't think that they do, but let me check.

QUESTION: But --

QUESTION: (Off-mike.)

MS. HARF: Let me check.

QUESTION: As a diplomat, if he applies – so do you mean to say that there is already – the ban on him is still imposed?

MS. HARF: I did not say – I said I have nothing for you on his case. Nothing, period, full stop.

QUESTION: And on this report?

MS. HARF: I haven't seen the report.

QUESTION: And how would you characterize the current state of relations between India and U.S.? And what are you looking to – about the relationship when Modi becomes prime minister of India?

MS. HARF: Well, I think it remains to be seen what the outcome of the election will be, so let's not try and do too much predicting in here. Secondly, we have a very close – very, very close – relationship with India on a whole host of issues, whether it's energy, the economy, environmental issues, security issues, a whole host of issues. That has not changed. We look forward to growing that even stronger. We will work with whoever the people of India decide should lead their country. We believe it's a critical partnership, and we're moving forward with it.

QUESTION: That includes Modi?

MS. HARF: It includes --

QUESTION: When he's elected --

MS. HARF: The people of India get to decide who leads their country. We'll work with whoever they decide.

March 28, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on India

Washington, DC

QUESTION: I have a question (inaudible). Madam, as India goes through elections --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- next week, through April and May -- one, if U.S. is following the elections in India. Two, Devyani, the diplomatic drama still in the minds of the many people during this election here in India. First there was a celebration because your judge dismissed the case, and again it was refiled again by the U.S. attorney Mr. Bharara. And again now the Indian foreign minister said -- and I hope -- I think he called Secretary Kerry -- that this case is no longer only a diplomatic but it has become a political issue. So where -- what is the future of this drama? When it's going to end and what it will take to end this drama between the two countries?

MS. HARF: Well, in our minds, the drama that I think people have been trying to keep alive is, quite frankly, past us. First, obviously, we are paying attention to what's happening in India. As we've said, it's up for the people of India to decide their future. We will work with whoever the people of India think should be their next leadership.

I would note that just on the 28th, which I believe is today -- yes -- we've convened the U.S.-India-East Asia Consultations to talk about a wide range of issues, including maritime security -- this was here at the State Department -- maritime security, expanding regional trade opportunities, increasing cooperation in multilateral fora. This is the sixth time we've had this consult.

So again, we are working with the Indian Government bilaterally in a very businesslike, very close, consultative manner on a wide range of issues. So we've, quite frankly, moved the relationship past this incident. There's a process in place. That's not our process. And we're working with the Indian Government on a whole host of issues.

QUESTION: But this Devyani thing is now -- it is -- is it a diplomatic or legal or political issue? How it's going to end, because there's a strain between --

MS. HARF: Well, it's a legal process. There's a legal process

QUESTION: -- because there's strained relations between the two countries because of this.

MS. HARF: We would disagree that relations are strained today because of this. We know it was a difficult incident. We know there were difficult issues. We talked about it for many, many days and weeks in this briefing room. But quite frankly, we believe we need to move the relationship past it. We believe the Indian Government wants to do the same thing. And we are working together very closely, as I said, on a whole range of issues.

...

QUESTION: U.S. ambassador to India met Mr. Narendra Modi, Gujarat chief minister and the BJP president – and prime ministerial candidate, and that was under a broad range of meetings. Can you update us if she met anybody else, because now the election is in the last – the campaign is in the last days?

MS. HARF: I wasn't aware that she had met. Let me check on those facts and make sure we have all of our facts right and see if there's any other meetings to read out for you. As we've said, a broad range of contacts leading up to the elections.

March 17, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on India, via telephone

Washington, DC

QUESTION: Thank you, Madam. Thank you very much. And of course, you are aware of that case was dismissed in New York against the former Indian diplomat at the Consulate General of India in New York, Madam – Ms. Devyani Khobragade. But there was a celebration for a moment, but finally again the case was re-filed against her in New York, U.S. District Court in New York by Mr. Bharara, and others at the Justice Department – of course, I mean that U.S. attorney’s office. So where do we stand? When this issue – I talk, everybody talk in the U.S. and India, in the Indian American communities, that issue is over and now we can go forward for the future of India-U.S. relations which are already on the higher level for the last 20 years or more. So where – what is the future now, madam, of the India-U.S. relation if this case continues (inaudible)?

MS. PSAKI: Well, Goyal, I would say that we spoke to this last week. Obviously, this is in the hands of the Department of Justice. They obviously made an announcement on Friday, and I would point you to comments they made.

In terms of the future of our relationship, as you know, Assistant Secretary Biswal was just in India. She had a productive trip while she was there. She had a range of meetings while she was there. Our relationship and all of the issues we work together on are far too important. So we’re looking forward, and we’re very hopeful about what the future holds.

QUESTION: Thank you, madam. Just a quick follow. You know election – India is going to elect in the next two, three months, and this is very important for the U.S.-India relations. And I think we have to back – go back behind this – these kind of issues. What are you doing about this, convincing the electoral or parties in India that we are doing – we will be doing business with India?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think we’re conveying pretty clearly that we have an important relationship and we work together on economic, strategic, and security issues. The Assistant Secretary’s trip was evidence of that as well. I think we have to move on to the next question.

March 7, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on India

Washington, DC

QUESTION: Recently released Human Rights Report by the Secretary accused India of widespread corruption in the Indian Government and also --

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- (inaudible). My question is: Recently Assistant Secretary Madam Nisha Biswal was in India, and if she had discussed this Human Rights Report with the Indian officials there? And second, if she or anybody, including the ambassador, met with the fighting against corruption Mr. Kejriwal, while also was the chief minister of Delhi? Now he's also going throughout India for -- fighting for the Lok Sabha elections?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any more details on her trip than what she's announced and what she's talked about in public comments. Obviously, we raise human rights issues whenever we can in a range of countries, but we'll see if there's more we can report back to you.

Michael?

QUESTION: Can you give details about her visit there in India?

MS. PSAKI: There have been pretty extensive details put out and she's done a number of press conferences or made some public comments, so I'd point you to those.

QUESTION: Staying with India --

QUESTION: Can I just -- yeah, I've got an India follow-up.

MS. PSAKI: Oh, sure. Okay.

QUESTION: Go ahead.

QUESTION: I just wondered if you'd got a reaction to the question you were asked yesterday about the cricket match.

MS. PSAKI: I don't. I don't have any comments on that.

QUESTION: Assistant Secretary Biswal was quoted -- was asked in a television interview whether Modi would be granted a U.S. visa as prime minister of India, and she replied, "I would just say that the United States has welcomed every leader of this vibrant democracy and that a

democratically-elected leader of India would be a welcome partner.” Is that – does that mean yes, that they – that Modi or basically anybody else who is elected, democratically elected prime minister of India, would get a visa to come to the United States? Or does it just mean that they’d be a welcome partner; they might not be welcome in the United States, but you’d be happy to be their partner over the phone or elsewhere?

MS. PSAKI: Well, as you know, we don’t speculate on visas, of course, and our position hasn’t changed on this case. And I think she was just reflecting the strength of our relationship with India. Obviously, the elections haven’t taken place at this point, but our position hasn’t changed on this, which is that Mr. Modi is welcome to apply for a visa, and obviously that would be considered through the normal process.

QUESTION: So it shouldn’t be taken, then, as it has been by some, as a suggestion that --

MS. PSAKI: As a --

QUESTION: -- he would indeed get a visa?

MS. PSAKI: Well, and we wouldn’t make a sweeping prediction for anyone, right --

QUESTION: Right.

MS. PSAKI: -- given visas are confidential.

QUESTION: So that’s not what she meant to suggest there?

MS. PSAKI: Correct, yes.

QUESTION: Okay. Thank you.

QUESTION: You wouldn’t make a sweeping prediction for anybody?

MS. PSAKI: Matt, what I mean is that we don’t talk about --

QUESTION: What about – yeah, what about – (laughter) --

MS. PSAKI: -- the visa processes. There are some, perhaps, that may be easier than others.

QUESTION: One --

QUESTION: (Inaudible.)

MS. PSAKI: Do we have any more on India?

QUESTION: Yeah, one more, quickly.

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: Modi had said several times that he will not apply for the U.S. visa, but question again comes over and over and over: If he becomes the prime minister of India tomorrow – I mean after the April and May elections – then what happens?

MS. PSAKI: I think that was Arshad's question.

QUESTION: No, I'm – that's what he said, Mr. --

MS. PSAKI: And Nisha Biswal spoke to it.

QUESTION: He will not apply for U.S. visa.

MS. PSAKI: So I would point you to that.

March 3, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on India, (via telephone)

Washington, DC

QUESTION: And finally, the Assistant Secretary of State for South and Central Asia Nisha Desai is traveling to India this week, leaving tomorrow. Is she carrying any message from the Secretary? This will be the – a major visit by her before the Energy Secretary’s travel there next week also.

MS. PSAKI: Yeah, that’s right. She is. She has a heavy schedule over the next couple of days. She’s going to meet with government and business leaders in Bangalore to discuss our joint efforts to foster innovation, increase our high-tech and engineering engagement, and strengthen U.S.-India economic ties. She’s also traveling to New Delhi where she will meet with senior Indian officials to discuss the full range of bilateral and regional issues, including our shared defense, security, and economic engagement.

She is – this is an important trip for us. We have a broad and strategic partnership with India, and we’re a proud partner with India on virtually every field of human endeavor, from innovative solutions, to poverty and disease, to space exploration and counterterrorism. And the Secretary is sending with her a message that this relationship is important, we want to move past disagreements we’ve had because we have so many issues that are important for us to work closely on. So that is the purpose of her trip, and obviously she has an expansive itinerary while she’s there.

QUESTION: And in the itinerary, does she have any plans to meet the opposition leaders before the election?

MS. PSAKI: I don’t have any plans for that in my list. We will check, Lalit, and see if anything has changed. But obviously, we’re meeting with a range of officials and – as you know, but it’s worth repeating: We don’t take a position on the future of leadership in India. Obviously, that’s up to the people of India.

February 28, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on India

Washington, DC

QUESTION: It's about the – yeah. (Laughter.) I got an email from the State Department saying I should read the previous – the previous --

QUESTION: What? You're talking about – just get it over with. (Laughter.)

MS. PSAKI: Sorry, go ahead. We're getting a little silly on a Friday afternoon.

QUESTION: The State Department said that – in an email to me last night that I should read the reports of the previous years and see that there is no change in policy. I did refresh my – and I'll tell you, page 56 of 2012 report mentions his name. I have the printout here.

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: Page 58 of 2011 report mentions his name and quotes another report saying that Gujarat – blaming Gujarat chief minister and 60 others for complicity in the 2002 communal violence. And in 2005, you revoked his visa. And now this time, as Matt had yesterday pointed out, is this an editing error or deliberate? If it is – there is a change of policy, please will you like to explain where do we stand today?

MS. PSAKI: There is no change in policy. There's no editing error. I went back and did my homework too on your behalf and the behalf of others. The 2013 Human Rights Report focuses on events that took place between January and December of 2013. We generally provide updates on significant developments that occurred during the reporting period related to events included in past reports. So obviously, our position with respect to the 2002 communal violence is clear and has been thoroughly documented in our Human Rights Reports over time, including the most recent report.

But we also note that we cite our concerns about several instances of communal violence, as I mentioned yesterday, but our goal is to use illustrative cases to shed light on the nature, scope and severity of human rights abuses we report, not to comprehensively catalog every human rights violation or abuse that occurred. And again, when there are significant developments – whether that's a legal case or issues along those lines – those are what are included. So it is not an indication of a change in policy or anything along those lines.

QUESTION: And there was another question on the meeting – Ambassador's meeting with the West Bengal chief minister. Do you have anything?

MS. PSAKI: Sure. Well, Ambassador Powell and the U.S. consuls general are engaging in comprehensive outreach across India to senior leaders in political parties, business organization and NGOs. Starting last November, Ambassador Powell has shared and listened to the views of many on the U.S.-India relationship. I'm not going to outline every meeting or confirm every meeting, but I can assure you that her engagement is broad.

And I also wanted to point out to you that we just sent out a media note – hopefully it went out – about Assistant Secretary Nisha Biswal's travel to India that will be upcoming March 4th through 6th.

QUESTION: Yeah. Just the last one on that media note.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: I went through it. It says she's going to meet the government officials, and it's – mostly the focus is on the economic cooperation and all.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: So she won't be meeting any other political leaders of other political parties before elections?

MS. PSAKI: Well, oftentimes schedules come together, but I don't have any meeting – any specific meetings, additional details on them here.

QUESTION: But before the elections, just before the – how good it can be for the economic cooperation? The government is not in a position to make any decisions.

MS. PSAKI: Well, there are a range of officials and leaders who are engaged in economic cooperation, including business leaders, including NGOs, and this is an important part of our relationship with India so it's no surprise that she'd be taking a look at a long-term – our long-term interests.

QUESTION: Jen?

MS. PSAKI: Let's just do a few more here. Go ahead.

QUESTION: Yeah. Another question regarding this Human Rights Report.

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: Actually, I asked this question yesterday too.

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: Just to clarify, shall we – should we assume that the language that you are using in these reports are more outspoken from the remarks that you – your remarks from that podium sometimes?

MS. PSAKI: I don't believe so. It depends on the question that you ask. But the Human Rights Report is representative of the views of the U.S. Government, so you can certainly quote anything in there as our views.

QUESTION: No, I know that, for example, when you are commenting on a situation in an ally – especially like in an ally like Turkey – your concern is interfering with the domestic policy of this ally.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: But you're not seeing, for example, the content of this report as interfering with domestic policy. And you're describing the events in Turkey, for example, the – and the graft probe and the subsequent events as scandal. Are you repeating – can you repeat this from the podium too? You see – do you see these events in Turkey as scandal?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I don't have the exact quoted language in front of me in my book here. Obviously, what the Human Rights Report pointed out as it relates to Turkey is that significant human rights problems reported though 2013 included restrictions on freedom of expression and assembly and deficiencies in access to justice. During the Park protests in the summer of 2013, authorities used excessive force to disperse protesters, causing mass casualties, including seven deaths, while also detaining thousands of people, including journalists, academics, lawyers and students. There are many other details that are included in the report, which we certainly would stand by.

QUESTION: Yes. But the main difference with this – I mean, the significant part of this report, you have included the corruption as a significant human rights violation for the first time.

MS. PSAKI: Well, I encourage you to write about the report.

QUESTION: Yeah. I wrote it. It was a headline story today, but --

MS. PSAKI: Well, write more stories about it. (Laughter.)

QUESTION: -- I am trying to understand that – where the Administration's standing in terms of the findings of this report?

MS. PSAKI: Well, it is an Administration report, so it's representative of our views and our standings.

QUESTION: So are you repeating the characterization of the events in Turkey as a scandal?

MS. PSAKI: Again, I'd point you to the report and the details. I don't have it in front of me, so I don't want to take your word for it. No offense. But I would point you to the details in the report. Go ahead.

February 27, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, Selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Yeah. Just on the – yeah, the (inaudible) report, it happens to be quite soft on Gujarat chief minister Narendra Modi. So – for his role in the 2002 riots – so do you still hold him accountable for those riots?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I don't know if you've had an opportunity to read the report. I know it just came out this morning and it's very long and we did a briefing --

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. PSAKI: -- with our acting assistant secretary. I wouldn't characterize our assessment that way. I think you'll find if you review the text that we're very clear about our concerns about several episodes of communal violence across India. So I would encourage you to take a look at that and --

QUESTION: I had a look at it, and even now our team in Delhi had a look at it. In the previous reports, Mr. Modi was specifically mentioned. And while – now he's not, and then it says that the government has taken considerable steps and all that, and then after the meeting of the U.S. Ambassador to India with Mr. Modi. So now with the elections coming up, they want to know, what is the U.S. position on that? And also to remember that in 2005, his visa was revoked based on his involvement in these riots.

MS. PSAKI: Well, I have nothing to convey to you on the status of a visa. As you know, we encourage individuals to apply, and they're – those proceedings or processes are private by standard. It's standard that they're private.

It shouldn't – what I'm conveying to you is that we have ongoing – we continue to express concerns about communal violence as it exists in India. As it relates to that specific meeting – I think we've talked about in the past – I would caution you to link them. Obviously, we're meeting with a range of officials, a broad range of officials. There's obviously a political season happening, but we'll meet with a range of officials on the ground, and it's an indication of nothing more than that.

QUESTION: Wait. You would caution --

QUESTION: Just a quick clarification. I wanted to know --

QUESTION: -- caution against linking them, yes?

MS. PSAKI: Caution against.

QUESTION: Right, okay.

QUESTION: The – I just needed a clarification that in 2000 – I’m not asking about his future reasons.

MS. PSAKI: Sure.

QUESTION: I’m saying that in 2000 – because of the 2002, the – 2005, his visa was revoked based on this Gujarat riot scenario. So is he now no more accountable for that? You – have you forgiven him? Or where is – where does that – the whole situation stand?

MS. PSAKI: I don’t have any new policy or change in policy or new update to report to you.

QUESTION: And you mentioned about the broad range of meetings that are taking place.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Can you give us any update on – with whom the U.S. Ambassador to India will be meeting in future, after – or is it just Modi and then it’s nobody?

MS. PSAKI: I have nothing to announce for you at this point, but obviously, our Ambassador meets with a range of officials every day, so we’ll see if there’s more to report in the coming weeks.

QUESTION: There were reports of – she going and meeting the West Bengal chief minister of energy, but then it all – the meeting, it seems, fizzled out.

MS. PSAKI: Well, let me check on that for you. I don’t know the status of that specific meeting, but I can check on that.

QUESTION: Thanks.

QUESTION: Jen, the question of the – actually the report raises – I mean, the question raises an interesting point. If Modi was mentioned in previous human rights reports for India by name, and he is not mentioned in this one – which I don’t know because I haven’t looked at it yet – but if that is correct, could you find out if that was a deliberate – something that was done deliberately? In other words, it wasn’t like --

MS. PSAKI: Sure, mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- an editing error or something. And if it was done deliberately, is there any reason for that?

MS. PSAKI: Sure.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. PSAKI: I'm happy to circle back with our DRL team.

February 14, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: ... Ambassador Nancy Powell met with Narendra Modi, the chief minister of the Indian state of Gujarat. My question is that – was she carrying any letter from the President or Secretary, a kind of paper visa for him to invite the – to the U.S., or any policy change in the U.S. mind as far as you --

MS. HARF: No. No. She – as we've said for several days now, this was a meeting as part of her broader and the embassy's broader outreach to a whole host of political actors in India. So I think we've made that very clear for a couple days now, and that's certainly been consistent.

QUESTION: But in the past, he was not welcomed, or nobody ever went to meet with him, or they were not willing to meet with him. But his party leaders at the highest level, including the president of BJP and the secretaries and among other peoples, and from the BJP and from the Congress Party, they all visited by U.S. But he was invited at three occasions here to speak at the University of Pennsylvania, also by the Gujarati community, but he was denied visa or he was not welcome to the U.S.

MS. HARF: Well, a couple points – and I didn't hear a question, but let me just make a few points. That's actually not true. Our current consul general in Mumbai and previous CGs have met with Chief Minister Modi, so to say no American officials have actually isn't correct. And in terms of his visa, as we have said repeatedly when individuals apply for a U.S. visa, their applications are reviewed in accordance with U.S. law and policy. That would be the case here, as it would be with anyone else.

QUESTION: Let me ask you one more finally, quickly.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Was there any policy against or about Chief Minister Modi not to visit the U.S.? Any kind of policy ever?

MS. HARF: Visa applications are – which is what, obviously, we would talk about here – are looked at on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with the regulations that govern them, and that has been the case in the past and will be going forward as well.

QUESTION: And now, after meeting with the ambassador, is he welcome now to the U.S.?

MS. HART: Again, this is part of our broader outreach in India to a host of political actors – NGOs, others – leading up to the elections, and we will work with whoever the Indian people choose.

February 6, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on India and Pakistan
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: India.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Talking about diplomacy, the new – newly arrived ambassador of India, Mr. Jaishankar, he had a first official discussion with the Carnegie last week where he said the lead behind, whatever, happened between the U.S. and India as far as the diplomacy took place in New York – he said that relations between the two countries, U.S. and India, are indispensable and we are moving forward and on many fronts. What I'm asking you is: Whatever this ambassador who has a lot – big knowledge, a lot of knowledge coming from China, where are we on those issues between the U.S. and India now? Are we moving forward? Because --

MS. PSAKI: Sure.

QUESTION: -- we had in the past a lot of things going on between two – the countries, but now it's look like --

MS. PSAKI: We are --

QUESTION: -- things are stalled. Sorry.

MS. PSAKI: We are focused on the same thing, which is the path forward and moving our relationship forward, and one of the next steps is scheduling the energy dialogue that we've been working on, so – but we, of course, agree that we have an important bilateral relationship and it's in our interests and India's interests to move that forward.

QUESTION: And one, if I may go to, on Pakistan.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: There is a Travel Warning to Pakistan --

MS. PSAKI: Yeah.

QUESTION: The Consul General, I believe, is still closed in Lahore, and also, as far as your Strategic Dialogue took place here between the U.S. and Pakistan --

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- but protests and killings are still going on and still their talks – they are talking about talking with Taliban and all that. You think those talks with Taliban are going to be successful or – where do you put those Taliban, whether they're in Pakistan Taliban or Afghanistan Taliban, a political party or a – are you allowing them to --

MS. PSAKI: Well, Goyal, welcome back, first of all. I know you've been gone for a while. We've talked about this the last couple of days. It's up to the Government of Pakistan to determine the path forward. There was a Travel Warning that went out yesterday that notes, the Department, that we have lifted the ordered departure status of U.S. Government personnel from the Consulate General in Lahore, Pakistan. So that was the new information that was included in there.

QUESTION: Just so we're clear, the key point there is that your officials are now able to go back to the Consulate General in Lahore, correct?

MS. PSAKI: Correct.

QUESTION: So it's the opposite of it – I mean, it's --

MS. PSAKI: Of what was announced months before.

QUESTION: -- not available for consular services, but you're actually – you – the security situation has improved to such a degree that you're letting your officials back in the building?

MS. PSAKI: Right. There's a range of reasons why these decisions are made.

QUESTION: Right, right.

MS. PSAKI: Just for one piece, just to be clear on, the consular services remain unavailable at this point, but the Embassy in Islamabad and the Consul General in Karachi are, of course, continuing to provide those.

QUESTION: Were there any specific threats that you had to issue a warning?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any more details. I know we talked about it at the time, but obviously, the new information is the new Travel Warning.

QUESTION: And as – finally, as far as those Taliban talks are concerned, of course the U.S. supports them, and where do you put those Taliban? I mean, a political party in the future in Afghanistan or in Pakistan, or what will be their designation, really?

MS. PSAKI: Well, it's an internal matter for Pakistan. I would point you to them on any updates on what's happening with talks that may or may not be happening.

January 31, 2014

Marie Harf, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: As you must have seen, the FAA has downgraded India's safety standards, and do you have any comments on that?

MS. HARF: I do. So the FAA today announced a determination that India is not in compliance with international safety standards set by the International Civilian – Civil – excuse me – Aviation Organization. The FAA therefore downgraded India from a Category 1 to a Category 2 rating. I'd refer you to the FAA to discuss sort of how this decision came about and what that means in practice, but I'd made three quick points on this.

The first is that both the U.S. and India are fully committed to restoring India to a Category 1 rating as soon as possible. There is currently an FAA team in India, in part to discuss how to go about doing just that.

The second, that this decision was made within a regulatory framework. When a foreign country's civil aviation authority has international flights into the U.S., the FAA is required to periodically evaluate whether that CAA is overseeing the safety of its international civil aviation operations according to the ICAO standards.

Third, the United States and India remain fully committed to cooperation in civil aviation. Again, for more details, I think the FAA can probably speak to what this means in practice.

QUESTION: But in the FAA statement, if you see, the FAA says that there were many meetings --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- and there were meetings even this week. So why it couldn't be come to an amicable solution? Because they say that we are ready to work with India to restore.

MS. HARF: Yep.

QUESTION: But what happened? Where was the deadlock?

MS. HARF: Well, this is a process with consultations and discussions that began many months ago. The assessment was conducted in New Delhi in September. The assessment team returned to India on December 11 for follow-up discussion. Our understanding is that while India has indeed made significant progress, a determination was made that it was not enough to meet the

ICAO standards, hence the step that we saw today. But again, we're committed to working with India to get them to take the necessary steps to get back to a Category 1 rating.

QUESTION: So you say that the – India failed to reach certain --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- where they could have made an effort to reach --

MS. HARF: Yep. Yes, that there are international standards that they did not meet in this case, but we're working with them. Again, we have an FAA team on the ground right to do so.

QUESTION: I mean, this isn't going to help your diplomatic efforts, though, to restore relationships with India which have been frayed over the issue of the diplomat who was arrested in New York. Was it not possible to try and defer this decision and --

MS. HARF: It's – and this absolutely had nothing to do with the ongoing case of Dr. Khobragade. Again, this was a regulatory decision. I don't know how much leeway we have in those, but it's my understanding that this was all made inside a regulatory framework that has very specific criteria countries have to meet under ICAO standards that we're all party to.

QUESTION: But you've got India that's declaring its disappointment, as my colleague mentioned. And we have seen that the relationship has been quite tense between the two countries recently.

MS. HARF: Well, again, these aren't our standards. They're the ICAO standards everyone has to live under, and we're committed to working with India to help them get back to a Category 1 rating. So --

QUESTION: And how are relationships at the moment between the two countries?

MS. HARF: I think we're all committed to moving on to working together on all of the issues we work on all the time. A number of folks obviously have talked to our Indian counterparts over the last few weeks, and I think we're all committed right now to moving the relationship forward and really focusing on working together.

QUESTION: India got the Category 1 in 1997, if I'm right. And then in, as you say, September – there was a delegation in December, there was – so was India given a deadline that you've got to fix this by this date, otherwise we are going to --

MS. HARF: That's – I don't know if there was a specific deadline, but I think that the FAA team and the folks made absolutely clear what the Indians needed to do to maintain their Category 1 rating. They were not able to do so. We're working with them right now to get them back on track.

QUESTION: In an interview with Arnab Goswami of Times Now, Rahul Gandhi, the vice president of Congress Party, accepted that there were some members of Congress who were involved in the 1984 riots, Sikh riots. And going according to Narendra Modi being banned from coming to or denied visa from coming to the U.S., will it be – will the U.S. also be denying Rahul Gandhi or Sonia Gandhi or other Congress Party members denial in visa?

MS. HARF: I don't – I haven't seen that, those comments, in regard to Mr. Modi's visa. We said he's free to apply for a visa, and we'll make a decision based on the process that we have in place here. I just don't have anything else for you on that.

QUESTION: No, but on the --

MS. HARF: I understand the question. I just, again, don't have any other analysis of that. I'm happy to check with our folks.

QUESTION: No, but if a party is involved in the 1984 riots --

MS. HARF: People are free to apply for visas, and we'll evaluate them on the merits and the process that we have individually.

Later

QUESTION: Narendra Modi had a visa, and after the 2002 riots it was revoked, period. Now the Congress Party vice president is accepting that Congress members of his party and some people in the government have. So can you check and let us know, if any of them have the visa, are you going to revoke that visa or not?

MS. HARF: Visa records are confidential. I'm not sure I can share that information even if I knew it. I'm happy to check and see if that's not the case.

January 16, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

MS. PSAKI: Okay. India.

QUESTION: The – two questions. First one: The Indian elections are coming up in 100 days approximately. So is the U.S. planning to send in – send election observer team?

MS. PSAKI: As you know, we – obviously, we wouldn't get engaged in domestic politics or domestic elections in that capacity. I can check with our team and see if there's any specifics.

QUESTION: Yeah, but the U.S. usually sends election observers to many --

MS. PSAKI: We often do. That's true. I don't have anything specific on that, so let me check on that.

QUESTION: Okay. And on this New York Times article about the American Embassy school, and the Indian ministry of external affairs is already calling it clearly a violation of the tax law. There's a handout from the school which says to a couple who is coming to teach that male spouse apply for the employment visa, and the female spouse be noted as housewife on the visa application. What is your reaction to that?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we've certainly seen those reports. Let me give you all a little more history here. Since 1952, when the Embassy exchanged diplomatic notes with the Government of India to establish the American Embassy school, the school has succeeded in providing an international education in New Delhi for the children of diplomatic and ex-pat business communities. It is not run by the Embassy. Only about a third of the students there are American. We are in discussion with the Government of India regarding issues they have raised concerning the school. Deputy Secretary Burns discussed these very issues with the Ambassador earlier this week, and we are committed to resolving them through diplomatic channels and to addressing the concerns that have been raised.

QUESTION: But this school is right next to the Embassy – it's on the land which is owned by the U.S. – and there is nothing that you take responsibility for?

MS. PSAKI: I think I just said we've – we're committed to addressing these concerns that have been raised. We'll work those through diplomatic channels, and we've already had conversations at a very high level about them.

January 13, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Since the return of Ms. Khobragade to India, I was wondering if there were – have been any discussions between Washington and Delhi, and more broadly, whether you see any efforts to repair relations after this incident.

MS. HARF: Well, I think, at this point, clearly – look, clearly this has been a challenging time in the U.S.-India relationship. We expect that this time will come to a closure, though. I think we're increasingly getting towards that point, and that together we will now take significant steps with the Indian Government to improve our relationship and return it to a more constructive place. I think that we have talked at length about the situation for weeks now, and what we're focused on is the situation coming to an end and moving forward.

QUESTION: Have there been any discussions since Friday, since – between the two countries?

MS. HARF: I'm happy to check. Well, I do have just one to note. Acting Under Secretary Gottemoeller met today with the Indian ambassador to the U.S. this morning to discuss our bilateral cooperation. She stressed that it is critical that both sides refocus our attention on the broad agenda before us, and as would make sense for the Acting Under Secretary, underscore the importance of increasing bilateral cooperation on nonproliferation, defense, and arms control. So this is just an example of an issue we've worked together with each other on all the time, a routine issue. This is the kind of business we just need to get back to, quite frankly, now that this is hopefully coming to an end.

QUESTION: Follow-up on India first. On the significant steps that you said, what are the significant steps U.S. is planning to take now to improve the relationship?

MS. HARF: Well, I think we've – on all sides, we have to take significant steps. It's not just the U.S., it's the Indians as well. I can check and see if there's any more details on what those are, but we work together on a wide range of issues that we've talked about in here since the beginning of this, whether it's, as I said, arms control, nonproliferation, whether it's Afghanistan, whether it's energy, economic issues. We just want to get back to business and we want to put this behind us, and we want both sides to work together to move the relationship forward.

QUESTION: And what are your expectations from Indian sides?

MS. HARF: I think the Indian Government can probably speak for themselves on that.

QUESTION: On the diplomat who was asked to leave from India, a lot of names – one name is in circulation. Can you confirm that name?

MS. HARF: Due to privacy considerations, I don't have anything further to share – or anything to share, I should say, not further – on who the person is or any other details on them.

QUESTION: And there are a lot of reports in the social media and some media also have reporting on the Facebook account of that particular official, the comments about the culture of that particular country. Have you seen that?

MS. HARF: I haven't seen the comments. I've seen the reports of them. Those comments absolutely do not reflect U.S. Government policy, nor were they made on any official U.S. Government social media account. I don't have more comment than that. Again, I would underscore that these do not in any way represent the U.S. Government position.

January 9, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on India

Washington, DC

QUESTION: Has the situation deteriorated to the point where you're ready to start calling them out on this?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any update to the comments I made yesterday, Matt.

QUESTION: Okay. So you're still hoping that you're going to be able to resolve this quietly behind the scenes? Is that --

MS. PSAKI: Well, I wouldn't put it that way. I would put it that our relationship with India is so important that we want to work through issues as they come up. We'll do that through diplomatic channels.

QUESTION: All right. Well, then can I just follow -- are you disappointed by the fact that they have chosen the route that they have chosen?

MS. PSAKI: I'm not going to address that. I -- any disappointment we have we express privately. And we're addressing their concerns as they come up.

QUESTION: All right. Well, perhaps publicly you could say -- are you happy with the way that they have handled this situation?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any more commentary than what I offered yesterday.

QUESTION: Do you believe that it is worthy or becoming of a country that aspires to be a great diplomatic power?

MS. PSAKI: As we have concerns, Matt, we'll express those privately.

Go ahead, Elise.

QUESTION: But do you think that they're holding the relationship hostage to this one issue? I mean, it seems as if --

MS. PSAKI: They have said they're not. And we have worked with them and we're working with them on other issues, so certainly we don't.

QUESTION: Like what?

MS. PSAKI: Well --

QUESTION: Space exploration.

MS. PSAKI: We remain in dialogue with them about all the issues we typically work on together, whether that's strategic interests or economic interests, and that remains the case.

QUESTION: Did they cancel the visit of the energy secretary because of this diplomatic issue?

MS. PSAKI: It was agreed that we would do this at a later time when both sides -- hopefully in the coming months -- where both sides could better deliver a more comprehensive package.

QUESTION: So you're saying that it had nothing to do with this diplomatic row? It was because of other types of --

MS. PSAKI: I'm saying the decision was made because we want to make sure it's under the best conditions and at the time where it can be most productive. Obviously, energy coordination and cooperation is an important issue we work with the Indians on.

January 8, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on India

Washington, DC

QUESTION: I have something on the cancellation of India trip by an under secretary, and why is it now? Is it effect of the arrest?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we place great emphasis, as you know, on the U.S.-India energy partnership. It was an issue when the Secretary was there, and he even gave a speech talking about these issues. It's a key element of our strategic partnership. In view of these important matters and in order to find a time to allow both sides to deliver on the important issues that we need to from both sides, we're looking for a mutually convenient time in the near future that will permit both sides to do that. So we remain committed to holding this dialogue, and we'll look for a time to hold it.

QUESTION: So he's not going this month, which was initially scheduled for?

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, I don't have a prediction of when it will be, but we'll look for a time in the near future to do it.

QUESTION: And do you have an update on the UN paperwork which you received on December 20th?

MS. PSAKI: I do not have an update on it.

QUESTION: Jen, despite your efforts to tamp this down, the Indians seem to be intent on ratcheting this up to the point of, I don't know what – to a point that some people, including the *Washington Post* editorial board, think is just ridiculous, basically. I'm wondering if you share those thoughts that were expressed in their editorial that India is practicing vindictive diplomacy that is not worthy of a true democracy.

MS. PSAKI: I would certainly not validate those thoughts. Our focus, Matt, as you know, is on moving the relationship forward on all the important issues we're focused on. As we have concerns, we'll express those privately, and publicly we'll continue to work with them on the important issues we have stakes in.

QUESTION: Okay. Well, apart from the important issues that you're continuing to work with, including energy, which you don't seem to be able to get a mutually convenient date, probably because the Indians are being resistant to it, I'm just wondering if you have any comment about the latest restrictions that the Indians have placed on your diplomats in Delhi and elsewhere.

MS. PSAKI: Sure. And one thing let me just note, and I think all – this would be of interest to you. Sorry, go ahead.

QUESTION: Go ahead.

MS. PSAKI: That also we're welcoming an Indian delegation to the State Department tomorrow as part of the first-ever International Space Exploration Forum we announced earlier today. So just important to note that we do have ongoing dialogues on a range of issues, and we will schedule the energy dialogue at the appropriate time.

On your question, Matt, we, of course, endeavor to always be in compliance with local laws and regulations. The Indian diplomatic notes, which I believe is what you're referring to, raise highly technical and complicated issues. We're continuing our conversations with the government in response to their diplomatic communication and asks with the importance of our broad relationship in mind.

We have provided interim responses where appropriate and we continue to review and discuss all requests for action. We're working, of course, closely with the Government of India on that.

QUESTION: Indian officials suggest that what they're doing is reciprocal, that there is a question of reciprocity here in terms of what they're doing as related to what happened to their diplomat in New York. Under any sense of the – your understanding of diplomatic reciprocity, is what they're doing reciprocal?

MS. PSAKI: I don't believe this falls into the category, but obviously, we're working through any requests they have and working closely with the government on it.

QUESTION: Okay. Well, if you don't believe it's reciprocal, at what point or what are you waiting for before you actually come out and speak out and say to India: Stop it, grow up, join the big boys club here, this isn't some – a childish game?

MS. PSAKI: Well, Matt, I think our view is that both sides want to move this relationship forward.

QUESTION: Is it? How can you say that when the Indians are doing this? I mean, why --

MS. PSAKI: Because we've had a range of private conversations with them, and that's our belief as the United States Government. So --

QUESTION: So their public tantrums and their public imposition of restrictions that are petty at best and vindictive at worst, as *The Washington Post* believes, that doesn't bother you at all?

MS. PSAKI: Matt, as we have concerns, we'll express them privately.

QUESTION: Right.

MS. PSAKI: We continue to believe that we can maintain our strong historic relationship, and that's what our focus is on.

QUESTION: Do you believe that not cancelling this space exploration meeting tomorrow is a sign of the United States taking the high road in this situation?

MS. PSAKI: I wouldn't qualify it that way as much as they're an important partner on space exploration and --

QUESTION: They are?

MS. PSAKI: -- this is a meeting we're going to have tomorrow, and we'll schedule the energy dialogue soon.

QUESTION: Can you explain to me how India is an important partner in space exploration? Give me one example of how it is.

MS. PSAKI: I'm happy to get you a ten-page memo on that, Matt. (Laughter.)

QUESTION: A ten-page? I would be impressed if you could get me a one-paragraph.

MS. PSAKI: We work with India and a range of countries, as you know, on innovation, on a range of issues. They are invited to this, they are attending tomorrow, and we're looking forward to it.

QUESTION: So it's not just U.S.-India. It's a whole group of --

MS. PSAKI: There are -- I believe there are a range of countries. I think we're putting out if we haven't already put out a Media Note on it.

QUESTION: Are there other countries who are attending as noted in the field of space exploration as India is?

MS. PSAKI: All right, Matt. (Laughter.)

QUESTION: No, I mean, who else is coming? I mean, what -- Mozambique?

MS. PSAKI: We have a Media Note on it, I believe. I'm not sure if it's gone out yet. If it hasn't --

QUESTION: Central African Republic?

MS. PSAKI: -- we'll make sure it goes out.

QUESTION: Algeria?

QUESTION: Who's leading the India delegation? Because there was a note that came out yesterday but it didn't have very many details in it at all, which it did mention India. Do you know if there's another one that's coming today? But --

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: It says "ministers," so if there's ministers, which is the minister from India who's attending?

MS. PSAKI: I will check. I'm not sure who the delegations are, so I'll check with our team and see. And it may actually -- I believe there is another Media Note coming that may have that level of detail in it.

QUESTION: Yes, please.

QUESTION: Just a follow-up?

MS. PSAKI: Oh, sorry. Go ahead. Oh, one more and then we'll go to you, I promise. Go ahead.

QUESTION: Follow-up on Matt's question. Do you think the steps that India has taken after the arrest of this diplomat -- are you comfortable with those steps, especially like closing down the commercial activities in the embassy, saying that if you violate the traffic laws, normal routine process will be -- will no longer will be waived off. Are you comfortable with those steps?

MS. PSAKI: Well, as -- what I will say is that as we have concerns we will express those privately, which is often the case of diplomatic issues. But we have been addressing their diplomatic notes as they've come up. It's important to note many of them are highly technical and complicated issues, and we'll continue to work through that process with the Indian Government.

QUESTION: So the U.S. is concerned with those steps that India has taken?

MS. PSAKI: We're addressing them as they come up.

QUESTION: But do you believe that in the course of normal practice of diplomacy that their measures should be taken privately and not announced with great fanfare?

MS. PSAKI: Well, oftentimes they're done privately, and we'll conduct our business as we think it's the right way to conduct business from here.

QUESTION: Okay. So – but you don't have – it doesn't bother you in the least that the Indians are making a big spectacle out of this?

MS. PSAKI: As we have concerns, we'll express them privately.

QUESTION: It doesn't bother you that they're not doing the same thing privately, that they're doing it very publicly?

MS. PSAKI: As we have concerns, we will express them to the Indian Government privately.

QUESTION: On the actual particular case of the diplomat --

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- I believe she's waived her right to be indicted within 30 days, which would have brought us up to January the 13th, next Monday, I think. So what is the State Department involvement now in the prosecution of this case?

MS. PSAKI: Well, on the judicial or that piece, it's in the hands of the Southern District of New York. I believe they've made some comments about these specific reports, so I would point you to them on that.

QUESTION: But there's no State Department involvement in sort of saying try and hold off; we're trying to sort this out behind the scenes --

MS. PSAKI: Obviously --

QUESTION: -- we don't want a diplomatic incident with India over this.

MS. PSAKI: Obviously, the legal piece is being managed by the Southern District of New York. We're of course in touch with the Indian Government, but I don't have any other details beyond that.

QUESTION: But are you in touch with the Southern District of New York, I guess is the question.

MS. PSAKI: In what capacity?

QUESTION: To ask them to try and stall the case until you get a diplomatic solution.

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any other details. Obviously, different agencies coordinate, but in terms of these specifics, they're running point on it. I will see if there's more we can share.

QUESTION: And what's the status on her application for G visa, which would give her the full diplomatic immunity?

MS. PSAKI: We've received the paperwork. It's under review. I don't have any other details on it or updates.

QUESTION: Has any progress been made? Is she being towards getting the G visa or she's being --

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any other updates on it.

January 6, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: The U.S. changed its stance from treating the case as that of an absconding maid to that of a trafficking offense and fraud. They are saying it on the basis of the – a bunch of emails The Times now has in its possession. And the dates don't match also, like the OFM deputy director on – said that the State Department has terminated the maid services from – and then she was asked to leave 30 days from that termination, and so she should have left on July 22nd. But then I was told a few weeks ago by a senior State Department official that she had complained on July 9th. And so where do we stand today, like?

MS. HARF: Well, in general, there's nothing new to report on this case. As I've said repeatedly, we're focused on moving the relationship forward and letting the process play out. I'm aware of those press reports. As I've also said repeatedly, the State Department's been in regular contact with the Government of India on this issue. I don't have more further comment for you on diplomatic communications, but suffice to say what we're focused on now is moving this forward, getting some resolution, and focusing on the relationship.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: On that, today the – Vikram Doraiswami, Joint Secretary Americas, met – had a meeting with the U.S. Ambassador Nancy Powell at South Block in Delhi, and he said no business as usual. And it seems he also said that it is your process and you are to sort it out. And so the – Delhi is putting its foot down, so what is your – you are saying that we are concentrating on moving forward, and they are saying no business as usual. So where do we stand today?

MS. HARF: Well, we stand where I just stood 30 seconds ago, that what we're focused on is when the Indian Government has issues and wants to raise them with us, we discuss those in diplomatic channels because we know this has been a sensitive issue. But moving forward, we're focused on the relationship. Again, nothing new to report today. And I'm not going to sort of do an analysis of every public comment that someone makes. We're focused on overall how closely we work together and where we go from here.

QUESTION: This is not a public comment. It is a – it is with the U.S. ambassador.

MS. HARF: It's a private comment?

QUESTION: It --

MS. HARF: If it's not a public comment, then it's a private comment. And as you know, I don't comment on private diplomatic communications.

QUESTION: Okay. And the – okay, the last one is about the Pakistanis are supporting the Indian stand, and the Pakistani vice --

QUESTION: Anything to bring the two together. (Laughter.)

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: Go ahead and --

QUESTION: The – and they – Pakistani high commissioner said that the Vienna Convention ought to be respected in letter and spirit by everybody, and he's supporting and – so do you think that the Vienna Convention was violated in this case?

MS. HARF: No, we don't, and I've said that from the beginning. But again, what we're focused on isn't going back over and re-litigating this case publicly. What we're focused on is taking the relationship forward and letting the judicial and legal process play itself out.

QUESTION: Despite these comments that this gentlemen mentioned, have there any – have there been any incidents of the Indians halting cooperation with the U.S. on any programs or – I mean, even if they say it's not business as usual, do you consider it to be --

MS. HARF: Not to my knowledge. Not to my knowledge, no.

QUESTION: Just follow --

QUESTION: Just one last one.

MS. HARF: Okay.

QUESTION: The --

MS. HARF: And then you're next. I promise. I promise.

QUESTION: That the Federal Human Resource Minister Shashi Tharoor, writing in an op-ed which will be published today, later in the day, he says that it was wrong to arrest her because she had full diplomatic immunity because she was an advisor to the UN. So what is your take on that?

MS. HARF: Well, again, I don't want to go back over all the facts of this case. I said at the time she had consular immunity. We also said we were looking into the UN accreditation issue.

Nothing's changed on that front, but suffice to say, the legal process is working itself out. Hopefully we can get a resolution to it.

Yes.

QUESTION: So there is not – no update, like, no --

MS. HARF: No update.

QUESTION: -- on that?

MS. HARF: On the process, right.

QUESTION: Many feels in India and here in the U.S. among the Indian American community that the issue has gone beyond, it should not have been. It should have been resolved peacefully, really, going from 2013 through 2014, and I hope that it will be resolved soon.

My question is here: Since she has been moved from the consulate to the UN, what changes the status why it has been done? And second, if India recalls her back to India, do you think she will be free to go from the UN to the airport, because maybe before it was not possible from the consulate to the airport?

MS. HARF: Well, as I said, we've received the request for change in accreditation, but the process is ongoing and no official decision has been made yet to do that, so there's no change in her status as of this point.

QUESTION: And --

MS. HARF: So those are all hypotheticals.

QUESTION: Right. But what is going on behind doors to resolve this issue? Because really, Indian American community is also not very happy what's going on. This should have – should be resolved immediately, as soon as possible, because it may be affecting some relations here.

MS. HARF: Well, we want it to be resolved as soon as possible; certainly, that's our goal. But we're only part of this process. We're the diplomatic part that focuses on the relationship and all the issues we work together on. There is a separate judicial and legal process that is working its way through right now. There's a reason we have these processes, and hopefully that will work itself out soon as well, but I don't want to get ahead of that process and certainly don't want to speak for it.

QUESTION: And finally, India has a new ambassador here, just arrived.

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: And it was not very good news for him, for a new ambassador to arrive with this drama going on. What do you think this new ambassador you are working on with – to resolve this and many other issues going on between the two countries?

MS. HARF: Well, I think the – and there have been a number of conversations with the new ambassador – but I think, again, we say the same thing privately that we say publicly: that there's a lot of work we have to do, there's a lot of business we have to get done together, a lot of issues we work very closely on economically, diplomatically. And that's what's important to us and that's what's important to do moving forward. And I have no reason to think that that won't be the case.

QUESTION: And Madam, finally, where do you put the relations between U.S. and India today in beginning of this new year and beyond?

MS. HARF: In general?

QUESTION: Yes.

MS. HARF: Well, as I've said, I think, many, many times throughout this whole ordeal, that we don't want this to define our relationship going forward and don't think that it will. And again, if you look throughout the region, if you look at Afghanistan, if you look at energy issues, economic issues, we have a whole host of things we work together on, and those are very important and shouldn't be derailed by this incident. And that's why, again, we are putting the process forward, we're setting that aside, we're letting it run its course, and we're focused on where to go from here, because, as we've always said, the relationship with India is incredibly important, it's vital, and that's what we're focused on.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Based on the diplomatic and judicial processes going on right now, how close or far we are from resolving this issue?

MS. HARF: I don't have any predictions, guys. I know everybody wants to make them and me to look into a crystal ball, but I just don't have any.

QUESTION: (Inaudible) hopeful that it will be resolved?

MS. HARF: Absolutely.

January 3, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: There's a video in circulation on some of the social media sites about the strip search and arrest of the Indian diplomat Devyani Khobragade. I don't know about the authenticity, but it's spreading very fast. Do you – have you – has the State Department seen it? Can you say it's authentic video or not authentic video?

MS. HARF: This video, which we are aware of, is absolutely not footage of Ms. Khobragade. Obviously, we're aware of the footage. It's – we would call it a dangerous and provocative fabrication. This hoax video, which I think has appeared on some news websites without, obviously, confirming its authenticity because it's not, we find it deeply troubling, irresponsible, and reckless, and condemn again this dangerous fabrication. I want to make very clear this is not video of her.

QUESTION: But is this the way normally when it – someone is arrested, this is how they are strip-searched?

MS. HARF: Well, we spoke with the Marshals about this issue and they did confirm – and they can speak more for themselves – that the footage in question does not depict U.S. Marshal employees, obviously that the search methods depicted in the video are not U.S. Marshals policy. Again, I'd leave it to them to speak more to this. I haven't watched the video myself, but I want to be very clear in saying this is not how we do things here.

QUESTION: Is it about some different incident or --

MS. HARF: I honestly don't know. Again, it's a fabrication. It may be a couple different – I've heard different rumors out there. But it is in no way Ms. Khobragade.

QUESTION: Okay.

QUESTION: Do you – are you looking into who concocted this?

MS. HARF: I can check. I don't know. Maybe.

QUESTION: I mean, it seems as though you're concerned that this has been put together to foment --

MS. HARF: Well, I don't want to guess why it was put together --

QUESTION: -- or to incite --

MS. HARF: -- but we do think it could be potentially dangerous if people think it's real, which it's not. We certainly don't want people to think that it is.

QUESTION: Potentially dangerous how?

MS. HARF: Because there could be security concerns. People -- it could cause people to react in a certain way. Obviously, we don't want false information like this out there.

Yeah.

QUESTION: And have you -- are you looking into the origin of this?

MS. HARF: I think that's what Matt just asked. I'll check with our folks and see if anyone here or elsewhere is. I just don't know.

QUESTION: Another question is Indian prime minister noted that in his 10 years rule the U.S.-India nuclear deal was the best moment in his life. But the U.S. industry is still not happy with the deal with India dragging its feet on implementation, liability cases. So where does the deal today stand?

MS. HARF: I don't know what the latest is. I'm happy to check with our folks.

QUESTION: Thanks.

...

QUESTION: This -- another news report about Assistant Secretary Biswal postponing her trip to India next week because of the tensions between the two countries. Is it true?

MS. HARF: The assistant secretary certainly looks forward to visiting India as soon as possible. It's my understanding there was nothing locked in stone on the calendar. I know there were some rumors out there. When it works in her schedule, she's very much looking forward to traveling there to the region and talking to folks on the ground.

QUESTION: But do you have any timeline for that?

MS. HARF: I don't, no.

QUESTION: Is she also planning to travel to Sri Lanka?

MS. HARF: I can check and see. I don't have any travel to announce, but I'm happy to check and see what those travel plans might look like.

QUESTION: And do you have any further update on the review process of the applications?

MS. HARF: Still ongoing.

QUESTION: Still ongoing?

MS. HARF: John.

QUESTION: Do you have any readout --

MS. HARF: And then we'll go to Syria.

QUESTION: -- any readout on any phone calls? No phone calls?

MS. HARF: No readouts. No readouts.

QUESTION: And you say the discussions are going on, the negotiations. So are they going on on -- from your embassy? Because if there --

MS. HARF: Negotiations? What are you referring to? I don't think I used the word "negotiations."

QUESTION: You said -- not negotiations. You said that the discussions to take it forward. So are they going on without any phone calls, like --

MS. HARF: Well, clearly, we talk with our folks in country quite a bit, also here. I don't have any phone calls from the Secretary to read out. I'm happy to see if other senior officials have made calls. I know people have been engaged on it at high level.

QUESTION: Thanks.

QUESTION: A follow-up to the question you were asked yesterday about two more investigations pending. Do you know --

MS. HARF: Pending investigations -- again, we -- every case is different, first of all. I'm not aware of any other pending investigations. That doesn't mean there aren't. But as a general matter, we would not be able to share details about any ongoing or pending investigation if there was one, which, again, I don't know if there is. That's just not -- we can't do that, I think, legally.

QUESTION: And the prime minister also said in his remarks in response to a question from *Washington Post* that this episode has resulted in a hiccup in the bilateral ties between India and U.S. Do you agree with the assessment?

MS. HARF: Well, I think what we're focused on and what I repeatedly is how to move the relationship forward and get it back in a place that is best for both countries. Clearly, I mean, when you hear the Secretary express regret about something, that means that everything hasn't gone as it should. And what we're focused on now is getting the relationship back on a really strong footing. We just have too much important work to do together going forward on a host of issues in the region and around the world.

QUESTION: As the diplomatic talks continue, is it headed towards resolving this issue, or do you think it's going to linger on for some time?

MS. HARF: Well, again, there's a judicial process, a legal process, underway. And I don't have any estimates for how long that will all take to play out. There's also our diplomatic discussions as well. Just nothing new to announce or guess about here today.

QUESTION: Thank you.

...

QUESTION: Yesterday, I had asked a question about India deploying around 150 police persons outside the U.S. Embassy New Delhi. Was there any fresh security threat or this is – what is the assessment about that?

MS. HARF: Well, we've welcomed statements from the Ministry of External Affairs that India is fully committed to ensuring the safety and security of all diplomats in Delhi and elsewhere, and we appreciate the efforts of the Indian police outside of our facilities. Beyond that, I'm not going to get into a lot of specifics about our security posture, but certainly, we appreciate the police's efforts, and we'll move forward from here.

QUESTION: So you are satisfied with the steps taken by the --

MS. HARF: We appreciated these, and we have noted that the governments – that they're committed to maintaining security, and we have no reason to think otherwise. Thanks.

January 2, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: India has deployed around 150 security personnel outside the U.S. Embassy in Delhi. Was there any security threat, or is it – what’s – do you have any --

MS. HARF: I wasn’t aware of that. I’m happy to look into it.

QUESTION: Do you have any update on the Indian diplomat case getting before you --

MS. HARF: No update.

QUESTION: -- for the UN --

MS. HARF: We received – we did receive the paperwork. I think folks had asked on Monday, and we received it on Friday, December 20th. I ended up getting the date. It’s under review. We can’t predict when that review will be complete and can’t compare it to previous requests because each is different and we evaluate each on their own merits. So no update for you on that yet.

QUESTION: What’s the normal general process being adopted?

MS. HARF: The normal process?

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: Well, I can see if there’s more specifics on how these are reviewed. Each case is reviewed on its own merit, obviously. Each case is a little bit different. I’m happy to see if there are general process points, but it’s under review right now. I just don’t have an estimation for when that’ll be done.

QUESTION: So is this case following the normal routine process, or there are some basic legal hurdles in this?

MS. HARF: Well, each case is evaluated on its own merits and they all go through the same process, but each is evaluated, as people would hope, I think, based on the merits of the case.

QUESTION: So what’s the merit of this case? Is it headed towards getting the ID card or not?

MS. HARF: I'm not going to get into the considerations we're taking right now on the case. Broadly speaking, I think it's important to take a step back. What we're focused on at the State Department is moving forward with the bilateral relationship. Obviously, there's a legal process that is ongoing; it's separate. But we're focused on moving this relationship forward, working together on all the issues we work together on all the time. That's certainly what our focus has been here.

QUESTION: Has there been any additional phone calls in the new year?

MS. HARF: Not from the Secretary, no. There's obviously a lot of communication at the ambassadorial level and from Washington, but none from the Secretary that I have.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. HARF: Yeah. India still?

QUESTION: Yes.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: The U.S. Ambassador to India, she also expressed regret, but it seems that that was also not enough. So where do we stand today? They are asking for – that all the charges should be withdrawn or things like that.

MS. HARF: Well, the legal process is separate, so obviously the Department of Justice and the Southern District of New York are handling those discussions. We think it's important right now for there to be space for these private diplomatic conversations to continue. We obviously are committed to working with the Government of India on a way forward. The ambassador obviously has been working on this a lot on the ground. But we're focused on where the relationship goes from here and how we get there, and that's what we're going to keep working on.

QUESTION: But what we hear from Delhi is that they are asking for that apology which is not coming forward, and --

MS. HARF: Well, every day you ask about that, and all I know is what our folks here tell me and what they're – the discussions they're focused on are now to move the relationship forward. We've obviously expressed regret at the highest levels here, so that's – we're certainly looking forward.

QUESTION: No, but you talk about sustaining this dialogue and diplomacy. If there – is there – at this moment it looks like there is – everything is at a standstill.

MS. HARF: In terms of what?

QUESTION: You say that we are moving forward in the relationship, but the only thing we hear about is this subject.

MS. HARF: Well, maybe that's because it's what you're focused on, but I would note a couple other things. Today, Ambassador Powell is in Hyderabad for a number of official events, including meeting with business leaders and participating in a clean water event. I think her trip is just one example, but it shows how much we and India are both focused on the way forward. And I think she noted this in her new year's message: We're both committed to continuing our cooperations on all aspects of our bilateral relationship. So this is just one example, but I think it depends on what you're focused on. But I think a lot of the bilateral work we do is just moving forward. That's what we're hoping to focus on.

QUESTION: Sorry, you mentioned – you said you thought it was important now for there to be space --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- for these private diplomatic talks. Which private diplomatic talks?

MS. HARF: Well, we're in constant conversation with the Government of India on this issue when they raise concerns or there have been a lot of demarches towards us. We're having those discussions privately. That's what I was referring to. The judicial process is separate and also private diplomatic conversations, but not ours.

QUESTION: I'm sorry – not ours?

MS. HARF: Not the State Department. I mean, the judicial process is being handled by the Department of Justice in the Southern District of New York. People have asked a lot about the diplomatic demarches and their communications to us, when they raise concerns, when we have concerns. Those are private diplomatic conversations that have been ongoing since the beginning, and those will continue.

QUESTION: Well – but are they – but they are unrelated to the legal case?

MS. HARF: Well, I mean, they're not entirely unrelated. It's – they're discussions based on a legal case that's ongoing, but the legal aspect of it is, of course, being handled by the Department of Justice.

QUESTION: All right. I'm just not sure --

MS. HARF: And you can't totally divorce them --

QUESTION: -- to what --

MS. HARF: -- from each other.

QUESTION: To what end are these diplomatic – private discussions --

MS. HARF: From here --

QUESTION: -- happening?

MS. HARF: -- they're focused on how to move the relationship forward, how to get past this incident, and the work we have to do together going forward.

QUESTION: Okay. So there isn't any kind of plea bargaining or anything like that going on in the diplomatic discussions between --

MS. HARF: Well, the Government of India is having discussions with the judicial folks, which would be considered diplomatic discussions. But that's certainly their ballgame, not ours.

QUESTION: So you're not involved in that?

MS. HARF: We're involved in the discussions at a range of levels, Matt, but that's obviously a situation for the judicial process to work out. Obviously, we're all talking, but I'm not going to go further into sort of what those discussions --

QUESTION: No, I'm just curious about the separation of powers here.

MS. HARF: Right. That's what I'm saying --

QUESTION: If the executive – if the Executive Branch is getting involved in --

MS. HARF: No, obviously, we talk to them about how to move the bilateral relationship forward. The Southern District of New York and the Department of Justice are in charge of the legal aspect.

QUESTION: But the case was investigated by the Department of State. The case was filed by Department of State. So --

MS. HARF: Well, the case was brought by the Southern District of New York.

QUESTION: No, but if you've seen the --

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: -- seen the indictment which has been filed in the Southern District of New York, which is publicly available now, it has been signed by a special agent --

MS. HARF: Right, because they investigate it.

QUESTION: -- but you don't, diplomatic --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Yeah, investigator.

MS. HARF: Yeah.

QUESTION: It's the campaign --

MS. HARF: But we don't bring charges against people. The Southern District of New York does.

QUESTION: The four or five counsels are there, all assigned by the Bureau of Diplomatic Security agent of the Department of State, so not signed by --

MS. HARF: Right. We investigate these things. We don't bring charges.

QUESTION: But investigations found out those -- the diplomatic --

MS. HARF: Investigations play into when the district attorney decides to bring charges or not. We could have investigated and they could not have brought charges, so that's not our decision.

QUESTION: So -- but do you stand by your investigation?

MS. HARF: Absolutely.

QUESTION: The Department of State --

MS. HARF: Absolutely.

QUESTION: -- stands by its investigation?

MS. HARF: Absolutely.

QUESTION: Any updates on the list of demarches that you had received?

MS. HARF: No, I don't have any -- let me see what I have. I don't think I have any updates on that. The only new -- I don't know if this is new, but -- thing I have is that we've provided interim responses where appropriate to some of the diplomatic communications. We continue to review and discuss all of the Government of India's requests for action, and we're working closely with them on these issues. That's the latest.

QUESTION: How many demarches have you seen?

MS. HARF: I don't have numbers, and again, probably wouldn't prove them anyways, but I don't have them in front of me.

QUESTION: Sorry – what's an interim response?

MS. HARF: A response that's not final yet.

QUESTION: A response that says thank you very much for your demarche; we'll get back to you?

MS. HARF: I don't know what the interim responses look like. They could look like a variety of things, Matt. I just don't know.

QUESTION: The Indian Government says it wrote to the State Department several times since June when the maid went missing, but there was no response from the State Department except for one instance. But you have been saying that there have been communications back and forth.

MS. HARF: Absolutely.

QUESTION: But we haven't got any details like the Indians have said – given to us --

MS. HARF: We prefer to keep those discussions private, in diplomatic channels. I've been very clear that we had constant communication with them throughout many months as this played itself out, but we keep them private for a reason.

...

QUESTION: On this security issue, the Indian embassy here has been requesting the State Department for several months that the parking lot across the embassy was removed from reserved for the diplomats. Now it's made public, so the Indian embassy is saying that it has increased the security threat to the embassy. Has the State Department taken note of it, taken any steps?

MS. HARF: I am not familiar with that issue. I'm happy to check on it.

QUESTION: It has been going on for past several months also.

MS. HARF: Okay, happy to check on it. Yes, Lucas, and then I'll go back.

...

QUESTION: Yeah, just a clarification. This Devyani Khobragade case was not the first one involving the Indian diplomats. It was a third one in a row. And there are a lot of more diplomats with maids made in India and bringing them from India. Is there any other investigation going on against anyone else?

MS. HARF: Well, the answer, first, is I don't know. And second, if I did know, which I don't, I don't think I'd be able to share that here.

QUESTION: No, but --

MS. HARF: But as I said -- as I said on this case, when there were allegations made, we informed the Indian Government that they had been made and that we'd be looking into them. But I don't think that's something we share publicly.

QUESTION: There were no arrests in the earlier two cases and --

MS. HARF: I'm not sure which two cases exactly you're referring to. I'm happy --

QUESTION: The New York ones. The -- Mr. --

MS. HARF: I think there maybe were some prosecutions in the past.

QUESTION: Mr. Dayal and --

MS. HARF: I'm happy to check on the specifics. I think there may have been some prosecutions in the past.

QUESTION: And they left U.S. and in this case -- but I am more interested in what is the ongoing investigation in some more cases because that is --

MS. HARF: Again, if there were, which I don't know if there are, that would be information that I don't think we would be able to share publicly.

QUESTION: Have there been any other complaints, any against any other Indian diplomats --

MS. HARF: Again, I don't --

QUESTION: -- on --

MS. HARF: I don't know the answer. If we had, I don't think that's information I'd be able to share.

December 30, 2013

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: What's the status of the application pending before the State Department on the UN transfer of the UN diplomat Devyani Khobragade?

MS. HARF: We have received the paperwork from the United Nations. It is currently under review, and I don't have anything further for you on that except that we're taking a look at it and when we have something more, we're happy to share it.

QUESTION: Normally, it's done within a few days, one or two days. What's -- why the --

MS. HARF: I'm not sure that's actually true. I can check our folks and see what the normal processing time is. I'm just not sure that's actually the case.

QUESTION: (Off-mike.)

MS. HARF: I don't know. I can double-check on that. I'm sorry, I don't know.

QUESTION: Also, the Indian Government informed you last week that when she was arrested she was indeed a member of Indian delegation to the United Nations. Do you believe that's -- that gives her that necessary diplomatic immunity from being arrested?

MS. HARF: As I said a few days ago, I think in response to a question on this -- it might have been yours or someone else's -- we have seen those reports, we're looking into it right now. Our folks are taking a look at that issue. Still looking into it, don't have any update on that. I'm happy to check in with them again.

QUESTION: And a few other questions on some reports happening in the Indian media that the U.S. Embassy in India is not paying enough salary to the security guards, Indian visa officers. For the security guards, it's less than around \$200 per month; for Indian visa officers, around \$300 per month. Do you think U.S. Embassy in India is violating any laws of the land over there as per the --

MS. HARF: I haven't seen those reports, but our standard practice -- and I have no reason to believe that's not the case here -- is to pay folks that work for us in countries around the world in conjunction with local law, with local practice. I'm happy to look into those specific reports, but I have no reason to believe that that's not the case for our folks in India right now.

QUESTION: But when they work for the Embassy in India, would they receive the U.S. minimum wage or the Indian minimum wage?

MS. HARF: It's my – and let me double-check on this because I'm not an expert on it. It's my understanding that it's an – that at a minimum it comports with local law and local practice, but that doesn't mean that it's not beyond that, so I'm happy check and see what our practice is across the board.

QUESTION: Can you also check that the reports about U.S. Embassy in Delhi --

MS. HARF: Which is actually what we were asking her to do in this case as well. I'm just --

QUESTION: Okay. Also, having – running full-scale commercial facility like shopping centers and beauty salon – and there have been reports about violating local tax laws over there. Can you check on those?

MS. HARF: Again, I can check on that. I haven't seen those reports, but I have no reason to believe that our folks have done anything wrong on that. I'm happy to check.

QUESTION: On a technical issue --

...

QUESTION: -- before the holidays: If the immunities change – if her status is changed to a UN diplomat, does that include reviewing whether there are any pending charges against her in the United States?

MS. HARF: I think there are a variety of scenarios depending on if immunity status has changed or not. There's not a yes-or-no answer, as much as I try to get one for you all on these questions, so on that I think it just depends.

QUESTION: And what about on the issue – does she – if she does get UN immunity, will she be absolved from --

MS. HARF: The charges don't – as Jen and I think both said, the charges don't go away.

QUESTION: Right.

MS. HARF: But again, there are a variety of scenarios that could play out here.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: Yeah.

QUESTION: On this issue, I mean, does the U.S. really want to pick a fight with India over this diplomat? Is it not better to just send her back to India?

MS. HARF: Well, I think what you've heard from me, certainly, and from the Secretary and others is that we don't want this to negatively impact our relationship, that we work on a broad range of issues together. Our bilateral relationship is too important. And we said repeatedly that we don't want it to. We've had some good conversations with our Indian counterparts, and that's why what we're doing right now is letting that process play itself out and focusing from our end on moving the relationship forward on the ground and here as well.

QUESTION: How quickly do you want – is this review going to take? I mean, the longer it does drag out, there is uncertainty.

MS. HARF: I don't have a timeframe for you. These processes take time, but I just don't have the specifics on timeframe.

India?

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: And then we're going to Japan. Just a few more on India.

QUESTION: Okay. A few, yeah. I have a list.

MS. HARF: Just a few. (Laughter.) I'm going to impose some discipline today.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. HARF: You're welcome.

QUESTION: On this UN visa review issue which is going on for more than a week – you received it, I think, late Friday night – not this Friday, the Friday before.

MS. HARF: I can double-check. I don't – can't confirm that. I'll double-check to see if that's accurate.

QUESTION: And there is a negotiation process also which is – has been started with India. There is a list of demands the U.S. is putting out to India. Can you give us --

MS. HARF: Who in the U.S.?

QUESTION: The U.S. to India if they – and that they are ready to stamp her status if India agrees to this, this, this.

MS. HARF: Well, I would say a few things. We obviously have discussions with the Indian Government. I'm assuming that my colleagues at the Justice Department or the Southern District – I don't know which – are having conversations as well. And I'm not going to outline what those diplomatic discussions look like.

QUESTION: Okay. So – and over the weekend, there was a story in the Indian media about the intelligence review. And I got a statement from the NSC spokesperson yesterday, and --

MS. HARF: Well, I'm certainly not going to disagree with her.

QUESTION: And – yes, but it is being led by the State Department, so the ball is in your court. So can you give us some more details about that?

MS. HARF: I don't have any more details. We've talked about it a lot throughout this process. I just don't have any more details for you.

QUESTION: Okay, the last one. The – and what is the average time you take to give this visa? And will it be soon, before her case starts rolling? And then can we have the answers with the questions that you have taken?

MS. HARF: A, I will look to get them as soon as possible. Some we may not be able to take, or not – might not be able to answer, excuse me. I don't have a timeline for how long it takes the process to play itself out. I can see if we have an average. I don't know that we do, but I can check.

QUESTION: Is there a – can you also please --

MS. HARF: Last one.

QUESTION: Yeah. Can you just please check --

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: -- in the history of this, have you ever denied anyone this --

MS. HARF: I would – I can check. I would caution anyone from comparing this to any other case. They're just --

QUESTION: For historical reasons, if you can check --

MS. HARF: I can check, yes.

QUESTION: -- if anybody has been denied this.

MS. HARF: I will check for you.

QUESTION: Thank you.

QUESTION: On --

MS. HARF: Japan, yeah. Last one.

QUESTION: Can you walk us through the process once you receive the application? Not in this particular case. In general, once you receive the application, what's the process you go through?

MS. HARF: I can't give you a lot more details about it. I'm happy to check with our folks and see if there's more I can share.

December 20, 2013

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on India

Washington DC

QUESTION: On India. The Indian information minister is demanding an apology for the diplomatic incident up in New York City, and he's saying that America cannot behave atrociously and get away with it. So is an apology forthcoming?

MS. PSAKI: Well, Deb, I know when – in my absence, my colleague Marie discussed this quite a bit over the last couple of days. As you know, we are engaged and in touch with our Indian counterparts. The Secretary has had a call. Under Secretary Sherman has been engaged. And we're continuing the conversation with our Indian counterparts privately. We've also put out a range of statements over the past couple of days that I would certainly point you to.

I also wanted to point you to the comments of External Affairs Minister Khurshid's comments earlier today where he talked about the importance of U.S.-India relations, talked about how valuable they are. And we certainly fully agree that it's important to preserve and protect our partnership. It's not just about diplomatic ties. We have over \$90 billion in bilateral trade. We're supporting thousands of jobs in both of our countries. We share very close counterterrorism cooperation. And we are engaged with India, of course, on a range of issues, including Afghanistan, which is often a hot topic in here.

So we will continue these discussions through diplomatic channels, through private conversations. You've seen the range of statements we've put out this week. But beyond that, I don't have any new update for you.

QUESTION: So no, not right now, right? At this moment?

MS. PSAKI: I would just point you to the fact that we've been very engaged in this, the Secretary's been engaged, Under Secretary Sherman's been engaged. We'll continue those conversations.

QUESTION: We shouldn't be expecting anything from Obama, for example, later today?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I know the President has a press conference later today, and if he's asked questions, I'm sure he'll address them, but again, I would point you back to the comments from both sides about the importance of our relationship long-term and the range of issues that we work together on.

QUESTION: You were inside the plane when Secretary called India's National Security Adviser Shivshankar Menon. What was discussed? And when did the Secretary first come to know about this issue?

MS. PSAKI: I'm sorry, UN Secretary – can you speak --

QUESTION: You were inside the plane when Secretary called NSA – India's NSA Shivshankar Menon.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: What was really discussed? Can you give us more detail? There was a readout, of course, but can you give us more insight into it? What was Secretary's thought process going on? And when did he first come to know about it, that this has gone – out of – blown – this has been blown out of proportion?

MS. PSAKI: Well, he – there's not more to add beyond the readout that we put out around the time of the call. He did the call from the plane. He also – and let me mention he's also reached out to Minister Khurshid, and we understand he was not able to be reached at the time, but he looks forward to speaking with him soon. That's not scheduled. Obviously, we're lining up schedules on that.

QUESTION: So you're trying to set up just a – you're trying to set up a phone call?

MS. PSAKI: Well, yes, but also he reached out to – we reached out to him, and I believe parliament was in session. He wasn't able – available at the time, but he looks forward to speaking with him soon when we can align the two schedules up. So there's not more to read out from the particular call he did, but he has received several briefings. He remains very engaged in this as it unfolds.

QUESTION: And given the kind of communication that has been happening with the two countries' officials, the two countries, does it give you a confidence that it will be resolved, that this political dialogue will continue? Or it's not --

MS. PSAKI: Well, I'd – and I already referenced this, but I would point you to the comments of External Affairs Minister Khurshid's earlier today, where he talked about how valuable the India-U.S. relationship is, how important it is, how we want to preserve and protect our partnership. And that's our view, of course, as well.

QUESTION: Well, but he also said – he did an interview with us and he said that the charges should be dropped, and – I mean, you seem to be at a stalemate in the sense that, okay, I think there's been an acknowledgement about the way that this was – the way the arrest and the

processing and everything was handled. And then there's the separate issue of the charges that are against this woman.

Now, the Indians seem to be kind of lumping this all together and saying, "Well, she was treated badly and these charges are a sham, so you should just drop the whole thing," where it seems as if the U.S. is saying, "Look, these allegations happened, a complaint has been made, charges have been filed, it has to go through the legal courts." How do you square that circle and just move forward with the Indians and this becomes a – put this in the past?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think it's accurate to say that our law enforcement authorities and the Government of India have some different interpretations of the issues and allegations at play. As you know and as Marie has referenced many times, this is now a legal case, and of course the State Department doesn't have jurisdiction over that. And we have been clear about our standing – our position of certainly standing with our judicial colleagues. So I don't have any particular update on that other than to say that this is a legal process that's working its way through.

Now at the same time, to your point, we of course are closely engaged with the Government of India, we're in close contact, and we want to move beyond this. And I think we all recognize the importance of our long-term relationship.

QUESTION: Are you concerned about possible impact on your economic and trade relationship with India? And you have already some feedback from U.S. companies, U.S. businessmen there about difficulty they could have in India, in doing business in India.

MS. PSAKI: Well, you're right that certainly, our trade relationship is vitally important. We have a \$90 billion bilateral trade partnership with India, and so that's one of the very important components of our comprehensive partnership. I'm not aware of specific concerns or complaints addressed on that level, but it is something that we are certainly focused on, and we certainly want our relationship and all the important components to continue.

QUESTION: Could you let us know if that call takes place?

MS. PSAKI: Oh, of course, absolutely.

QUESTION: And also, has the State Department received the request from the Indian Government about the transfer of the diplomat, Devyani Khobragade, to the United Nations?

MS. PSAKI: We have not yet received an official request through the proper channels for accreditation.

QUESTION: This was asked yesterday about the retroactive nature of immunity, if it was granted. I think ABC asked about a document that has been online that says that she would have

– I guess retroactive is what we’ve been calling it, but that would apply to past crimes. Do you have any clarification further on that?

MS. PSAKI: Sure. And I know there’s lots of – it’s obviously a very complex issue, I think, given we’re all continuing to discuss it. So I want to clarify one point on immunity, because I know yesterday we talked about how retroactive immunity would not apply. It’s more legally accurate to say that the concept of retroactive immunity isn’t the right way to look at a situation like this. So if we take a step back just on the issue broadly, diplomatic immunity means, among other things, that a foreign diplomat is not subject to criminal jurisdiction in the United States for the time they are a diplomat, for the time they have that immunity. So it does not – however, when immunity is conferred, it does not retroactively take effect at a previous point in time, but relates solely to the diplomat’s current status.

So I think some of the confusion here has been if there is a change in status, does that mean that there is a clean slate from past charges? There’s not. Receiving diplomatic immunity does not nullify any previously existing criminal charges. Those remain on the books. So it just is related to – nor does obtaining diplomatic immunity protect the diplomat from prosecution indefinitely. It relates to the status for – to a diplomat’s current status for the length of the time of that status.

QUESTION: So that’s not really anything different than yesterday. Is – I’m not sure I understand what’s different.

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think there was – what was said yesterday is completely accurate, but I think the confusion stemmed from whether it would wipe away or provide a clean slate from past charges.

QUESTION: Right.

MS. PSAKI: Perhaps not for you, but perhaps for others.

QUESTION: No, right.

MS. PSAKI: And that is incorrect. The answer is no.

QUESTION: So basically it just provides her with – this new immunity would prevent her from getting arrested again, or if – so basically, it would prevent her from actually having to be subjected to the same type of --

MS. PSAKI: Well, there are certain – it would apply during the time if for instance – and this is all purely hypothetical, speculative, right, and there are a range of different options that could happen here – but for anyone, it would apply for the length of time that they have that diplomatic status. But it doesn’t retroactively wipe out past discretions.

QUESTION: So basically, she wouldn't get – she couldn't get rearrested. She could probably leave the country. These are the type of things that are afforded --

MS. PSAKI: Well, I don't want to speculate on that. And again, there are so many different scenarios here. I know that you all want to play them out, and we certainly try to have the best answers we can, but I don't want to play it out to that degree. But it means that during the time of that status, if there's a different status granted, doesn't mean it wipes out past discretions.

QUESTION: Okay. So let's say she does get transferred and you approve it, the UN approves it. Her diplomatic immunity becomes full as opposed to consular, okay? If she is charged again within this case on something else, then that diplomatic status then would apply, correct? Her new diplomatic status would apply?

MS. PSAKI: I'd have to check into that, Deb. I think that's a few steps beyond my legal education, which is none.

QUESTION: Do you have some figures on the number of visas the U.S. issues every year to such kind of domestic workers – A-3 visa, let us say? And do you also have some figures on the number of complaints you receives from such domestic workers and how many diplomats' cases have been registered – I guess this number of diplomats?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have that kind of data. I'm not sure what we have available, but I'm happy to look into it and see if we have something we can provide to all of you on that.

December 19, 2013

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: I'd like to start with the Indian diplomat, of course, and I have two questions.

MS. HARF: Okay.

QUESTION: One, there's talk that she has been indeed transferred to the UN mission, okay? Have you all been notified of that?

MS. HARF: We have not yet received an official request through proper channels for re-accreditation. I'd refer you to the UN to see if they've received something.

QUESTION: Okay. They say they haven't, but India says that --

MS. HARF: Okay. I can't speak for the UN.

QUESTION: Yeah, but the --

MS. HARF: Or the Indians.

QUESTION: The Indians say that --

MS. HARF: We have not received it.

QUESTION: Okay. The question yesterday was if that happens, how does that affect her diplomatic status.

MS. HARF: So a couple points on that. I don't want to get into hypotheticals or into her case in any way. Obviously, we haven't received anything --

QUESTION: Generally speaking.

MS. HARF: It would depend on what kind of position a person's being transferred to. But generally speaking, if there's a change in immunity, right, because of a different diplomatic status, that immunity would start on the date it's conferred, after the process. So there's a process: it goes to the UN Secretariat, comes to the U.S. State Department, everybody has to say yes. There's a process, a bureaucratic process. And then, if a different diplomatic status is conferred, it's conferred at that date.

QUESTION: So we're talking no retroactive --

MS. HARF: It is not retroactive.

QUESTION: Okay. Did the -- why was it necessary to evacuate the family? Were they being threatened in some way? The husband and the kids, they got visas very, very fast. They left December 10th, which his only two days before the diplomat was arrested. So what was the deal? Why did they have to get these visas so that --

MS. HARF: Without going into specifics about some of those details, the U.S. Government has taken steps to reunite the alleged victim with her family. Obviously, I'm not going to go into specifics about that. We are aware of the existence of allegations that the family was intimidated in India. Obviously, I can't confirm those. But in general, we take those kinds of allegations very seriously.

QUESTION: So that would be the reason why the visas --

MS. HARF: Again, I'm not going to talk specifically about these cases in any way other than just to say we're aware of the allegations, and of course, take them seriously.

QUESTION: Did the housekeep claim -- try to claim asylum on the basis of human trafficking?

MS. HARF: I can't get into specifics about these specific cases in any way or discussions we had in terms of visa applications or anything like that. I just can't get into those specifics. It's an ongoing matter.

QUESTION: But can you confirm that whatever visa was issued to the servant or maid she brought, it was issued by the U.S. Embassy in Delhi, I believe. And also, I'm sure she must be aware of what kind of visa she's getting or she's going to the U.S., and so --

MS. HARF: Is there a question?

QUESTION: So what do you think -- are you going to held somebody responsible at the embassy that who issued the visa they didn't check the proper papers and all that?

MS. HARF: Well, I don't actually know where the visa application was submitted. I can double-check. Obviously, for diplomats or consular officers there's a process. I'm happy to check if there are more details. Generally speaking, we can't get into those types of specifics on any one specific case.

QUESTION: And as far as new position at the United Nations, whatever she had the position at the consul general in New York and whatever the incident took place, that will not affect -- that will remain the same? New position will not change any --

MS. HARF: Well, we haven't received an official request for re-accreditation. Obviously, if we do, we'll look at it. So I don't want to venture to guess hypothetically what a new position might look like because we haven't received that yet.

QUESTION: Any request that she might leave New York for India?

MS. HARF: Look, what we're focused on, broadly speaking, right now – I know that – I mean, not to my knowledge. But what we're focused on right now is working to move the relationship forward. Under Secretary Sherman spoke this morning with Foreign Secretary Singh again. They had a good conversation. And also, there's a process, right, in place right now through the judicial system, a legal process that we also would like to see play out. And we'll continue having conversations with the Indian Government, certainly, as this process moves forward.

QUESTION: And U.S. Attorney Mr. Bharara defended whatever action he took or his office took against this diplomat, Indian diplomat. But Indian Government shot back and then they're saying that our question is only that Vienna Convention was not followed, which every diplomat around the globe is protection under the Vienna Convention, whether it's India, U.S., or anybody in the world. So where do we stand on this Vienna Convention?

MS. HARF: Well, we certainly adhere to the Vienna Convention.

QUESTION: You think the U.S. Attorney made some kind of mistakes were made there, but now they are defending each other?

MS. HARF: Well, a couple points. Obviously, we adhere to the Vienna Convention, as we expect other countries to as well. I think the Secretary – the statement yesterday about the Secretary expressing regrets, especially that certain – I think this is one issue we've talked about a lot here – he certainly had regrets that certain courtesies were not extended in this case. I think it's fair to say that that's why we're looking at what happened. We work very closely with our law enforcement colleagues. The gentleman that you mentioned that put out a statement last night also said some very positive things about working with the State Department and what we had done. So we obviously take law enforcement matters very seriously. We'll continue working with the law enforcement community going forward on this. But I think the Secretary was very clear when I spoke yesterday about the regret that he was expressing in this case.

QUESTION: And thank you, final question on this issue.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: There were some demonstrations going on in Delhi at the U.S. Embassy. One, what do you think that if you have requested additional security measures from the Indian Government? And finally, how serious you think the State Department or U.S. Government think this issue is? Maybe it's first of its kind in 60 years of U.S.-India diplomatic relations.

MS. HARF: Well, I think that's an interesting question, but it's certainly not indicative of our broad and deep and vital bilateral relationship. That's what we've said from the beginning. This is an isolated episode. The Secretary certainly regret – certainly expressed regret that things weren't done differently at times, but what we're focused on and why the Secretary and everyone else is so focused on this, is an incredibly important relationship. That has in no way changed.

If you look at how we've worked together during this Administration, certainly, which is what I'm familiar with, we have a broad and deep relationship. We work together on a host of issues, whether it's economic issues, trade, Afghanistan, other issues, and that is only going to continue to increase. So that's why what we're focused on is not letting this episode impact our relationship, and indeed, moving forward with it.

QUESTION: And I just wanted to say Indian American communities very much shocked and surprised and watching and they – what they are saying is that they want to see to resolve this issue at the peaceful and not to hampering any relations of the community and the countries – both countries.

MS. HARF: And we would certainly agree that we don't want it to as well.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. HARF: Yes. And – yes. Elise, I'll go back to you next time.

QUESTION: On Under Secretary's phone call --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- to India's foreign secretary, the readout which is coming out from Delhi is that Under Secretary distanced herself from the statement issued by U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara in New York yesterday. Is that your understanding? Is that --

MS. HARF: Well again, he can speak for himself, certainly. The State Department doesn't speak --

QUESTION: Okay. Is the State Department this time --

MS. HARF: Right. And I'll give you a little readout of what their call was. The readout I have from the Under Secretary is that both parties affirmed our intent to keep working through this complex issue. We certainly look forward to having further conversations. I don't have more of a readout of their private conversation for you. Certainly, we work very closely with law enforcement. And I think our statements, my statements from here and others, speak for themselves, certainly, on this.

QUESTION: Does the State Department agree with the statement issued by Preet Bharara yesterday?

MS. HARF: I'm not going to go line by line and parse a statement that was made from the Southern District of New York. As I've said, we worked very closely with our law enforcement partners, and the statements that I've made, I think, from this podium certainly are – speak for themselves. And that's what we're focused on here.

QUESTION: But there's just been this suggestion that because this is becoming an international incident that should there be pressure put on the U.S. courts to kind of drop the charges, let it go, and I think that – can you clear up like – does the State Department support this woman being prosecuted for the crimes that she was charged with?

MS. HARF: Well, again, that's not for us to support or not support. That's a decision for law enforcement and the judicial --

QUESTION: But you don't think she should get off scot-free?

MS. HARF: Well, let me finish. Yeah, no. And certainly, what I was going to say – and for the judicial process to make – we certainly take these types of allegations very seriously though. It's not a decision for us whether to prosecute or not, right? But we very clearly have said every year in diplomatic notes to every country that has diplomats here throughout the world that there are obligations they have for their staffs when they bring them to the United States. We make those obligations very clear and we take any allegations that they haven't done so very seriously. So certainly, there's no discussion like that going on. We just want the process to move forward.

QUESTION: So any suggestion that you would be putting pressure on the U.S. Attorney's Office to drop the charges --

MS. HARF: Is not true.

QUESTION: Ma'am, can I follow-up?

MS. HARF: The State Department doesn't --

QUESTION: Yeah --

MS. HARF: -- doesn't put – doesn't charge people or drop charges. That's not what the State Department does.

QUESTION: It is signed by the State Department, right, this --

MS. HARF: The arrest warrant? No, it wasn't. Let me pull that up. Hold on just one second.

QUESTION: No, the – yes, the 11 days indictment was signed by the State Department.

MS. HARF: Hold on one second and let me pull this up. I have something on here – this on here. Let me find it for you, because this is important. The State Department doesn't charge people with crimes. Let me check though, hold on. I think I have this in here. Let me find it, just give me one second. And if I can't find it, I will endeavor to find it by the end of the briefing.

It's not for any State Department official to sign off on any arrests, right, even regarding a foreign diplomat. A federal judge issued the warrant for her arrest.

QUESTION: That's fine. But the complaint was filed by the State Department – Mark Smith, Special Liaison to U.S. Department of State Bureau of Diplomatic Security. Based on this complaint, arrest warrant was issued, right? So Indian Government is saying to withdraw the complaint. My question is --

MS. HARF: Well, but there have now been charges filed against her that are not filed by the State Department. I'm not sure exactly what complaint you're referring to. Certainly, we play a role in the process. I'm happy to look at it, but we don't file charges against people.

QUESTION: This is the same complaint which has filed --

MS. HARF: The Southern District of New York does.

QUESTION: Yes.

MS. HARF: That's why last night they made the statement.

QUESTION: Yeah, that's why --

QUESTION: Can I follow – can I just follow up?

MS. HARF: Yeah. And I'm happy – I don't know what's exactly in front of you. I'm happy to look at it. We certainly played a role as the arresting authority. And also, when the allegation was brought to us, we helped investigate it as well from our side here working with law enforcement. So we certainly played a role. But in terms of who could drop charges, that's not a State Department purview.

QUESTION: Because the complaint has been filed by the State Department. Only the State Department isn't – can drop the charges, right?

MS. HARF: No, the State Department can't drop charges that have been brought in this --

QUESTION: But you can withdraw the complaint.

QUESTION: Withdraw the complaint.

MS. HARF: Again, I don't know the details of the complaint, and I don't know if even withdrawing the complaint, which I'm not saying anybody is considering would, in fact, drop the charge. That's not something that's even being considered.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: I'm happy to look at the complaint. But suffice to say, charges that are brought in federal court against somebody are brought by the Southern District of New York, regardless of a complaint. I'm happy to check into the legalese behind that.

QUESTION: So just to put a fine point on it, it sounds like what you're saying is the incident in which I think everyone acknowledged that she was not extended – even the Secretary – was not extended certain courtesies during her processing should be separate and distinct and have no relation on the charges that were brought against this woman and what should happen to her going forward.

MS. HARF: Certainly, yes. I mean, the Secretary didn't specify about exactly what he was talking to in terms of specific courtesies, but those are separate issues, right. We take these allegations very seriously. We're not in any way walking back from those allegations or the charges. Again, this is really a law enforcement issue. But in terms of expressing regret for what happened and how we move the bilateral relationship forward, that is separate from the legal and judicial process that's --

QUESTION: I'm not – what happened, meaning the way that she was treated during her arrest?

MS. HARF: During and after.

QUESTION: After?

MS. HARF: Yes, mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Yes. I'm not trying to say what happened or not happened. Did the Indian side ask the American side to drop the charges or let this woman go back?

MS. HARF: There's been a lot of private diplomatic conversations. I'm not going to outline all of that for you. What we're all focused on is the process and where it goes from here.

QUESTION: Yeah, because the process – you are talking – we are talking about different two things. Somebody was charged. Whether it's right or wrong, I'm not sure. And then the procedure, what happened, and the whole discussion was in the last three, four days mainly on the procedure and some doubt about the charges.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: What I'm trying to figure out, because it seems that the Indian media or Indian people are talking about – I'm not trying to generalize it, but they are talking about the possibility or the necessity of dropping the charges, or at least let her go home.

MS. HARF: I'm not going to get into hypotheticals about how this process may play out. What I'm saying is nobody is saying that these – nobody is walking away from the charges, right? But there's a process – a judicial and a legal process that goes from here that is separate from the State Department, right? So I'm not going to prejudice how that process might play itself out or look into a crystal ball, because I can't. There's a number of different scenarios that could happen here.

QUESTION: Another question related to procedure. Are they talking through you to the federal whatever, the Marshal forces, or they are talking directly --

MS. HARF: Who is "they"? The Indian Government?

QUESTION: The Indian Government or Indian --

MS. HARF: We're certainly talking to them. I don't know. You'd have to check with the Department of Justice about what conversations they have.

QUESTION: They are not doing talks through you?

MS. HARF: Not to my knowledge. I'm happy to check. We certainly have a direct relationship with them for a number of reasons, yes.

QUESTION: I have one more.

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: Is it time now to go back to Vienna Convention and make it clear to the international community that they have to deal with these issues in the future, not in their own countries – based on their countries' laws, but where they are based in a host country?

MS. HARF: In terms of going back and looking at the Vienna Convention?

QUESTION: Yeah, all these problems and issues. Do you think it's time now? Because Vienna Convention – maybe it's too old now for those diplomats to understand.

MS. HARF: Well, I don't know of any move to renegotiate the Vienna Convention. I think it serves us pretty well. And we would say this is an isolated incident. Obviously, we're looking at what happened.

QUESTION: I just want to clarify on immunity, the retroactivity of it.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: In the *Diplomatic and Consular Immunity* handbook, it seems to suggest that immunity extends “whether the incident occurred prior to or during the period in which such immunity exists.” So that seems to be sort of discrepant. I mean, can you point us – what should we be looking at to see where this statute comes from (inaudible)?

MS. HARF: Yeah. I’m happy to check with our experts and point you to a statute. Very clearly -
-

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: -- it does – it’s not retro – immunity is not retroactive. When you’re granted a different kind of immunity, it starts on the day that that has changed. And I’m happy to see if there’s a statute for you.

QUESTION: I guess --

MS. HARF: It’s easy, I think, to – I don’t even know what statute you’re looking at --

QUESTION: Sure.

MS. HARF: -- to cherry-pick one. But I’m not sure what applies to what.

QUESTION: Maybe a clarifying question here would be: If the immunity starts on the day that it’s conferred --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- does that apply to this incident that’s being played out in the Southern District of New York since she –

MS. HARF: Again, we haven’t received an application for re-accreditation. I’m not going to get into hypotheticals about what that may or may not look like.

QUESTION: Earlier this year, two Filipino women were rescued escaping the grounds of the residence of the Saudi --

QUESTION: Can we stay on India?

QUESTION: This is part of it.

MS. HARF: Hey, hey, it's the holidays. I'll call the questions. It's related. I'll go back to you next on India.

QUESTION: Allow me to start again. Thank you. Two Filipino women were rescued escaping the residence of the Saudi diplomatic military attache's residence in Northern Virginia. As far as I'm aware, no Saudi diplomats have been – there's been no complaints, they've not been charged, none of them have been cavity-searched. How do you explain the discrepancy between the treatment of this Indian diplomat and those Saudi diplomats who allegedly committed even more egregious crimes against their own (inaudible)?

MS. HARF: I'm not aware of all the details of that case. I'm happy to look into it, and if I can share something, I'm happy to. Each case is different, though. Obviously, we take any allegation very seriously, of the kind – the nature that you mention and the kind that are mentioned in this case as well, and we investigate them when they're brought to our attention. I'm just not aware of the details of that case, and don't want to make a comparison about why something was or wasn't done.

Yes. Go back to India.

QUESTION: Yeah. Yesterday the Indian Embassy, on behalf of the Indian Government, issued a statement that they gave an account of the 23rd June the maidservant went missing, and 24th June they informed the Office of Foreign Mission. And then NYPD was not taking the complaint, and there was a problem there. And for that, they issue – they informed you about it. And then they shoot a letter on 25th of June to NYPD. And then after a meeting with NYPD, they registered a complaint. And on 23rd June to 8th of July, a lady called offering – asking and saying that she's a lawyer on behalf of the maidservant, and she asked for a compensation. And this was also conveyed to the State Department, and they said that till date there was no reply from the State Department. And then on – in September, the metropolitan court from Delhi issued these arrest warrants and all that, which were also informed to the State Department.

And so what is – and then on – suddenly on – in September, the State Department's letter asked them that – the Embassy to investigate, which was answered by the Ministry of External Affairs. So there's a lot of the – this can go on and on with the list that they have provided.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: What is your reaction to that?

MS. HARF: Well, yeah, I have --

QUESTION: Because you must have seen that.

MS. HARF: I'd make a couple points. It's highly inaccurate to say that we ignored any Government of India communiques on this issue, period. We're still compiling a precise sequence of all of our government-to-government communications on it – goes back months. Some of these communications are private diplomatic conversations or law enforcement sensitive. I'd point that out now.

I think it is accurate to say that our law enforcement authorities and the Government of India have some different interpretations of the issues and allegations at play throughout this entire scenario. But I would say that we have engaged in extensive conversations with the Government of India about this issue in Washington, in New York, in New Delhi, going back to the summer. We've also requested the Government of India to provide us with the results of its own inquiry into the allegations made by Dr. Khobragade's domestic worker and to make her available to discuss them, I don't think either of which was done.

So we've had a lot of conversations back and forth, we're continuing to now, and I think it's fair to say that we're still looking into exactly what all of those conversations look like. But we definitely responded. I certainly – it's inaccurate to say that we did not.

QUESTION: So at the end of your answer, the question comes: Who is lying, Indian Government or – from this? Because – and they have --

MS. HARF: I think lying is a pretty strong word.

QUESTION: They have specifically --

MS. HARF: It doesn't really have any place here.

QUESTION: They have specifically said that there were no answers.

MS. HARF: As I said, we have repeatedly engaged with the Government of India on this issue. If we have more details to provide in terms of a tick-tock of all those conversations, we can. But some of these are private diplomatic conversations, details about which we don't share publicly.

QUESTION: So you say that this was going on, the conversations, since June?

MS. HARF: Since the summer, yeah. Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Yeah. And that was not one way?

MS. HARF: I'm sorry? The summer?

QUESTION: Just a minute. Let me clarify. So it was not one-way conversation --

MS. HARF: Correct.

QUESTION: -- not just they sending?

MS. HARF: Absolutely not.

QUESTION: You were replying to it?

MS. HARF: Absolutely, it was a two-way conversation.

QUESTION: Thanks.

QUESTION: Were you expecting that something like this will happen or – when you are talking all these months? I mean, because it seems that it was – either the message was not clear or the communication was not – I mean, what you call it, clear enough to clear the atmosphere.

MS. HARF: Well, we certainly – I mean, this is why we notify governments, including, as we did in September in this case, when there are allegations made against their diplomats or consular officers or other folks in their missions here in the U.S. We tell them their allegations. Again, we've expressed regret with some of the things that have happened here, and what we're focused on is moving the relationship forward. And that's what all of our folks here are certainly working on all the time.

QUESTION: (Inaudible.)

MS. HARF: Wait, wait, wait. Deb had another one on India, and then I'll go back around. Yeah.

QUESTION: Do you know where the maid – the housekeeper is now?

MS. HARF: I don't have information about her whereabouts that I can share.

QUESTION: You said she was reunited with her family, though.

MS. HARF: In the United States.

QUESTION: Oh --

MS. HARF: It's my understanding.

QUESTION: Okay. So they're not back in Delhi, then? They're probably here somewhere?

MS. HARF: That's my understanding. I'm happy to double-check.

QUESTION: Okay. Did the Diplomatic Security agents take any kind of DNA swab?

MS. HARF: I can double-check. I don't know the answer to that.

QUESTION: Okay. Do you know if India has reconsidered any of the demarches that initially were put into place?

MS. HARF: I can double-check on what the status of those remains right now. I know there was one nonviolent protest outside one of our consulates, and the Indian security responded very quickly, very helpfully. We would thank them for doing so. That's clearly a good sign, I think, but we're just going to focus on how to move forward here.

QUESTION: The ID cards, the --

MS. HARF: I can double -- I don't know if those were ever implemented. I'm happy to check.

QUESTION: Okay. And is it --

QUESTION: What consulate was that at?

MS. HARF: Let me see. Hold on. I have it in here. Kolkata, I think is how you say it. K-O-L-K-A-T-A. Someone correct me if I'm wrong on that.

Yes.

QUESTION: Some of them --

QUESTION: (Inaudible.)

MS. HARF: Wait, hold on a sec -- okay.

QUESTION: Do you have any more calls to report from Kerry?

MS. HARF: From the Secretary?

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: On India?

QUESTION: Mm-hmm.

MS. HARF: No.

QUESTION: Okay. He hasn't talked to the foreign minister, then?

MS. HARF: He has not.

QUESTION: Is he -- everybody --

MS. HARF: No plans to.

QUESTION: No plans to?

MS. HARF: No. I mean, he always open to, but I think there was some misreporting out there today that he maybe was planning to, and that's just not – not the case.

QUESTION: Well, I heard that he tried to call him yesterday, but that he couldn't get through or something.

MS. HARF: I don't know what the sort of tick-tock was. Obviously, he talked to the national security advisor. There may have been a logistical reason why he couldn't, but it's not – I mean, there – he's not – there's not a call planned today or tomorrow to my knowledge at this point.

Yeah.

QUESTION: So where the talks or negotiations or meetings going on, at what level, to resolve this issue? And finally, anything on those demonstrations at the U.S. Embassy in Delhi?

MS. HARF: Well, we're certainly having diplomatic conversations for how to move the relationship forward. I would refer you to DOJ or the southern district of New York to speak to what conversations they're having as part of the judicial process. I certainly can't speak to those.

QUESTION: And the demonstrations at the --

MS. HARF: I don't have anything additional on those.

QUESTION: Are you asking any additional – have you asked any additional --

MS. HARF: I can check on that. We don't generally discuss security procedures, but I'm happy to check.

QUESTION: And at this time, finally, we are not looking any kind of Travel Warning?

MS. HARF: No, not to my knowledge.

QUESTION: Thank you, ma'am.

QUESTION: And the --

MS. HARF: Hold on. Chris?

QUESTION: No, this is on a different topic.

MS. HARF: Okay.

QUESTION: And the – like, yesterday, the – after the Secretary Kerry’s phone call --

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: And then there – and then Secretary Sherman’s call to the foreign secretary, the previous one, not today.

MS. HARF: Yes. Yeah, yesterday.

QUESTION: There was a feeling that it – we are on towards – moving toward de-escalation of the whole situation.

MS. HARF: That’s certainly our goal.

QUESTION: And then – no, but then last night when the – yesterday, when the – from the attorney issued a detailed statement, and then the Indians retorted back. That has put it back into a kind of a – what is your – the State Department take? That’s why it’s very important to know what is the State Department’s take on that letter.

MS. HARF: Again, they can speak for their own statements. I don't think it was a letter. I think it was a statement. Maybe I’m wrong on that.

QUESTION: Yeah, okay.

MS. HARF: But I think Secretary Kerry wanted to make the call yesterday because he believes this is important. His words, I think, were very clear to the national security adviser. Mine, up here, conveying those words were clear. Under Secretary Sherman, as you mentioned, has spoken now repeatedly with Foreign Secretary Singh. And we’re conveying repeatedly the same message, both about our regret about what happened, but also how we move forward from here. That’s a consistent message we are conveying diplomatically through proper diplomatic channels to the Indian Government.

QUESTION: And you will not confirm that Sherman – Secretary Sherman distanced herself from this statement?

MS. HARF: I don't have any additional readout from their call for you.

QUESTION: Can I ask one more?

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: (Off-mike.)

MS. HARF: Hold on.

QUESTION: The Indian Government today accused the U.S., saying that U.S. is undermining or not recognizing the Indian judicial system because Delhi's high court and Delhi's district court had issued warrant against the family members and even the maid – the missing maid. And it was sent to the U.S., the State Department, to find a place there and send her back to India. There was no recognition by the State Department or your judicial system about that.

MS. HARF: Again, we've been having conversations about any issues that the Indian Government has brought to us as part of this case going back many months. Those conversations are ongoing. I'm just not going to detail specifically what those are about.

QUESTION: Is the State Department aware of any allegations that she was physically abused or that maybe she was living under poor conditions?

MS. HARF: I'm happy to --

QUESTION: Or even if that she --

MS. HARF: I'm not sure I could even share that if it was part of our investigation. I don't – to my knowledge, I just don't know the answer. Obviously you know what she was charged with, which was visa fraud. And I'm happy to check into what – if I can, share any more details about the investigation. I probably can't as it's an ongoing legal matter.

QUESTION: One other thing was that she was not allowed to hold her own passport.

MS. HARF: I can check on that too. But again, I probably can't get into it either way, but I'm happy to look into it.

QUESTION: Can you also provide us a timeline of communication with the Indian Government?

MS. HARF: Certainly, if we have more details on that to provide we're happy to. Some of this we keep private for a good reason. But as we put together a full, comprehensive look at that, I'm happy to share as much as I can.

QUESTION: The Indian media is reporting that the maid's father-in-law works for the U.S. Embassy. Is that right?

MS. HARF: I do have something on that. I can confirm that he either was or is – I don't know the current status – employed in a personal capacity by a U.S. diplomat, not as a U.S. Government employee.

QUESTION: What does that mean?

MS. HARF: Someone can hire someone in a personal capacity to work for them, but he's not a U.S. Government employee.

QUESTION: What was he hired to --

MS. HARF: I'm not going to go into further details about what he was hired to do. But you can think about things that would be official U.S. Government employee work, and what would be someone's -- would hire someone to do in a personal capacity. Those are different things, and I just can't get into any more detail than that.

QUESTION: It's current, or --

MS. HARF: I don't know that. I'm happy to check.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: I just don't know if it -- current or past.

QUESTION: A U.S. Government employee isn't a State Department employee?

MS. HARF: A U.S. diplomat?

QUESTION: A U.S. diplomat working at the Embassy in New Delhi.

MS. HARF: That's my understanding, yes.

QUESTION: So where do we go from here on this? Is this over?

MS. HARF: Does it feel over?

QUESTION: No.

MS. HARF: No. But honestly and what I said, I think at the top, is really what we're focused on here. And I want to convey really strongly from the Secretary, the ambassador, and everyone on down that this relationship with India is incredibly important. This incident is not something that should define that, certainly, or that should negatively impact that. What we're focused on is having conversations at many levels about moving the relationship forward, moving past this episode, and letting the judicial and legal process move itself forward in whatever way it does, which is, of course, not housed here. So we're focused on taking the temperature down, on focusing on the bilateral relationship, and moving together on all the issues we focus on all the time.

QUESTION: Is the State Department done with its own assessment of what happened?

MS. HARF: We're still gathering all the facts, talking to the number of folks that were involved.

QUESTION: How long is that going to take?

MS. HARF: No estimate for you. There was a lot that happened here, and we're trying to get all the facts.

(Later)

QUESTION: Can I ask a point of clarification on Josh's question?

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: You mentioned that the father of the maid works or worked for a U.S. --

MS. HARF: I think father-in-law.

QUESTION: Father-in-law?

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Okay. Is that U.S. Embassy in India? And do you know --

MS. HARF: That's my -- yes.

QUESTION: -- where in India it is?

MS. HARF: I believe in Delhi.

QUESTION: In Delhi. Okay.

MS. HARF: Yeah.

QUESTION: And that's not the ambassador (inaudible)?

MS. HARF: Not to my knowledge, no. I'm happy to check on more details. I just don't have all the details in front of me.

December 18, 2013

**Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC**

MS. HARF :...The third statement I have at the top, and then happy to take questions on all of this – again, this just went out to all of you, but I wanted to highlight it again at the beginning – that today Secretary Kerry called Indian National Security Advisor Menon to discuss the December 12th arrest of Deputy Consul General – excuse me – Khobragade. The Secretary understands very deeply the importance of enforcing our laws and protecting victims, and like all officials in positions of responsibility inside the U.S. Government, expects the laws will be followed by everyone here in our country.

It's also particularly important to Secretary Kerry that foreign diplomats serving in the United States are accorded respect and dignity, just as we expect our own diplomats should receive overseas as well. As a father of two daughters about the same age, the Secretary empathizes with the sensitivities we are hearing from India about the events that unfolded after the arrest. And in his conversation with National Security Advisor Menon, he expressed his regret as well as his concern that we not allow this unfortunate public incident to hurt our close and vital relationship with India.

QUESTION: I have several questions about the statement.

MS. HARF: Which one?

QUESTION: The statement you just read about the Indian diplomat. First of all, you said he expressed regret.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: What did he express regret for, exactly?

MS. HARF: Well, I'm not going to --

QUESTION: The treatment? The arrest in general?

MS. HARF: Well, I'm not going to parse too much the words that were discussed in private diplomatic communications. He expressed regret with what happened. Again, as the father of two daughters about the same age --

QUESTION: You mean he --

MS. HARF: -- he empathizes with the sensitivities, certainly. I'm not going to further parse what he said in a private conversation. But needless to say, it was a positive conversation, and we're focused on moving the relationship forward.

QUESTION: Can I follow up?

MS. HARF: Hold on. I --

QUESTION: On -- okay. And also on the statement, you -- it says here that Kerry expects that laws will be followed by everyone here in our country, and then it also says that he is -- it is important that foreign diplomats in the United States be afforded dignity and respect.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: It sounds to me like he's saying that because he doesn't think that they were. I mean, why else would you say that?

MS. HARF: Again, I'm not going to further parse what we said or what he said. He's expressed regret at what happened, and he reiterated that we're focused on the way forward. I think what the general idea here is obviously, particularly as a former prosecutor, we take very seriously upholding the rule of law. We're not saying that's not important. We're not saying that these charges aren't charges that we think, of course, we would need to enforce if in fact true. But what he was also saying is that as Secretary of State, we do think it's important for diplomats here and our diplomats overseas to be afforded, as we said, respect and dignity -- again, just as we want our diplomats to be afforded overseas. So he had the discussion with the national security advisor, and again, reiterated that we're focused on moving forward.

QUESTION: So do you -- does he think that she was treated with respect and dignity --

MS. HARF: I'm not going to further parse what we said --

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: -- in the statement.

QUESTION: Okay. And just one more thing real quick.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: What led the -- to the arrest, do you know? What led to --

MS. HARF: What led to what the charges were?

QUESTION: Yeah. What led the Diplomatic Security to make the arrest? Do you know?

MS. HARF: Well, it was the result of being charged with some --

QUESTION: I mean, how were they --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Was he -- were they just executing, like, a warrant to get her, or were they actually -- they were actually making the arrest, right?

MS. HARF: Correct.

QUESTION: So they must have been -- they must have had a reason to --

MS. HARF: Well, we -- again, I said yesterday we notified the Indian Embassy in September that there were allegations against this person involving some of these issues, so they knew back in September that we, the U.S. Government -- and obviously, this is a Department of Justice issue and a District of New York -- Southern District of New York issue -- about the charges that were eventually filed against the deputy consul general. And that's, of course, as a result of those charges why she was eventually arrested.

QUESTION: Can I ask a follow-up?

QUESTION: Did you have any reply from the Indian Embassy about your communication with them?

MS. HARF: In September?

QUESTION: In September.

MS. HARF: I can double-check on that. I'm not sure.

QUESTION: May I follow up on --

QUESTION: A couple things on this.

MS. HARF: Yeah, there's, I'm sure, a lot on this. We'll get to everyone. Go ahead.

QUESTION: Well, no, I just --

MS. HARF: Go ahead. Uh-huh.

QUESTION: I wanted to ask as to why Secretary Kerry called the Indian national security advisor particularly and not his counterpart, the foreign minister.

MS. HARF: I can double-check if there was a reason. He has a relationship with a wide range of Indian officials. I'm happy to check if there was a specific reason.

QUESTION: I wondered if it was anything to do with some of the measures that were taken yesterday, including removing the concrete blocks from in front of the --

MS. HARF: I wouldn't -- I honestly wouldn't read anything into it. I'm happy to check what the reason was, but as you know, he talks to a range of officials. And we've spoken to a range of officials. Just this morning, Under Secretary Sherman spoke with Foreign Secretary Singh to convey our understanding of Indian displeasure at this incident, and our expectation that Indian

Government agencies will continue to fulfill their host government obligations regarding the safety and security of our personnel and mission premises. So obviously, we're talking at a number of levels to a number of folks.

QUESTION: Marie, there are reports and we have Indian sources telling us that the Indian Government has transferred the diplomat in question from the Indian Consulate in New York to the Indian Mission at the United Nations. To your knowledge, is that true? And does that require any kind of approval on the part of the State Department, or can they just do that if they wish to?

MS. HARF: Well, we've seen these media reports, but we at the State Department have not received any official communication regarding a possible change of credentials. In terms of the process, if and when such a request is made to the UN, it would be made to the UN secretariat who would then inform the Department of State. If, again, such a request is made, which we have not received any communication on such a request, it would have to be reviewed by all appropriate authorities at the UN and at the Department of State. It's not an automatic thing by any means. But again, we haven't received such a request.

QUESTION: So you would have to sign off on it?

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Okay. So that's a yes?

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: Great. And then secondly --

MS. HARF: There's a process.

QUESTION: Yeah. I get it.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: And then would her being grant – would her transfer to the Indian Mission to the United Nations alter her immunity status?

MS. HARF: Going forward or in the past?

QUESTION: Both.

MS. HARF: I can double-check on the specifics. Again, since no request has been made to us, I don't know what that would look like in practice, and I don't want to get into a hypothetical here. I'm happy to check on that. I've been very clear about what her diplomatic status was at the time of the arrest and currently is, which is, of course, consular immunity. I'm happy to check if it would change it.

QUESTION: There are also reports and Indian sources saying that she would have full diplomatic immunity were she transferred to the Indian Mission to the UN. And her lawyer – her American lawyer has said in public that that would give her – that that would apply retroactively to any alleged crimes she may have committed in the past. I find it a little hard to believe that someone could be granted ex post facto immunity, so that's particularly my question. I realize it is hypothetical in the sense that – but I'm sure that the State Department lawyers could address that question of --

MS. HARF: I'll check and see.

QUESTION: -- a change of status leading to retroactive immunity.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. I'll check and see. But again, as we have received no official notification, there's no changes in respect to her immunity status. But I'm happy to check the hypothetical.

QUESTION: (Inaudible) if somebody got it. Thank you.

MS. HARF: Uh-huh. Yes. Go ahead.

QUESTION: Marie, a few questions. Did Secretary Kerry in his conversation receive any assurances? You said it was positive.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: So did he walk away feeling like U.S. diplomats in India will be protected?

MS. HARF: Well, that's certainly what we conveyed, what Under Secretary Sherman conveyed. I think he walked away from the discussion with – squarely focused on where we go from here in moving the relationship forward. That's why I said it was positive. Obviously, we don't want this to negatively further impact our bilateral relationship. Secretary Kerry wanted to directly engage

on this with the Indian Government, and I think that's how I would describe what he walked away from it with, and we have no reason to believe that they didn't as well.

QUESTION: Because there have been very specific threats made by Indian politicians – maybe not the leader of the country itself; however, those in positions of influence and power have threatened retribution, retaliation against Americans.

MS. HARF: Yes. And we, of course, believe that those have no place at all in this discussion. We made very clear that the Indians have to uphold their obligations both on security – also, we don't believe they should undertake any steps that prevent diplomats from doing their job, right? We talked about some of the demarches and what those might have included.

QUESTION: And can I just clarify --

MS. HARF: Yeah.

QUESTION: -- is the statement – is an expression of regret an apology?

MS. HARF: I'm just going to use the word regret. I know people are really, really focused on what words we're using and why we use what words. But I think the Secretary was very clear that we regret what happened here and that we're focused on moving forward. I don't believe he used that exact word but was very clear, again, about – personally, the notion that as the father of two daughters, he regrets what happened, and as the Secretary of State who's responsible for our diplomats all over the world. He wants to focus on how we move forward.

QUESTION: What exact word? Regret or apology?

MS. HARF: Regret. The statement says regret.

QUESTION: You're not sure if he used that exact word?

MS. HARF: No, I'm – the statement says he expressed regret – that exact word, I can tell you.

QUESTION: Great.

QUESTION: Could you on this point, when you said that as a parent – is that what you said? As a father of two daughters?

MS. HARF: As the father of two daughters who are about the same age.

QUESTION: So, I mean, a lot of those that break the law have parents and have fathers and so on, but they still break the law. So is he saying that, "I, as a father, don't like to see this person who has a father arrested"? Is that --

MS. HARF: That's not what I said, Said. You're putting words in my mouth and in his mouth.

QUESTION: No, I'm just asking – I'm trying to understand.

MS. HARF: What I said first, actually, was that, obviously, the U.S. – all laws of the U.S. have to be respected by everyone who's here, diplomat or not. That's point A. And certainly, as a former prosecutor, he feels very strongly about that. He was speaking about the overall situation and what transpired and expressing his regret at that. I'm not going to further parse his words, but suffice to say the point of the conversation was to focus on how we move forward.

QUESTION: To pick up on a question that Jo asked in response to this letter that the State Department sent, if you could check into what the response from the Indians --

MS. HARF: If there was a response.

QUESTION: If there was one.

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: But also --

MS. HARF: And that was September 4th. I don't know if I gave you the exact date yesterday.

QUESTION: The 4th.

MS. HARF: That was September 4th.

QUESTION: But also now, obviously, the Secretary is expressing regret. One would assume that the State Department and the Indian Embassy would maybe work in the meantime between September 4th and December – I think it was 12th of this arrest to try to avoid this, that you're now – this incident that you're now expressing regret for.

MS. HARF: Well, let me be clear about what on September 4th we advised them of. It's State Department policy to advise foreign missions of allegations made involving a member of a mission or a family member. So we did so. We advised them of this on September 4th. But again, that's separate – entirely separate from the law enforcement process that is an important one of looking into these allegations. And then if the Department of Justice and the Southern District of New York think there should be charges brought, obviously that's a totally separate process from our diplomatic notification when there were allegations brought forward.

QUESTION: Why was – sorry to jump in.

MS. HARF: It's okay. And then we'll get back to you guys.

QUESTION: Why was this decision actually made to arrest this diplomat?

MS. HARF: It was based on charges that had been filed in the Southern District of New York.

QUESTION: So it was purely because the charges had been – when were the charges filed? I sorry; I should know that, but I don't.

QUESTION: It was on the 11th.

MS. HARF: I believe it was the --

QUESTION: (Off-mike.)

MS. HARF: Yeah, I can – I think it was the – let me double-check on the exact date. But obviously, this was just a response to charges that had been filed.

QUESTION: But I think to follow-up on Jo, I think one of the questions that we're circling around is since DS was the arresting agency --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. Because of her position.

QUESTION: Because of her position.

MS. HARF: Yes, uh-huh.

QUESTION: Others in her position, even if they are junior, are sometimes given the opportunity, as her lawyer would say, to turn themselves in. Why the choice to arrest in front of the school, by DS?

MS. HARF: I can double-check. Honestly, the – I can double-check with our folks and see what the exact logistics of it were and why. I honestly don't have the answer.

QUESTION: Can I go to the letter? Sorry, Arshad. I guess in the letter that you wrote on September the 4th, was, the Indian Embassy warned that their diplomat could face arrests on these charges?

MS. HARF: I don't have the text of it in front of me. We notified them that allegations had been made. I think it probably goes without saying that if allegations are made and we're looking into them, consequences could come. I don't have the exact text. I'm happy to see if I can get it.

QUESTION: And --

MS. HARF: Yes, I'm going to go back to you guys, and then I'm going to come back around.

QUESTION: (Inaudible) back in – before September, in June or July, the Indian Delhi high court issued an arrest warrant against a maid, and this request was made to the State Department, also the Department of Justice. What effort – what attempt was made to follow the court's orders issued in Delhi to get back the maid back to Delhi?

MS. HARF: I know you asked about this yesterday. I don't have any more information for you about --

QUESTION: But did you receive any communication from the Indian Embassy on this?

MS. HARF: I don't know the – I mean, not that I know of. But that doesn't mean we didn't. Let me check again with our folks and see what we may have received. I just don't have any more information on that. I know you had asked about that yesterday.

QUESTION: The Indian Government --

MS. HARF: But all the information I have starts in September.

QUESTION: Okay. Secondly, the Indian Government today also accused the U.S. of indulging in visa fraud by helping the maid to get out of the country and the family, whereas they were charged of serious offenses inside the country in Delhi. What effort has been made? Do you agree with their charges?

MS. HARF: Well, again, U.S. officials have been in contact with the complainant in her family, who would be this person you're referring to, as part of their investigation into this ongoing U.S. law enforcement matter. I can't comment on the substance of that contact, but I want to stress that all authorities have followed and are following all laws and procedures certainly related to this issue and any other issues as well.

QUESTION: And on the phone call, where was the phone call made from? From the plane or from --

MS. HARF: Where? From the plane.

QUESTION: From the plane?

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: So before you landed in Honolulu?

MS. HARF: That's my understanding.

QUESTION: Thank you.

QUESTION: So according to the media report, and the Indian police removed a concrete security barriers outside U.S. embassy in New Delhi on Tuesday, it's a kind of retaliation for the treatment of this issue? I mean, is there a State Department response, any kind of response?

MS. HARF: Well, as I said, Under Secretary Sherman and others have made clear to the Indian Government that they need to uphold their obligations to protect our security. I'd note a few other points. We welcomed a statement from the Ministry of External Affairs that India is fully committed to ensuring the safety and security of all diplomats in Delhi and elsewhere, and that they fully intend to fulfill their Vienna Convention obligations. So we'll keep talking to them about it and working on this moving forward.

QUESTION: According to the report that – because she was strip-searched. So may I confirm that? Is it legal for – as a kind of diplomatic – I mean, foreign diplomat here in United States? May I confirm this?

MS. HARF: Well, I believe that the U.S. Marshals spoke on the record to this last night, and I – if they have anything additional to add about that, I'd refer you there.

QUESTION: Can I just follow?

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. And then you're next, I promise. I'll get to everyone.

QUESTION: That kind of normal behavior is for the criminals, right, and not for the diplomats? Is this the kind of treatment you give to the foreign diplomats; you treat them on par with the criminals, hardcore criminals?

MS. HARF: Well, again, I'm not going to speak to those specifics. I think they put out an on-the-record statement last night about their process and their procedure, and if they have anything additional to add, I'm happy for them to do so. Again, what we're focused on right now is what I said today about the Secretary's conversation and about where we go from here. If they have anything specific to add, I'm happy for them to – wait, you're next.

QUESTION: I have a few points. First is that India had asked for an unconditional apology. You are using the word "regret."

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Did the NSA Menon accept the regret?

MS. HARF: I'm not going to further detail their conversation. On our side, we've said it was a positive conversation. I believe folks on the Indian side may now have as well. And what we're focused on is moving forward. And I do think it was a good opportunity for the Secretary to very directly express his regret and talk about where we go from here.

QUESTION: The Secretary made two points in his – from your readout. One was on laws and the other was on diplomats. Laws, obligation to follow that were followed really to the – and the second one, diplomats, the Secretary said “accorded respect and dignity, just as we expect.” Was that accorded? If not, whose fault is it?

MS. HARF: Again, I think I already got asked this question. I’m not going to further parse what I read out in terms of what the Secretary conveyed to the national security advisor. Clearly, he expressed regret with what happened here, broadly speaking. We’re continuing to look at exactly what transpired to see what exactly was done, and are focused on, of course, moving forward with the relationship.

QUESTION: So have you heard anything further on this from the Indians? Because there is a list of things they have done. They have removed the barricade. They have – and with Christmas coming they have stopped the import of liquor and food. There’s a detail – they’re asking for details of salary. Have you provided the details of salaries of domestic help for the U.S. diplomats?

MS. HARF: Well, as I said yesterday, we’ve received several demarches from the Government of India. I’m not going to get into the substance of them. But we’ve been very clear that we believe our diplomats should be allowed to continue with their jobs; they should not be impeded from doing them in any way by any of these actions. That’s what we’re focused on. The conversations continue at high levels, clearly, and we’ll keep having them going forward.

QUESTION: Can you explain how giving details of salaries of their domestic help impedes their jobs?

MS. HARF: I’m not going to speak to specifics that have been out there rumored that were potentially in one of these demarches. I’m just not going to get into the specifics.

Yes, in the back.

QUESTION: So you referred earlier to when the allegations were made known to the Indian side, and then when the charges were later filed. So when the charges were filed, why was she not given the option to surrender instead of being arrested?

MS. HARF: Again, I don’t – that was the question Margaret asked. I don’t have those details about how that exactly transpired. I’m happy to check into that and see if there’s more I can share.

QUESTION: Okay, and a quick follow-up.

Ms. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Did you say that you would come back on the question of whether immunity would change and she switch – if she switches from consular to diplomatic status?

MS. HARF: I said I would check into that hypothetical. As of right now, there's no change in her immunity status because we haven't received any kind of communication like that.

QUESTION: So has there never been a past precedent where charges have been leveled against – faced by a diplomat and their immunity status has changed?

MS. HARF: I don't know. I'm happy to check in with our – I mean, “never, ever” is a big question but I'm happy to look and see if there's some sort of precedent. I just don't know.

QUESTION: Can I follow up on immunity?

MS. HARF: Yeah.

QUESTION: You've been very clear about the difference between diplomatic immunity and consular immunity, but it's my understanding that consular immunity may still protect consular officers from detention. There's a section of the State Department website that says: “Although foreign career consular officers enjoy limited immunity from jurisdiction, Article 41 of the VCCR does grant them personal inviolability, therefore such individuals may not be arrested or detained pending trial except in the case of a grave crime and pursuant to a decision of a competent judicial authority.”

So were the standard procedures followed in detaining this consular officer? And it seems that a judicial authority would have to sort of initiate that. Do the charges being filed --

MS. HARF: Well, that would --

QUESTION: -- constitute that?

MS. HARF: Certainly, not. We wouldn't be the judicial authority that would speak to that. It would be the Southern District of New York, I think, the Department of Justice, or of course, the U.S. Marshals who were involved in this as well.

QUESTION: But does consular immunity – not diplomatic immunity but consular immunity – protect someone from detention except in the cases of grave crimes?

MS. HARF: Well, and I can check in terms of what this charge, she was charged with, where that falls into that rubric. I'm not familiar with every single part of the State Department diplomatic immunity code. I'm happy to look into it and talk to our experts and see exactly why this case was handled as it was. But again – and these are important questions to answer. We're happy to do more digging on it. We're focused here in finding out exactly what happened and on

how we move forward because we don't want this isolated episode to negatively impact our relationship.

QUESTION: Just a quick one?

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: It's been two days since I've been asking about that will – did the State Department give a go-ahead for this operation? Was – were all these --

MS. HARF: What operation? What are you referring to?

QUESTION: The operation to arrest the --

MS. HARF: Well, we were the arresting – the Diplomatic Security was the arresting authority here.

QUESTION: You arrested her.

MS. HARF: Correct. Yes.

QUESTION: So the --

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: So the whole procedure was followed that should have been followed?

MS. HARF: Again, we're looking into what happened right now on all parts of it. We aren't responsible for every part of this process. We had a limited responsibility for one part of the process. Exactly what we're doing right now is talking to other agencies and other folks to tease out the details of exactly what happened. We've been very clear that we played a role in this, and that's why we want to get more details, certainly, about what our folks but other folks did as well.

QUESTION: When can we expect an answer on that?

MS. HARF: We're looking into it right now. Obviously, it's complicated. It involves a bunch of different folks. But as soon as we have something to say further on it, I'm happy to.

QUESTION: On the phone call, do you know how long the phone call lasted?

MS. HARF: I don't.

QUESTION: And on the regret, regret on what happened in New York or on what happened in Delhi?

MS. HARF: Regret on the situation writ large. I would say both, honestly. He certainly expressed regret about what happened with this case writ large, sort of how this has all played out. But I think part of it, of course, was focused on the fact that we don't believe that there should be steps taken in Delhi or elsewhere in India by the government to prohibit us from doing our work, to put restrictions on our work, some of the things we've talked about with the demarches. It was really about the whole situation, honestly, and focused on how we move forward.

QUESTION: Really?

QUESTION: So it's not about the arrest, it was about --

MS. HARF: It was about -- I said about what happened. Take whatever you will from that.

QUESTION: Just a follow-up on the call --

QUESTION: There are a lot of things --

MS. HARF: Don't shout, please. I'll get to you.

QUESTION: One minute. There are a lot of things happened. One was the arrest, then she was strip-searched, and then -- and he mentions --

MS. HARF: I'm not going to further parse what that means.

QUESTION: No, because he --

MS. HARF: The Secretary expressed regret about what happened in this situation.

QUESTION: And he mentioned his daughters, so that becomes a personal attach and that --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm, absolutely. As I said, as the father of two daughters about the same age, but also as the nation's top diplomat who's responsible for the safety and security and treatment of our diplomats around the world, this is an issue Secretary Kerry feels very strongly about, wanted to personally engage on it at a high level, wanted to express regret about what happened, and wanted to reiterate that what we're focused on is moving the relationship forward.

QUESTION: On the Vienna Convention, does -- the Indian Government has taken several steps after this event. Does any of them, do you think, is in violation of Vienna Convention, or they are not?

MS. HARF: Well, we've certainly told them they shouldn't take any steps that are – they have to uphold all of their obligations, and we'll keep talking to them about the specifics.

QUESTION: Yes, please.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: I mean, you are reviewing or questioning, or these questions are related to the procedures?

MS. HARF: We're having conversations with the different folks that were involved, yeah.

QUESTION: Okay. Is – do you have any doubt about the charges? Are you reviewing it or not?

MS. HARF: Not to my – certainly, that would be a Department of Justice question. That's not what I was referring to that we were reviewing. What we're looking at and having conversations about is what transpired in terms of the arrests and what happened afterwards.

QUESTION: Okay. You were not asked --

MS. HARF: We're not reviewing the charges, to my knowledge.

QUESTION: And – but you were --

MS. HARF: But that's not really a question for me.

QUESTION: No. I mean, I'm just – but you were not asked by Indian Government to review the charges?

MS. HARF: I can't speak for what the Indian Government has or hasn't asked us. I'm not privy to all of those conversations, but we're talking with them about how to move forward from here.

QUESTION: As to the procedures that were followed during the arrest itself, I'm aware, obviously, that's the U.S. marshal's responsibility. But they've indicated that they are – the arrest was in accordance with their procedures; they were happy with what happened. How does the State Department feel about that? Because clearly, this has caused such a huge diplomatic problem for you guys. Should there not be a review of those procedures?

MS. HARF: Well, I think I've said very clearly that we're doing that right now. We're looking into exactly what happened – not just us, but the other folks, including the marshals that were involved. I think I'll let them speak for their own agency and their own procedures, but I do think that Secretary Kerry was very clear when he expressed regret at what happened. That includes multiple steps in this process, right. And going forward, we're focused on looking at what happened and not having another unfortunate episode like this happen.

QUESTION: So you are unhappy with the procedures followed by the U.S. marshals?

MS. HARF: That – I mean, the Secretary very clearly expressed regret about the whole situation. I'm not going to further parse what that might mean.

QUESTION: So you indicated earlier that the U.S. would probably have to sign off on the transfer to the --

MS. HARF: Not probably. We would – the UN and the U.S. both, yes.

QUESTION: Right. So under what authority would that be? Because in a sense, this is India reassigning its diplomat from one posting to the – to another.

MS. HARF: Well, it's my understanding – and let me double-check with our experts on this – that when a diplomat's posted to the United States, right, there's a process. Just like when we're posted somewhere overseas, there's a process in terms of them accepting your posting and all of that, and giving you immunity, which is – we're the ones who would give immunity, so I think it's a credentialing process, right.

QUESTION: In a sense, they're moving – if this happens, she would move to another entity. She's moving to the UN, which is not the U.S.

MS. HARF: But still is a diplomat in the United States. U.S. missions to the UN are technically in New York.

QUESTION: Right, but --

MS. HARF: UN is technically international property, but the missions are in New York.

QUESTION: Yes, but the immunity that flows from being in the UN comes from the UN's authority.

MS. HARF: I can double-check on the specifics. Again, they would be the ones that have the lead in the credentialing process and how that would work, but we do have a role to play, and I'm happy to get more details on that. But again, it's a hypothetical because we haven't received any communication to that effect.

QUESTION: Did Secretary Kerry personally sign off on the arrest?

MS. HARF: I don't think that's how it works. I'm happy to check. Sign off officially or – I don't even – I mean, in any way --

QUESTION: Was he aware that the arrest was going to take place?

MS. HARF: He was certainly aware, yes, absolutely. He's been kept up to speed on this case. I can double-check on exactly how it works.

QUESTION: The last one --

MS. HARF: How the process works, I just don't know.

QUESTION: So he approved the arrest?

MS. HARF: I can double-check on how it works, because I don't know he has official approving authority.

QUESTION: Now, did you see the statement that came out from the spokesperson of the ministry of external affairs today? He was asked -- there were some Q&A, and he said there seems to be a difference between the understanding about the Vienna Convention, because he says we understand our obligations and our rights under the Vienna Convention and we will implement them fully, and also ask for their implementation fully. So actually, the word --

MS. HARF: We don't disagree with that.

QUESTION: -- we are getting in Delhi that they feel that the U.S. has not been fulfilling its obligation under Vienna. Do you have a comment on that?

MS. HARF: We fulfill all of our obligations, yes. I don't believe that we would -- I mean, there's no indication that we haven't in this case or any other. So I'm not exactly sure what he was referring to.

QUESTION: On the credentialing process --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. Let me go back to that.

QUESTION: -- if you are changing her status, which would have -- to me, implied change of visa nomination, does that mean that one of the criteria is whether she has any charges pending against her in the United States?

MS. HARF: I don't know the answer to that. I can double-check on that. I just don't know. Obviously, the UN plays a big part in this process if that's where she would be credentialed to, so you should probably check with them about their processes, and I'm happy to check on our end as well.

QUESTION: But you'd be granting the visa, so --

MS. HARF: I don't know if it's a visa. Let me -- I don't have that in front of me. Let me double-check. What I've seen is that when such a request is made, the UN Secretariat informs the

Department of State, it would have to be reviewed by appropriate authorities and the Department of State. I don't know if that involves a visa. I don't know exactly what that includes. I'm happy to check.

QUESTION: Jay Carney in his briefing today said, "We're looking into the intake procedures surrounding this arrest to ensure that all standard procedures were followed and that every opportunity for courtesy was extended."

MS. HARF: I agree.

QUESTION: Was – is it – I mean, you've been looking into this since last week, I think. Do you think that every opportunity for courtesy was extended?

MS. HARF: We're still looking into it. There's just a lot of facts to gather here. We want to make sure we know all of them, talk to everyone involved. We're still looking into it.

QUESTION: And how long was she in the custody of DS before she was handed over to the marshal service?

MS. HARF: Marshals? I can double-check. I don't know.

QUESTION: On the process of ascertaining everything that happened, can you maybe go into a little bit more detail about what that entails? Does that mean you're talking to the marshals who handled this detention process? And have you spoken with this diplomat?

MS. HARF: I don't have any specifics to read out in terms of what those conversations look like. I'm happy to check with folks and see if there are. We're talking to the different players that were involved in different parts of the process.

QUESTION: Do you plan to reach out to her?

MS. HARF: I can double-check and see if there are any plans on that.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: And would you tell us, when this review process is over, what the outcome of the review process was?

MS. HARF: Absolutely. When we have more to share about our conversations we've been having, I'm happy to do so.

QUESTION: And do you think this entire process has derailed the strengthening of bilateral ties between the two countries? Prime minister was here, foreign secretary was here. Day before she was arrested, there was huge, long series of talks – series of talks been going on with the two countries --

MS. HARF: Not at all. And our hope, certainly, and what the Secretary conveyed today, is that it doesn't. There are too many important issues that we work on together. We do have a very close, vital relationship. As you said, all you have to do is look at the meetings with the President and the Vice President and the Secretary have had with our Indian counterparts to really demonstrate how important this relationship is. That's why we don't believe this isolated episode should further hamper our efforts to work together. And that's why we're focused on moving forward here.

QUESTION: This one, yes or no. Is this the highest level of Indian official the U.S. has spoken to or has contacted, NSA?

MS. HARF: On this issue?

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: I don't know technically in the Indian hierarchy where the foreign secretary is compared to the national security advisor. They were both spoken to today by senior State Department officials. I don't know of any other contacts.

QUESTION: (Inaudible) don't you mean foreign secretary also?

MS. HARF: Yes. Under Secretary Sherman, today, as I said a little while ago --

QUESTION: Okay, yeah.

MS. HARF: Let me pull this back up – spoke with Foreign Secretary Singh this morning.

QUESTION: Okay, yeah.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: That's the foreign secretary, not the minister of external affairs, however?

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: Correct, yes. The Foreign Secretary Singh.

QUESTION: So again, while you're checking on that hypothetical about the credentialing, could you also please clarify whether this is only about the U.S. signing off on her getting a

potential UN credential, or also do you have authority, or are you involved in her exiting her consular immunity or her consular position?

MS. HARF: I will double-check on all of that. Again, this is a total hypothetical at this point. But I'm happy to check and see what in general it is about here.

QUESTION: I'm just curious about standard practice. If you have a foreign diplomat on U.S. soil who has knowingly broken U.S. laws and lied to the federal government about it, is there any precedent for that person continuing to serve?

MS. HARF: That's a good question.

QUESTION: And does that disqualify them somehow from, like, in terms of the agreement you have with their country or any country?

MS. HARF: It's a really good question to which I don't know the answer to either. I'm happy to check with our folks and see if there is any precedent and how that would impact anything. Again, at this point she's only been charged. There's a judicial process, of course, but I'm happy to check.

December 17, 2013

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Do you have anything to say on the steps announced by Indian Government today on the – withdrawing some of the consular facilities provided to Indian diplomats inside – U.S. diplomats in India and withdrawing the security parameters outside the embassy in opposition to the steps – arrest of Indian diplomats in New York?

MS. HARF: Well, a couple points on this. I think you probably saw the statement that I put out just before coming out here, that the U.S. and India enjoy a broad and deep friendship, and this isolated episode is not in any way indicative of the close and respectful ties that we share and will continue to share. We have conveyed at high levels to the Government of India our expectations that India will continue to fulfill all of its obligations under the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, and Vienna Convention – on Consular Relations, excuse me.

Obviously, the safety and security of our diplomats and consular officers in the field is a top priority. We'll continue to work with India to ensure that all of our diplomats and consular officers are being afforded full rights and protections. Also, of course, safety and security of our facilities as well is something we take very seriously, and we'll keep working with the Indians on that.

QUESTION: Why wasn't that in the statement?

MS. HARF: Because it was a short statement and I knew I'd get lots of questions on it in the briefing. I mean, there's – I have a lot of information on this we can talk about in the briefing.

QUESTION: But specifically --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- I mean, this statement was in direct response to what obviously is India's concern and problems with the way that their diplomats were treated. And the statement --

MS. HARF: Diplomat.

QUESTION: The diplomat is treated. And the statement was worded in a way that indicates that you don't necessarily think that the law – that the New York law enforcement personnel handled this in the best way.

MS. HARF: I don't think --

QUESTION: Considering that you said that Diplomatic Security acted according to procedures, and clearly, you're making an effort to not let this affect the relationship with --

MS. HARF: Well, we certainly don't want it to affect the relationship, and it's just a fact that Diplomatic Security only has part of this -- part of the situation. We understand there are sensitive issues involved here. For example, the State Department isn't the entity that conducts the intake procedure at the federal courthouse. That's the U.S. Marshals. It's just a fact that that's not something I can speak to. They'd have to speak to their part of the process.

But again, we don't want this to negatively impact our bilateral relationship, and we'll keep talking it with -- about it with them on the ground and here.

QUESTION: Just some simple things.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Your comment about how you have conveyed to the Indian Government at the highest levels or --

MS. HARF: At high levels, I said.

QUESTION: -- at high levels --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- that you expect them to uphold the Vienna Convention -- is that a reference to the fact that Indian police today removed security barriers around the Embassy?

MS. HARF: Certainly part of it.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: Certainly part of it.

QUESTION: So did you see the Indian police removing those security barriers as a reflection of their unhappiness at the treatment of their diplomat in New York?

MS. HARF: I'd let them speak for what the reasoning was behind it, certainly.

QUESTION: Okay. Do you feel that it has impaired the security of the Embassy?

MS. HARF: I don't think I'd go that far. Obviously, we don't comment on our specific security posture. And we take security very seriously, and we will continue to have conversations with the Indian Government to make sure our facilities are properly secured. I don't have anything

additional than that. I have no indication at this point that it has, and certainly it shouldn't, and we don't want it to.

QUESTION: But you do rely on the host government to --

MS. HARF: Absolutely.

QUESTION: -- provide security.

MS. HARF: And this is why we've been very clear that they need to keep providing security to the extent that they do, and that we'll work with them going forward.

QUESTION: And who conveyed that message, and to whom?

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. So a couple of folks have spoken on each side. Under Secretary Sherman spoke with the charge at the Indian Embassy on -- I believe last week, late last week, Friday evening. Assistant Secretary spoke with officials at the ministry of external affairs several times, and Ambassador Powell has spoken on the ground with the ministry of external affairs several times on this issue as well.

QUESTION: Which Assistant Secretary? For Diplomatic Security or for --

MS. HARF: Oh, no, I'm sorry. Biswal for SCA.

QUESTION: Right, for South and Central --

MS. HARF: Yeah.

QUESTION: Okay. And then, sorry, the last one you said was?

MS. HARF: Ambassador Powell on the ground is engaged on this as well.

QUESTION: Okay. And Ambassador -- or Secretary Sherman speaking to the charge on Friday, that was, however, well before the removal of the security barriers, which occurred today. So she --

MS. HARF: Right.

QUESTION: -- even back then, she was reinforcing that she expected that the Indian Government --

MS. HARF: In general, talked to them about the -- not about the security issue, obviously, but in general talked about the situation, the episode, and obviously, our relationship going forward.

QUESTION: But then who – the question was that – you said that you had conveyed at high levels your expectation that they will meet their obligations under the Vienna Convention. But apparently, that wasn't Sherman talking about the security, so who --

MS. HARF: I can double-check on who sent what message, Arshad.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: But again, this is a message we're – I'm conveying it here.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: I could – I don't have all the diplomatic conversations to read out, but it's a message we are conveying, and these are the folks who've been in discussions.

QUESTION: Marie, have you actually asked for them to rescind these measures that they took today, particularly the ones about the security barriers?

MS. HARF: I can double-check and see if we have more details about the diplomatic conversations. We've been very clear that they need to uphold all of their obligations under the Vienna Convention, and in terms of security, we'll keep working with them on that as well. Again, our focus here is on moving the bilateral relationship forward, that this one isolated episode not impact the bilateral relationship.

QUESTION: Do you feel that measures that were taken were actually proportionate to what happened to the deputy general consul in New York last week?

MS. HARF: Again, I am not going to get into specifics about what may or may not have been done. Thus far, all indications are that appropriate procedures were followed. But nonetheless – and my statement pointed to this this morning – we understand this is a very sensitive issue and we're continuing to review exactly what transpired. And I would point out again that the State Department wasn't the only entity involved here, so I would point folks to the U.S. Marshals, who obviously play a role in this as well.

QUESTION: But I think my question was more – are the measures, were the measures taken by the Indian – Indians' government proportionate to what --

MS. HARF: Oh, I see. Measures by the Indian Government.

QUESTION: Indian Government, yes.

MS. HARF: Proportionate to what?

QUESTION: To the arrest in New York of a deputy consul general.

MS. HARF: Well, again, this limited episode with somebody who was charged with a crime is a separate and isolated incident. We believe that we need to move forward, they need to keep with – between our two countries with security, with diplomatic, all of the consular issues that I talked about with the Vienna Convention. I just don't think that they necessarily should be tied together in that way. Obviously, we know this is a sensitive issue though, and that's why we're looking at what transpired and talking to the Indians about it directly.

QUESTION: So it was over the top. It was over the top then?

MS. HARF: I'm not going to use those words. I'm just saying that we have said privately to the Indians and publicly I'm now saying that they need to uphold their obligations going forward, and we'll keep having the discussion.

QUESTION: So just to put a fine point on it, if you're saying that they shouldn't be linked and then you're saying that they shouldn't take actions against your diplomats in a response to one of their diplomats being arrested, even if it was handled possibly in an improper way?

MS. HARF: Well, again, at this point there are no indications that it was, as I said just a second ago. Let me go back to this --

QUESTION: Even if they have concerns with the way she was treated, it sounds like you're saying, just to put a fine point on it, that the Indian Government should not take punitive measures against your diplomats in response to an incident that they feel one of their diplomats was (inaudible).

MS. HARF: Certainly, we have called on them to uphold all of their obligations under the Vienna Convention, everything that they are obligated to do and according our diplomats rights and all of the things that go under the Vienna Convention.

QUESTION: Because sometimes if there's an incident with a diplomat of one country, for instance, if you ask a diplomat to leave a country or they're PNG'd or something, the other state will take reciprocal measures. But your --

MS. HARF: This is a very different situation. This isn't – this is an isolated episode, obviously, of somebody who has been charged with a crime. And again, isolated episode that doesn't involve her daily duties, her responsibilities in New York, and I think I'd probably leave it at that.

QUESTION: Now could you talk – you talked a little bit about it, but you said you would get us some more answers on this diplomat's – this deputy consul general's diplomatic status. Could you expand on that a little bit?

MS. HARF: Well, I don't think I said I'd get on theirs specifically. I said there are different kinds of immunity – diplomatic immunity, consular immunity, I think there are a couple of other kinds. I have asked our folks to sort of lay out very explicitly, hopefully to be released as a TQ, exactly what all of those mean. But generally speaking, right, diplomatic immunity applies sort of across the board – again, this is a very general and the lawyers are probably going to be mad at me – but consular immunity only applies to things done in the actual functions of one's job. And this just isn't for diplomats in the U.S., of course; it's for our diplomats overseas as well.

QUESTION: Now, even if a diplomat doesn't have diplomatic immunity or consular immunity -
-

QUESTION: What's the difference, by the way, between diplomatic immunity and consular immunity. I don't understand that.

MS. HARF: Well, diplomatic immunity applies to everything. Consular immunity only applies to official functions in – that one performs in the duty of their job.

QUESTION: So is this person – does this person enjoy diplomatic immunity?

MS. HARF: Consular immunity.

QUESTION: Only consular?

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Why don't they enjoy diplomatic immunity, given that they are a diplomat?

MS. HARF: Well, she's the consul general at a consulate.

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: I can double-check the exact specifics for who falls under what. I know it's different everywhere. And again, this applies to our folks overseas as well.

QUESTION: So – but that would be good to get clear.

MS. HARF: I'm trying to get a little more clarity from our folks. It's a little complicated --

QUESTION: Sure.

MS. HARF: -- but about who falls into what is different in every country, and so who falls into what category.

QUESTION: Okay, so her immunity as you understand it pertains solely to --

MS. HARF: Official functions.

QUESTION: -- her official functions.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Okay. So she's not immune if she is alleged to have committed a crime --

MS. HARF: Visa fraud, for example.

QUESTION: -- not in the course of her official functions.

QUESTION: But even if she doesn't enjoy --

MS. HARF: Absolutely. Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Even if she doesn't -- she only enjoys this limited consular immunity in function to her job, do you believe that a diplomat of that nature should receive kind of special treatment or extra courtesies in terms of the way that they're treated by law enforcement in the process of an arrest?

MS. HARF: Well, we certainly afford people what they're entitled to under the Vienna Convention. And again, I've asked our experts on this to pull a little bit more about what that means. I'm not sure it's entirely clear about the definition of some of these words, whether it's courtesies or others, so I've asked to get a little more information. But, in general, we obviously adhere to that. And again, in this case it doesn't -- there are no indications that anything but appropriate measures were followed. But we do know this is sensitive. We are looking into it for exactly that reason, to see exactly what transpired. Again, State Department only has part of it, so we can only speak for part of it. But we're looking at what happened to see.

QUESTION: Is there any doubt that she was strip-searched?

QUESTION: Was she strip-searched? Was she strip searched? Just a simple yes or no.

MS. HARF: Well, again, I would remind you that I think those allegations have come up as part of the intake -- that's been an allegation that was possibly part of the intake procedure, which, of course, the State Department does not conduct. That's the U.S. Marshals who do that. I would refer you -- I can't speak for them what may or may not have happened.

QUESTION: Do you know if she was strip searched?

MS. HARF: Again, I can't speak for the U.S. Marshals.

QUESTION: I'm not asking you to speak for them. I'm asking if you know whether she was strip searched.

MS. HARF: I can't speak --

QUESTION: You're doing an investigation into this, right?

MS. HARF: I wouldn't use the term "investigation." We're looking at what transpired and what we --

QUESTION: Okay. So you're looking into what happened. So we won't use the word --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. And if we have anything to announce about the details of that we will.

QUESTION: Given --

MS. HARF: I just don't have anything additional to announce today, Arshad.

QUESTION: It's not a question of announcing. It's you're looking into this.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: One of the allegations that clearly has the Indian Government most angered --

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: -- is that she has said to have been strip searched. The question is whether you know -- I mean, I can understand it would be embarrassing to admit it, but it's also just a factual matter. And if --

MS. HARF: I don't speak for other government agencies, actually. I speak for the State Department, and that allegation --

QUESTION: And the State Department is not aware of whether or not she was strip-searched? Because the State Department presumably wants to know whether or not she was strip-searched so that it can deal --

MS. HARF: Again, we're looking --

QUESTION: Can I finish? So it can deal with the Indian Government.

MS. HARF: Let me finish.

QUESTION: Go right ahead. So you don't want to know whether she was strip searched?

MS. HARF: That's why we're looking into what transpired right now.

QUESTION: So you don't know?

MS. HARF: That's why we're looking to get – I don't have all the facts. No. I wasn't there.

QUESTION: Do you know that fact?

MS. HARF: I don't know what – I do not know the facts about exactly what happened and I'm not going to stand up here and say what I've heard or what I haven't heard or what allegations are out there.

QUESTION: But if you don't know, I'm willing to accept that. That was my question.

MS. HARF: I'm not telling you I haven't heard anything – I've heard about the allegations.

QUESTION: Right.

MS. HARF: So what the State Department is doing is looking into them. We are looking at what transpired. We – I can stand up here and speak for my government agency. Other folks can speak to allegations about what happened in their own custody. I can't.

QUESTION: Are you looking into it because the Indians are upset about it and they have concerns about it? Or did what you hear about the way she was treated give you alarm and that you want to look into it? Is it because of the Indian sensitivity or you heard this and was like, hey, that may not be --

MS. HARF: Well, we certainly know it's a very sensitive issue in India, and we take that very seriously because we value the bilateral relationship so much, certainly. And that's why we're trying to gather more of the facts of --

QUESTION: Because the Indians are upset?

MS. HARF: For a host of issues, honestly, because we know it's a sensitive issue in India. We value the relationship. There are a lot of rumors out there about what may or may not happen, and so we think it's important to get all the facts.

QUESTION: Can you clarify three points? First is you've been saying that all the procedures were followed. What is the official procedure for a violation like this? Because you said that she was handed over to the Marshals. So before that, that means the State Department came to know about it. So what is the procedure that was followed?

MS. HARF: Well, in accordance with – I think this might be what your question is getting at – the Department's policy of advising foreign missions of allegations made involving a member of

a mission or a family member, the State Department advised the Embassy of the Republic of India in writing in September of allegations of abuse made by an Indian national against the deputy consul general of India in New York. I'm sorry, I called her the consul general earlier. I mispronounced her title. So we notified them in writing in September. Obviously, we play a role in this, but the Department of Justice also obviously handles the legal aspect of it as well.

QUESTION: So you say that it was completely followed – the procedure?

MS. HART: Again, there are no indications at this point that it wasn't, but this is the reason we're looking at all the facts because we do know this is an important issue. It's a sensitive issue, and we want to make sure we have all the facts so we can focus on moving the relationship forward and not on this isolated episode.

QUESTION: And you have talked about the security issue of the U.S. diplomats. There are a host of other points, like for example, Indian Government has asked for an unconditional apology and they have asked for the – from the embassy and the consulate, U.S. embassy and consulate, details of the salaries of the domestic help. And they have asked for a stoppage of import clearance for U.S. embassy's food and liquor. Airport passes for the U.S. consulates and embassies has been – have been withdrawn. They have been asked to return their IDs, which are very important, and there is a complete blanket refusal, a ban to meet any U.S. delegation – as you saw, the Narendra Modi, Rahul Gandhi, and Ms. Kumar – all these people. And all ministers have been asked not to meet them. What is your take on all this?

MS. HART: Yeah, so I can confirm that we have received several demarches from the Government of India, I think speaking to some of these issues. I'm not going to get into the substance of those private diplomatic conversation. This is what I was speaking to at the beginning, though – some of these diplomatic privileges that you're talking about. We've conveyed, again, at high levels, to the Government of India our expectations that India --

QUESTION: What is the high level?

MS. HART: -- will continue – again, I named some of the people that have --

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HART: -- that have spoken. Under Secretary Sherman did. The ambassador did as well, as did the assistant secretary for the region. And so we'll continue to convey our expectations that India will fulfill all of its obligations, certainly, going forward. This is an isolated episode. We're looking into it, but our focus right now is how to move forward on all the issues we work together on.

QUESTION: Can you say whether the --

QUESTION: Just a last one?

MS. HARF: Wait, hold on. He has one more.

QUESTION: Just a last one?

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: You are in your – in what you are saying, it seems that you're asking India. What are you offering India in return?

MS. HARF: I don't understand exactly what you're --

QUESTION: You are saying that you are asking them to look at their obligations and --

MS. HARF: Well, everybody has to fulfill their obligations. It's not about getting something in return. It's about – we fulfill our obligations. We expect every country to as well.

QUESTION: Okay. So you are confirming that you have fulfilled your obligation towards this diplomat?

MS. HARF: Again, we're taking a look at what happened. I have no indications that we didn't, but we want to take a look at it because we know it's important and we want to address it directly with the Indian Government.

QUESTION: Can I do a follow-up --

QUESTION: Can you say --

MS. HARF: We'll go to Elise and then I'll come over there.

QUESTION: Can you say whether Diplomatic Security was the arresting power? I understand that the Marshals do the intake service.

MS. HARF: Yes, I can.

QUESTION: So DS was the actual --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- arresting power?

MS. HARF: Yep.

QUESTION: Okay.

QUESTION: In September, you notified Indian Government about it.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. In writing.

QUESTION: But Indian Government says they have also notified the U.S. Government State Department about a case against the maid in a non-available warrant against the maid issued by Delhi high court and has asked the U.S. to deport her back to India. When was that notified --

MS. HARF: I'm not aware of that. I'm happy to check on that.

QUESTION:... It was mentioned by my colleague that one of the issues was the withdrawal of all ID cards issued by the Ministry of External Affairs. How is that going to affect the work that your diplomats do on the ground in India?

MS. HARF: Well, we certainly don't want any of the measures that he outlined to affect our work on the ground in India because it's such an important relationship. We work together on so many important issues. And that's why we'll keep talking to the government about how to move forward.

QUESTION: What are they actually used for on a day-to-day basis?

MS. HARF: I can double-check. I can double-check.

QUESTION: Have they actually taken those measures that he described, or you don't know?

MS. HARF: I'm not sure. I'll double-check. I'll double-check with --

QUESTION: Is it true that if the diplomat doesn't have that ID the diplomat can be arrested by the local police or --

MS. HARF: I'll check. I'll check. I don't know.

QUESTION: Is Secretary Kerry aware about this issue, and what are his thoughts on this?

MS. HARF: I haven't spoken to him about it. As you know, he's in the Philippines right now. I'm happy to check with our team. Obviously, he's aware of what's going on, but I'm happy to check if there's additional thoughts that he has on it.

QUESTION: Or if he has issued any specific directions on --

MS. HARF: I'm happy to check with our team that's with him on the ground.

QUESTION: Yeah. Just because you mentioned so much about the security of the diplomats and all that, has the White House been informed about it, and what is it they're saying about it?

MS. HARF: Absolutely, we're in constant contact with folks around town on this issue. I think my colleague --

QUESTION: No, I specific --

MS. HARF: -- Jay Carney, might have spoken to this in his briefing today. But what -- go ahead.

QUESTION: Yeah. This is what I wanted to double-check on that.

MS. HARF: Uh-huh. I mean, certainly we have conversations with them about this issue. I don't have any specifics to read out for you on that, but certainly we talk to them about stuff all the time.

September 30, 2013

**Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, India/Pakistan
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: What is your reaction to the meeting yesterday between Pakistani and Indian prime ministers who were able to agree that the two countries should observe ceasefire --

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- along the line of control in disputed Kashmir region?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we welcome any and all high-level discussions between Pakistan and India. That would improve their bilateral relationship. As President Obama said last week, we share an interest with both countries in seeing a peaceful reduction of tensions on the subcontinent, and we continue to support, strongly, efforts by India and Pakistan to improve all aspects of their bilateral relations, and we encourage further dialogue.

QUESTION: And did the outcome meet your expectations? Because, it was widely expected that the two countries would be able to announce the resumption of peace process --

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- and the composite dialogue which is -- addresses these outstanding issues.

MS. PSAKI: Well, it's not for us to evaluate, but dialogue is a positive step forward and we'll continue to encourage that.

QUESTION: And also to that --

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: The Pakistani Prime Minister in his speech to the United Nations underscored the need for settlement that belongs to any Kashmir disputes. Most of the security problems emanate from that dispute.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Would you expect that the two countries will be able to move forward towards that?

MS. PSAKI: Well, our position on Kashmir has not changed. We still believe the pace, scope, and character of India and Pakistan's dialogue on Kashmir is for those two countries to determine, and we continue to encourage dialogue.

September 17, 2013

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on India/Pakistan
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: India. India-Pakistan.

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: In the upcoming days, of course, India and Pakistan will be also at the United Nations General Assembly meetings, including Indian Prime Minister and Pakistani Prime Minister.

My question is that – what India is saying, that before India and Pakistan can have peace talks, Pakistan should deliver Ibrahim Dawood, who is running a – terrorist activities from the Pakistani soil against India, terrorism and also murders, and he’s wanted by the Indian Government. And now, recently, the Home Minister of India, Mr. Shinde, also made a request to the U.S. to help to bring him to justice in India.

So where do we stand? Is the U.S. helping India? Because both countries are cooperating on terrorism and on many issues, but this is the main issue, as long as he is using the Pakistani soil against India, and that is also going to against other countries, including the U.S.

MS. PSAKI: Well, Goyal, I’d have to look into that a little more closely for you. Obviously, we always feel that dialogue between India and Pakistan is important for continuing the relationship between the two countries.

September 13, 2013

**Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on India/Pakistan
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: I have two questions, one on India and one on India and Pakistan, please. As far as India is concerned now, Mr. Narendra Modi, the chief minister of the Indian state of Gujarat, is officially candidate for the prime ministership of India in the upcoming elections from the BJP party. My question is now: Anything change as far as the U.S. behavior, what the party's asking and officials as far as visa and his visit to the U.S. is concerned? Or you are still, or U.S. is still denying visa to visit the United States?

MS. HARF: Well, I'm not going to comment, as I don't think we ever do, on domestic Indian politics. As to the specific case, there's no change in our longstanding visa policy. With regard to the chief minister, that he is welcome to apply for a visa and await a review like any other applicant. That review will be, of course, grounded in U.S. law. And I just am not going to speculate about what the outcome of that review might be.

QUESTION: And as far as any comments on that he's now the candidate for the second party, or one of the largest parties?

MS. HARF: Again, I'm not going to comment on domestic Indian politics. These are decisions for the Indian people to make, certainly not for me to make judgments on one way or the other.

QUESTION: But what party leaders are asking that many of the party leaders, including Mr. Rajnath, who is the president of the BJP party, was here in Washington. And many others on a regular basis, including from the BJP or from congress and other leaders from the Indian Government or party levels have been provided with and they registered here with no problems. Is there – what is the problem? Is there some kind of campaign going on against Mr. Modi, or some other internal problems are there as far as his visa is concerned? That's what everybody's asking in India.

MS. HARF: Again, we're not involved in domestic Indian politics. If Mr. Modi would like to apply for a visa and await a review like any other applicant, he's certainly free to do so.

QUESTION: Yeah, no. U.S. always engages itself with opposition parties and leaders of other countries, and you have been doing --

MS. HARF: “Always” is a strong word.

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: But continue.

QUESTION: Most of the time. As he is the prime minister candidate for the main opposition party of India, is the U.S. now willing to engage him in different kind of dialogues?

MS. HARF: I just don’t have anything more for you on this. Again, I’m not going to comment on domestic Indian politics. I would take a little issue with “always” engaging with folks. If we have anything new to update for you, we will.

QUESTION: India and Pakistan now ready to meet on various issues, problems, and all that. But there is still fighting going on on the border, and India is blaming the Pakistanis are still firing at Indian soldiers, and there were some causalities also. At the same time, Indian Government is calling on Pakistan before they talk – one, how can you even talk and meet when there is fighting going on? And also, they do not give Mr. – or this Ibrahim Dawood is sitting in Pakistan and it’s – there’s a most wanted in India. Indian Government is calling on Pakistan, also seeking U.S. help, as far as Indian Home Minister is concerned, calling on the U.S. to help India as far as bringing Dawood, because he’s the most wanted person. And also he is blamed for most of the terrorist activities against India, inside India. So where do we stand --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- because on one hand, they want to talk, and the Nawaz Sharif government wants to talk with India. On the other hand, they have kept this most wanted terrorist wanted by India, and also most of other terrorists by U.S. Abdul Saeed is also sitting there in Pakistan.

MS. HARF: Well, we would certainly encourage and we have encouraged further dialogue between India and Pakistan on a range of issues. We would welcome any and all high-level discussions particularly between Pakistan and India. I know our ambassadors in both countries have made this point, and we’ve made it publicly as well. I’m not going to get into the details of what those discussions might look like. That’s for India and Pakistan to talk about together.

QUESTION: But how about these two terrorist wanted by the U.S. and wanted by India?

MS. HARF: I just don’t have anything further for you on that. If we have anything, I’m happy to get it to you.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. HARF: Yeah. Did you have another question? No. Okay. Yes.

QUESTION: Hello. Thank you, Marie. This is Golam Arshad with *Amar Desh* newspaper.

MS. HARF: The other Arshad.

QUESTION: Yes. The other Arshad, yes. Thank you. Well, the people that I work for is *Amar Desh Patrika*, and my editor is now in jail for the last six months, languishing in jail. And it's a matter of great concern, for internationally also the press is being persecuted now in Bangladesh under a democratic government and gagged. One of the television center has been shut off the air, and the chairman of that paper is now in jail. Having said that, for the safety of democracy in Bangladesh, I would really ask for international press freedom of speech and violation (inaudible) human rights is absolutely the case that we are in Bangladesh. We are facing an election coming up.

But having said that, if all these things take place, I think in Bangladesh there is a fear that Bangladesh may enter into an unconstitutional crisis, a constitutional crisis, which may lead the army to step in. Now, I say the word "may" as we personally – the United States – totally abhor any army intervention per se. But having said that, this is – isn't it a matter of concern for you as well, Marie, if I may take the --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. Well, we have repeatedly urged the leaders of the major parties in Bangladesh, as you know, to come together and agree on a way forward to ensure free, fair, and credible elections in the coming months. I think we've made that point crystal clear.

QUESTION: Yes, yes.

MS. HARF: What the way forward looks like is for the parties in Bangladesh to decide themselves. But obviously, nonviolence is essential to any solution. As we noted earlier in the week, Secretary Kerry has written to the Prime Minister encouraging him to engage in constructive dialogue on a way forward.

In terms of press freedom, I don't know the details exactly of the situation you mentioned, but as we do everywhere call on governments to ensure press freedom around the world, certainly detention of journalists is something that we strongly condemn. So we would encourage everywhere in Bangladesh and everywhere else freedom of the press, just like we have here in the United States, because it's important to any free and open society and certainly any democratic society.

QUESTION: Yes, Marie. The thing is that the editor of the paper Mahmudur Rahman is now in jail. And this is – there is a fear that he may be sent into a condemned cell down the road, if he's been proven guilty of high treason. It's a treason I use with – very cautiously, treason. So it means that an editor has been persecuted. And if you could kindly take this question.

MS. HARF: I will. I'm not familiar with the details of this case.

QUESTION: Yes.

MS. HARF: Clearly, we would oppose persecution of journalists for anything they've written or anything they've said. But I'll get some details on this, and I will take it as a question.

QUESTION: Well, thank you very much, if you could kindly take this question.

MS. HARF: I will kindly take it as a question.

QUESTION: Thank you so much.

QUESTION: Madam, quickly can I go back – my back – question back on India?

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Have officially U.S. received any request from the Home Minister of India or from the Government of India as far as Ibrahim Dawood in Pakistan wanted by India?

MS. HARF: I will take that question and get back to you. I don't know the answer.

QUESTION: Thank you, ma'am.

QUESTION: Do you have any reaction to the four men who were sentenced to death in the gang rape case?

MS. HARF: I do. Thank you for the question. We are heartened to see that the Indian justice system has spoken and the perpetrators of these heinous attacks have been convicted and sentenced in a court of law. Like so many people in India and around the world, we were saddened by this horrific act of violence, yet moved by civil society's response at the same time. Secretary Kerry has spoken about this this spring, cited this woman's bravery and her fight for justice. In India, as in all countries around the world, gender-based violence continues to be a challenge that we are focused on countering, on working with people to counter all across the world.

August 22, 2013

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, Selections on India/Pakistan
Washington, DC

QUESTION: In disputed Kashmir region --

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- things seem to be heating up. Yesterday, one Pakistan army official and today two Pakistani soldiers were killed in Indian fighting. Are you concerned that the situation might get out of control?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we are certainly aware of these reports. We are concerned – remain concerned about the violence along the Line of Control. We understand that the governments of India and Pakistan are in contact. We continue to encourage further dialogue. As you know, our policy on Kashmir has not changed. We still believe that the pace, scope, and character of India and Pakistan’s dialogue is for those two countries to determine.

QUESTION: But are you – has the Secretary been in contact with the leadership of those two countries?

MS. PSAKI: Let me just double-check the calls. I don’t have any calls from him, but as you know, we have a very robust U.S. presence in both of those countries, and I know they, of course, remain in contact with all – with leaders on a range of issues.

QUESTION: And do you recognize that the new Pakistani Prime Minister, Nawaz Sharif, has been stressing the importance of peace between the two countries, but his call for return to peace talks seems to have fallen on deaf ears in New Delhi?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we --

QUESTION: What is – what do you think is the reason for Indian aggression?

MS. PSAKI: I can’t speculate on that. We certainly continue to encourage both sides to participate in dialogue.

QUESTION: Experts also say – fear that if things continue this way, this might also impact U.S. plans for Afghanistan, in the – in view of imminent drawdown from that country, if the two countries continue to be tense on Kashmir – in Kashmir, their tensions can be – spill over to Afghanistan as well.

MS. PSAKI: Well, we're not at that point yet. I certainly don't want to speculate on future. We certainly hope that they will engage in dialogue, and of course, they have played important roles in the process in Afghanistan as well, and we're hopeful that will continue.

QUESTION: Thank you.