

Daily Press Briefing: Discussion of China

Contents

August 14, 2014	3
August 11, 2014	4
August 7, 2014	6
August 5, 2014	8
August 4, 2014	9
July 30, 2014	10
July 24, 2014	11
July 17, 2014	13
July 16, 2014	15
July 10, 2014	17
July 9, 2014	20
July 8, 2014	21
July 7, 2014	23
July 1, 2014	27
June 27, 2014	28
June 26, 2014	30
June 25, 2014	35
June 24, 2014	39
June 20, 2014	41
June 12, 2014	43
June 11, 2014	44
June 6, 2014	45
June 5, 2014	47

June 4, 2014	49
June 3, 2014	50
May 30, 2014	54
May 29, 2014	56
May 27, 2014	58
May 23, 2014	64
May 22, 2014	68
May 21, 2014	70
May 20, 2014	77
May 19, 2014	84
May 15, 2014	93
May 13, 2014	96
May 9, 2014	98
May 8, 2014	99
May 7, 2014	101
May 6, 2014	105
May 2, 2014	106
May 1, 2014	107
April 28, 2014	108
April 15, 2014	111
April 9, 2014	112
April 4, 2014	113
April 2, 2014	114
March 31, 2014	115
March 24, 2014	117

August 14, 2014

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

QUESTION: Gao Zhisheng, the human rights lawyer from China, his wife has said that he was badly treated in prison, that now he can't even speak intelligibly, that he's malnourished. She's asking the U.S. to ask the Chinese authorities to let him come here for medical treatment. Has the U.S. had conversations about that, or do you have any observations about his state?

MS. HARF: We have raised his case both publicly and privately at senior levels in Washington and in Beijing with Chinese officials, and we will continue to do so. We urge Chinese authorities not to impose any restrictions on his movement so he can be able to travel freely and be reunited with his family.

QUESTION: Do you – and I think her – the quotes that I saw from his wife said that he had been tortured. Do you have any reason to believe that is the case?

MS. HARF: I can check with our folks.

QUESTION: One other one on China. For the third or – third day in a row, I think --

MS. HARF: Ambassador King.

QUESTION: Bingo.

MS. HARF: I don't have it for you yet.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: I had a strongly worded conversation with our team about that this morning. Hopefully we'll get that to you soon.

August 11, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Japan
Washington, DC

QUESTION: So the ASEAN Regional Forum fell short of moving toward talks on a more binding code of conduct. Where does the United States believe efforts to resolve this – these variety of territorial disputes rests now?

MS. HARF: Well, the Secretary addressed this in his press avail at the end, and he said that he thinks the language does go far enough; we made the points that we came to make. And he said we weren't seeking to pass something per se, trying to put something on the table that people could embrace. So he also said that a number of countries had decided that's what they're going to do. It's a voluntary process. But he also said he thinks there's a way to achieve some progress with respect to the South China Sea based on the conversations they had at ASEAN. It's an ongoing conversation, but I think judging from his comments, he seemed like we had made some progress.

QUESTION: Is a voluntary process sufficient?

MS. HARF: Well, he certainly made clear in his comments that he believes it is. I can check with our team and see if there's more behind that or more that we were pushing for. But judging from what he said, it seemed like he was happy that we've gone as far as we could at ASEAN, at least for now.

QUESTION: Out of the S&ED, it seemed that the United States and China were perhaps more together on code of conduct in South China Sea than at the end of the ASEAN Regional Forum. Is that --

MS. HARF: I can check with our folks. I hadn't heard that from the team that was out there. I don't know if there's that perception out there. Again, we had many conversations at the S&ED, many over the last few days at ASEAN and other meetings. So let me check with our folks and see. It's not the sense I'm getting, but it's a complicated issue. There are very strong feelings about it, as we know. But we believe it's important to keep engaging on it.

QUESTION: I have a related question on that, actually. The leaders of Japan and China, for the first time, met while at ASEAN. I think this was the first time since Abe took office in 2012. Do you welcome that development?

MS. HARF: We welcome a better relationship and communications between countries in the region, so yes.

QUESTION: A quick follow-up on that. Is that --

QUESTION: I had a question.

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: Just on the issue of the voluntary commitment.

MS. HARF: Let me check and see if there's more details to that. I was keying off of what the Secretary said, but I can check with our team and see if there's more to share on that.

QUESTION: Yeah. I guess specifically what I'm wondering is will you be – does that mean you will be expecting all the countries in the region to be taking those voluntary actions? Or would you see it as fine and dandy if some countries choose not to take voluntary actions?

MS. HARF: I think the goal probably is for everybody to. That would seem to be what our goal is. But let me check with our folks.

QUESTION: Voluntary does suggest that it's up to them ultimately.

MS. HARF: Right. But I think we hope that they do. Let me check and see if there's more.

QUESTION: Thanks.

MS. HARF: We don't want to have to – we want people to get there on their own and understand why it's important --

QUESTION: Sure.

MS. HARF: -- for all of them to abide by a code of conduct.

Yeah.

QUESTION: Marie, there was some fairly harsh commentary in – on China's Xinhua State News Agency today about this issue. Among other things, they allege that Washington is further emboldening countries like the Philippines and Vietnam to take a hardline stance against China, raising suspicion over the real intention of the United States in making an amicable solution more difficult to reach. And then they also say, "It is a painful reality that Uncle Sam has left too many places in chaos after it stepped in, as in what people are witnessing now in Iraq, Syria, and Libya," close quote. "The South China Sea should not be the next one," close quote.

MS. HARF: Well, we're not the ones that are fomenting instability there. It's the aggressive actions the Chinese have taken that are doing so. Everything we are doing is designed to lower tensions, to get people to resolve their differences diplomatically and not through coercive or destabilizing measures, like we've seen the Chinese take increasingly over the past several months.

August 7, 2014

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

MS. HARF: QUESTION: Do you have anything on the report that a Korean American was held by the Chinese authority near a border city between China and DPRK? Is --

MS. HARF: I – go ahead.

QUESTION: Yes.

MS. HARF: No, no, no. Continue. Go ahead.

QUESTION: Yeah. He’s running a Christian NGO and he has been interrogated by the Chinese authority. I just wonder if you have any more substance or details on this particular case.

MS. HARF: We are aware of those reports, but unfortunately, because of privacy considerations, I can’t comment any further.

QUESTION: Can you confirm?

MS. HARF: I can’t comment any further in any way.

QUESTION: Just --

QUESTION: Does the United States seek consular access to this particular U.S. citizen?

MS. HARF: Well, I can’t comment in any way on any specific cases. Obviously, we care very deeply about the safety and welfare of U.S. citizens all over the world and would provide consular access when needed in general.

QUESTION: Gao Zhisheng, the human rights lawyer, has been released.

MS. HARF: Yes, and we welcome that news.

QUESTION: What’s your assessment of his situation right now?

MS. HARF: Well, I don’t have much more of an assessment here. We’ve welcomed the news that he was released today upon completion of his sentence, also continue to urge China to release all prisoners of conscience – there are still a number that are in prison and uphold their commitments to respect and protect the human rights of all of their people. We also urge Chinese

authorities to allow him to leave China to be reunited with his family in the United States if he so chooses.

QUESTION: Do you know if there have been communications with the Chinese side about his case, specifically in the past couple of days?

MS. HARF: I can check. I don't know the answer to that.

QUESTION: On China. Chinese --

MS. HARF: Let's stay on China, and then I'll go to Elise.

QUESTION: Yeah. Chinese authority is planning to build five lighthouse on five islands in the disputed waters in the South China Sea. Do you – what is your take on that? Do you think it's defiant?

MS. HARF: Well, we've said for a very long time that we believe territorial disputes should be managed and resolved peacefully, diplomatically, and in accordance with international law. For this reason, we support efforts that lower tensions and expand space for peaceful and diplomatic resolutions of disputes. Look, ideally claimant states, when there are disagreements, would decide among themselves what type of specific activities are considered provocative or out-of-bonds, offer to put a voluntary freeze on any such actions if other claimants would commit to do so likewise. I know this is going to be a topic of conversation in general at the upcoming ASEAN summit, the code of conduct particularly. But no more specific comment than that.

QUESTION: Another China-related.

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: The – after the U.S.-Africa summit, meanwhile we heard that the Chinese Government is actually inviting the United States to work with China to engage or to work together on a project. It's a hydroelectric dam project in Democratic Republic of Congo. What's your take on that?

MS. HARF: I hadn't seen that. I'm happy to check. I hadn't seen that. Yes.

QUESTION: Thank you.

August 5, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Japan
Washington, DC

QUESTION: About the islands that I had asked, since Friday --

MS. PSAKI: Yes, I do have an answer for you.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. PSAKI: The Japanese Government has notified us that it has named these islands and noted that this does not represent a change or expansion of Japan's territorial or maritime claims. We'd certainly refer you to them. Just, it's worth restating that the United States does not take a position on the underlying question of the ultimate sovereignty of the Senkaku Islands.

Go ahead.

QUESTION: Are you concerned that this raises tension in the region? Do you think that the Japanese should not have done this? Do you think this is going to a new level?

MS. PSAKI: I don't think I expressed that concern, so I think it's safe to say I would not express it.

August 4, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Japan
Washington, DC

QUESTION: So Japan has named five disputed islands, and the Chinese have denounced it. I wondered if you had any comments on whether you thought this was a provocative action by Japan.

MS. PSAKI: Is this – I'm sorry. I want to make sure I'm referring to the right thing. You said Japan has named – can you say this one more time?

QUESTION: Yeah. There were I think – what is it – 158 islands or so, and as you know, there's some disputed islands.

MS. PSAKI: Of course.

QUESTION: Japan has named a handful of them, five of them on Friday I believe, and China has denounced it. And I wondered if you had any comments about that.

MS. PSAKI: I'd have to check with our team on that. We're happy to get you a comment on it. My apologies.

QUESTION: Thanks, Jen.

MS. PSAKI: I didn't have that with me here today.

July 30, 2014

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

MS. HARF: We are concerned about reports that China has indicted prominent economics professor Ilham Tohti. Since authorities took him and at least six of his students into police custody in Beijing on January 15th, we have been deeply concerned about the lack of transparency concerning his welfare and access to legal representation. We call on Chinese authorities to release Mr. Tohti and his students and to guarantee them the protections and freedoms to which they are entitled under China's international human rights commitments, including freedom of expression.

July 24, 2014

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

QUESTION: Right. I understand the tensions in the South China Sea have toned down quite a bit these days --

MS. HARF: Well, I would actually -- I would take a little -- I mean, we've seen China actually increasingly take steps that have led to tension and we believe are destabilizing and trying to change the status quo. So we've actually said -- a little different from here. We are encouraging parties though to work together on these issues and to try to resolve them without any additional escalation.

QUESTION: I'm glad you said that, which leads to my next question. If -- I understand it's the U.S. position to look for a binding code of conduct in the South China Sea. If in any case any of the parties -- any of the claimants are dragging their feet on the binding code of conduct, what alternative crisis management mechanism can the United States pursue?

MS. HARF: Well, we have talked about a code of conduct and we think that's important. We've also talked about different ideas that other countries have put forward. For example, the Japanese have put forward an idea about a hotline between Japan and China to try and deal with these issues directly when they arise to prevent tensions from escalating. So there are a number of different ideas we talk about with our partners in the region. Again, all in trying to get to the same goal here.

QUESTION: I do realize that from the -- earlier this month, China and U.S. has just six (inaudible) for Strategic and Economic Dialogue --

MS. HARF: Absolutely.

QUESTION: -- and then which -- very impressively 116 outcomes are achieved under the strategic track. One of them, item number 4, is a mechanism building, which says that both sides will try to set a rules of behavior for air and maritime encounters. Is that something to do with the South China Sea or the East China Sea?

MS. HARF: It's in part -- on the maritime side, obviously we talked about a number of the different issues. In terms of the aviation, we talked about the ADIZ that China declared -- was it last year? I don't even remember. Earlier this year?

QUESTION: ADIZ.

MS. HART: What we talked about quite a bit in this room, so there are all these issues that we talk about with them and we want to put rules of the road in place, we think that's important for all of the countries in the region, and it's an issue we constantly talk about the Chinese with.

QUESTION: Yes, quickly, follow. Many U.S. companies operating in China, including fast food companies, are blaming Chinese authorities harassment. Have you heard of these complaints or what --

MS. HART: I haven't. I'm happy to check for you.

July 17, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China

Washington, DC

QUESTION: And then on China, yesterday you guys put out a statement of the resumption of the counterterrorism dialogue with the Chinese. There's some concern in the human rights community that this is a suggestion or this implies that you are fully supportive of China's counterterrorism strategy, including out in its west with the Uighurs. Do you – does the U.S. still have concerns about the Chinese counterterrorism operations or their policy in the west of the country? And if so, why was it – was it appropriate to be – to resume this discussion with them?

MS. PSAKI: Well, let me first say that counterterrorism is, of course, an area that China and the United States have cooperated on. And as part of the dialogue that took place just a couple of days ago, we discussed – the United States representatives discussed our comprehensive approach to counterterrorism that includes an emphasis on the protection of human rights, access to education, social development, and appropriate security measures.

Our concerns that we've expressed, when warranted, about ongoing discrimination and restrictions on members of ethnic and religious minorities in China remains. And we will continue to urge Chinese – China officials to take steps to reduce tensions and uphold its international commitments to protect religious freedom.

We do an annual report, and the Secretary, of course, raises human rights issues at every opportunity he has in his discussions with the Chinese.

QUESTION: Sorry. You said – so you're urging the – sorry – the dialogue includes you pressing China on the need to protect human rights in – while it conducts its counterterrorism operations?

MS. PSAKI: Correct.

QUESTION: Is the United States really in a position to be telling any country about the protection of human rights and counterterrorism programs, given Guantanamo, given the deaths of innocent people in drone strikes?

MS. PSAKI: Well, Matt, I think we express concerns about issues, including the treatment of Uighurs, in these dialogues as we felt it was appropriate to do so, and as others have concerns they can express them to us as well.

QUESTION: Okay. So anyway, the main point of my question was: You do not see that there is any kind of a disconnect here in having this dialogue along with your concerns about – at the same time as you're still expressing your concerns? This is an opportunity for you to raise those concerns? Is that the way the U.S. sees it?

MS. PSAKI: That's part of what is certainly raised in this dialogue. But we think cooperation on counterterrorism issues is something that is important and should continue and will continue as well.

QUESTION: Just to pursue that, to clarify: Was the issue of human rights actually raised during the counterterrorism dialogue?

MS. PSAKI: Yes, that was part of the discussion that we had just two days ago.

QUESTION: And was there a specific reason why the dialogue is being held now? Was it a regularly scheduled thing or is it – in light of various incidents that have happened in China?

MS. PSAKI: I believe it's been scheduled for some time, but why don't we check on that for you and see if there's anything that prompted it at this particular moment.

July 16, 2014

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

QUESTION: China just moved one of the oil rigs in South China Sea.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Do you applaud this move?

MS. PSAKI: We welcome China's announcement that it is moving its oil rig from its location near the Paracels to an area closer to Hainan Island. The oil rig incident has highlighted the need for claimants to clarify their claims in accordance with international law to reach a shared understanding on appropriate behavior and activities in disputed areas. We support relevant parties adopting a voluntary freeze on provocative unilateral actions in support of further implementation of the 2002 code of conduct for the South China Sea between China and ASEAN.

QUESTION: Do you see the reason behind it – does it have anything to do with your recent call of all claimants to freeze their provocative actions, or the President's call with Chinese President Xi, like if they have reached any consensus?

MS. PSAKI: Well, the White House, of course, put out a readout of their call. As you know, issues related to maritime issues, issues related to the South China Sea often come up. The Secretary certainly discussed these issues and reiterated his concern while he was in China just last week. I'm not going to speculate on China's reasons for withdrawing its rig, but of course, we have expressed our same concerns publicly as we have privately.

QUESTION: And a quick one on the announcement of the BRICS bank yesterday. First of all, what's your thought on this?

MS. PSAKI: I think – I don't know that I have much more than I said yesterday. I'm happy to reiterate that. I know there have been some announcements over the course of the last 24 hours. As I noted yesterday, this summit is a venue for leading emerging economies to discuss economic issues they may have in common. Obviously, they made an announcement about the plan for the creation of a BRIC development bank. There are no – not a lot of details about the specific focus that this planned development bank would play – or what it would have – the specific focus it would have, I should say. And many of the important details, including its governance and any relationships with the established international financial institutions aren't clear yet. So we'll wait to see what more details emerge.

QUESTION: But do you have any concern that the China and Russian lead BRICS bank may affect the U.S. interest?

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, without knowing the objectives or the focus or the means of governance, it's hard for us to speculate on that or worry about it at this particular moment.

QUESTION: If it is modeled after the World Bank, I mean, if they are trying to replicate the World Bank, would that be fine with you?

MS. PSAKI: Said, I don't think we've seen the details of how it's modeled, and obviously, it has to serve a particular role and needs to these countries that works with the other financial institutions that are out there internationally.

...

QUESTION: So Chinese Government still emphasize that it has not any plan to stop the – carrying out the exploration activities in water. What's the view on – what's the U.S. view on that?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think – our view, I think, on – is well known on this issue. We certainly maintain a national interest in maintenance of peace and stability and respect for international law, unimpeded lawful commerce and freedom of navigation and overflight in the South China Sea. The Secretary reiterated just last week his concerns about some of the recent actions when he was in China and those have not all been addressed.

July 10, 2014

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

MS. PSAKI: Secretary Kerry yesterday continued his visit – I should say today – continued his visit to Beijing for the Sixth U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue and the Fifth U.S.-China High-Level Consultation on People-to-People Exchange. The CPE aims to enhance and strengthen ties between the citizens of the United States and China, and has done so over the past four years in the areas of culture, education, science and technology, sports, and women’s issues. This year the two sides agreed to add a sixth area of people-to-people exchange: health, and the additional of a health pillar, starting with the 2015 CPE in Washington, D.C. So next year we’ll strengthen existing health collaboration, encourage more people-to-people collaboration in this important area.

During sessions at the S&ED, the Secretary continued discussions on the full range of bilateral, regional, and global issues. He reiterated to his Chinese counterparts that we seek a relationship defined not by strategic rivalry but by practical cooperation on common challenges and constructive management of differences where our interests diverge. With regard to human rights, the Secretary raised our concerns in a direct, candid, and constructive way. He also continued our conversations on cybersecurity and cyber threat. And you probably have all seen the press conference he did on the ground earlier this morning our time, so I’d certainly point you to that.

...

QUESTION: On this report that a hacking attack penetrated OPM databases, I was wondering if you have any confirmation that any State Department employees’ records may have been stolen.

MS. PSAKI: Well, let me first say – not that I’m aware of, Elliot. Let me first say that OPM and, of course, DHS are the lead regarding this incident, as you know. As soon as they learned of the possible intrusion, they took steps to assess and mitigate it. We have no reason to believe that any personally identifiable information was compromised from anywhere, so to answer that specific question.

QUESTION: Are you seeking clarification from the Chinese side on whether there was any government involvement in this attack? Because at the moment, it seems that’s unclear.

MS. PSAKI: Well, as you know, we routinely raise cyber security issues. But DHS is in the lead, so I’d point you to them for any specific questions about this.

QUESTION: But it hasn’t come up with Secretary Kerry’s – as far as you know – his discussions?

MS. PSAKI: I think he said earlier today that he just learned about it right before the press conference or right before the meeting, so it wasn't raised today.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. PSAKI: Go ahead.

QUESTION: Follow-up on this. Given the timing of this story broke out, do you think it will help your conversation with Chinese and put more pressure on them on this cyber intrusion issue?

MS. PSAKI: Well, as you know, we are eager to reengage through the Cyber Working Group that we have recently established with the Chinese, and that's been long the case before today and before opening any newspapers. And we hope that that is something that we can reconvene in the near future.

QUESTION: But it seems to me it's odd, because it's second day of S&ED, and this incident actually happened – took place in March. So I just wonder, do you have any thought on the timing of this story?

MS. PSAKI: I would point you to The New York Times for their decision to put a relevant news story in the news during the S&ED.

QUESTION: But this – do you think it's helpful to help your stance in --

MS. PSAKI: I really don't have any analysis on that. I would just reiterate to you that the cyber issues and cyber security came up during the discussion, as you've seen from reporting on the ground. It's a big priority for us; it's a priority for the Chinese, and that's why we're – we'd really like re-engage through the working group.

QUESTION: But as you mentioned, the working group has been suspended.

MS. PSAKI: You're right.

QUESTION: So what are other channels? And --

MS. PSAKI: Well, the other channels are it can be raised through a range of levels. And it was obviously raised over the last couple of days, even though the working group was not a part of what took place at the S&ED.

QUESTION: So that didn't bother you, getting --

MS. PSAKI: I think we expressed our preference that that issue and that working group would be a part of the S&ED. But we still took the opportunity to raise the issues during the last couple of days.

QUESTION: Do you blame the Chinese in this particular instance of spying on the OPM?

MS. PSAKI: I'm not going to – we're not going to discuss attribution. And again, the State Department is not the lead on this particular case.

...

QUESTION: Secretary Kerry said in Beijing that he discussed the importance of enforcing sanctions on North Korea, and China has a huge role to play in this regard, and China understands this obligation. Does this mean that China has agreed to carry out those sanctions more vigorously than before?

MS. PSAKI: Well, China has been an important partner in the implementation of sanctions, and even as recently as last year they took a number of important steps. I will leave it to them to announce whether there are additional steps that they plan on taking. But I think the Secretary was just referring to the important role they play and the relationship that they have with North Korea.

July 9, 2014

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

MS. PSAKI: I just have a couple of items for all of you at the top. Secretary Kerry continues his visit to Beijing for the sixth round of the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue, and the fifth U.S.-China High-Level Consultation on People to People Exchanges. On July 9th, which is of course today, he opened the S&ED and reiterated our commitment to cooperate in areas of common interest and to constructively manage our differences.

As the Secretary said, we welcome the emergence of a peaceful, stable, prosperous China that contributes to the stability and the development of the region and plays a responsible role in world affairs. Secretary Kerry co-chaired the S&ED strategic track session and a special joint session on climate change and clean energy, where the two sides reviewed and strengthened efforts to tackle climate change. He also attended an event to highlight the importance of combating wildlife trafficking and to outline areas of cooperation to stop this transnational crime.

...

QUESTION: The two writers who are under house arrest in Beijing, can you confirm that the International Women of Courage Award winner was invited previously to the U.S. Embassy?

MS. PSAKI: I have some information on this and some of it we're still gathering, Scott. But we are concerned – there were two Chinese recipients of the Secretary's International Women of Courage Awards who were invited to a private dinner focused on women's issues. We are concerned that Tsering Woeser was placed under house arrest and prevented from attending – I believe the other recipient as well – and we're looking into the matter to determine more details about what happened here and, of course, the reasons.

QUESTION: Has that been communicated with Chinese officials at the highest level, since some of the highest levels are in Beijing right now?

MS. PSAKI: I would have to check and see if this is an issue that came up in the dialogue in those discussions. And why don't I do that, and we'll let you know.

July 8, 2014

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

MS. PSAKI: Secretary Kerry arrived in Beijing, China to take part in the sixth U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue and the fifth U.S.-China High-Level Consultation on People-to-People Exchange. He had a small working dinner with State Councilor Yang Jiechi. And tomorrow, the S&ED and the CPE will begin.

As you know, the S&ED is a central forum for the United States and China to take stock of progress, set new goals for the relationship, develop habits of cooperation in areas of mutual interest, and to manage areas of difference through candid, high-level discussions. The S&ED remains an important component of our efforts with China to build relations between our countries, and the CPE provides a high-level forum for government, civil society, and private sector representatives to discuss cooperation in various areas of common interest. Secretary Kerry will also co-chair this year's forum and call for closer and expanded people-to-people ties.

...

QUESTION: Does the United States have – on China. Does the United States have a view on Chinese authorities preventing some Uighur civil servants and students from observing the Ramadan fast?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we are deeply concerned by reports of discrimination against and restrictions on ethnic and religious minorities in China, including Uighurs, especially during the holy month of Ramadan. We urge Chinese authorities to take steps to reduce tensions, uphold China's international commitments to protect religious freedom and other universal human rights – and certainly, observation of religion is one of them – and reassess counterproductive policies in the region and other ethnic areas.

QUESTION: Is it your understanding that this is not the first time that this has happened in that area?

MS. PSAKI: I believe there is some history here. I don't have that in front of me. But certainly, we've been – expressed concern about discrimination against Uighurs in China, and I know that's been related to religious observations as well.

...

QUESTION: Hi. My question is: You said yesterday that the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula will be one of the key topics for the strategic --

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- talks with China. And what kind of specific outcome do you hope to see from the meeting with regard to this issue?

And my second question is: U.S. has been negative about Chinese plan to set up regional development bank AIIB.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: And do you think this will also come up during the strategic talks? Thank you.

MS. PSAKI: Well, there are a range of topics, certainly, that will be discussed that may or may not be at the top of the agenda. In terms of the AIIB, we believe that there is a need for additional public, private, and multilateral development bank to support infrastructure development. But we also believe any proposal for a new international development financial institution should clearly explain how it will complement and add value to existing institutions. As you know, there's already an existing institution that does some of the same work.

And additionally, we believe that any international institution involved in infrastructure investment and development should incorporate high standards of governance, environmental and social safeguards, procurement, and debt sustainability that have been established over decades of experience at multilateral development banks.

And as you know, there's already the ADB, which plays a critical role in regional infrastructure development, so the AIIB – excuse me – hasn't – doesn't exist yet, and obviously, those are the bar – that's the bar we believe it should pass.

In terms of North Korea, there's been an ongoing dialogue between the United States and China as well as all of our partners in the Six-Party process about how to best work together to put the necessary pressure on North Korea, but the ball remains in their court to take the necessary steps to abide by their international obligations. But certainly, we expect the threat from North Korea, our concerns about North Korea to be a part of the discussion ongoing on the ground now.

July 7, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on the Department and China
Washington, DC**

MS. PSAKI: The Secretary is en route to Beijing to take part in the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue. The Strategic and Economic Dialogue is a central forum for the United States and China to take stock of progress, set new goals for the relationship, develop habits of cooperation and areas of mutual interest, and manage areas of difference through candid high-level discussions. The S&ED remains an important component of our efforts with China to build relations between our countries, and the 2014 S&ED brings dozens of high-level U.S. Government officials to Beijing to discuss nearly every issue – every major issue in our bilateral relationship, from issues like food security and human rights to combatting wildlife trafficking.

Our two countries will exchange views and forge progress on global, regional, and bilateral challenges, including pressing issues related to Ukraine, Afghanistan, Iran, the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, and maritime disputes. We expect to have high-level discussions on climate change and clean energy, including how expanding cooperation under the U.S.-China Climate Change Working Group and the U.S.-China EcoPartnerships will allow us to make significant strides toward addressing the pressing global challenge.

July 2, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/South Korea
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Thanks. I just have a few quick questions about the China-South Korea summit tomorrow.

MS. PSAKI: Sure.

QUESTION: What is the U.S. expectation for the outcome of the summit generally, and do you have any concerns for any part of the summit – the agenda or the signing of any new diplomatic documents that they could sign?

MS. PSAKI: Again, I'm not sure that this is an event – or you tell me – that we are involved in at any senior level or --

QUESTION: No, it's between China and South Korea.

MS. PSAKI: Sure. So I would just say, broadly speaking, that we'll see what the outcome is. Obviously, we remain in touch with both countries. I think we put out a readout of a call the Secretary did with one of his Chinese counterparts, and we're in close touch with South Korean officials as well. But they're both important partners, whether it's in the Six-Party process or on other issues in the region. So we'll see what comes out of it and if there's anything we need to speak to.

QUESTION: Okay. And China is reportedly going to ask South Korea to join the Asia Infrastructure Investment Bank, and the U.S. has reportedly warned South Korea against joining it. Do you have any position on the development bank itself, or your expectations for what South Korea might decide whether to join or not?

MS. PSAKI: I don't. I'm happy to check with our team and see if there's any concerns or issues raised that we'd like to express publicly, though.

QUESTION: Okay. And then in general, do – is there any concern at all that South Korea is perhaps becoming too close to China, given the fact that President Obama emphasized on his Asia trip that the U.S. should be South Korea's main security ally?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we also encourage dialogue between countries in the region, and we've long encouraged the strong and peaceful rise and prosperity of China. So we'll see what comes out of the dialogue tomorrow, and certainly we'll encourage meetings moving forward.

QUESTION: Okay. Thank you.

...

And finally, I want to express deep concern by the United States by reports that Zhang Shaojie, pastor of the government-sanctioned Nanle County Christian Church, was convicted July 4th and sentenced to 12 years imprisonment in retaliation for his peaceful advocacy on behalf of his church community. We call on Chinese authorities to release Pastor Zhang and we urge China to cease harassment of his family members and congregants. We call on the Chinese authorities to allow citizens to worship freely in accordance with China's own laws and its international human rights commitments. Freedom of religion is a critical – is critical to a peaceful, inclusive, stable, and thriving society.

QUESTION: Was there a reason that you separated the two China things by the Saudi thing? Are you --

MS. PSAKI: There was not.

QUESTION: Is there – do you expect that this guy's case is going to come up in the Secretary's conversations --

MS. PSAKI: Well, as --

QUESTION: -- or in any of the conversations that --

MS. PSAKI: As you know, there are a range of officials on the ground. We raise human rights issues at every opportunity and we always welcome a direct and candid dialogue.

QUESTION: All right. One thing that I noticed that you didn't say was on the agenda was cyber issues. Does that mean that there is not going to be any discussion of this issue, which you and others think is a very big deal, with the Chinese?

MS. PSAKI: Well, it continues to be – cyber continues to be an incredibly important issue to the United States and to China. And we are – have a range of means of communicating on cyber issues. Was – that was not meant to be inclusive of every topic discussed by every official on the ground. As you know, we have quite an extensive delegation who will be there.

QUESTION: Right. But in terms of the actual formal cyber talks that you had been going on that the Chinese canceled after the indictments of the PLA guys, that's not happening. Is that correct?

MS. PSAKI: Nothing has changed in that regard.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. PSAKI: But again, there'll be a great deal of time for dialogue. There are many meals involved, so I'm certain there'll be a range of issues that will be discussed.

QUESTION: So they're going to be chatting about cyber-crime over their --

MS. PSAKI: Stay tuned, Matt. There's quite a bit of time our team has on the ground.

QUESTION: -- orange chicken, lemon chicken?

...

QUESTION: As far as Secretary's visit to China is concerned, you have been talking to the Chinese about these recent tens of thousands of Chinese demonstrating against the Communist rule in China for human rights and also China is against democracy. Do you support democracy in China?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we support -- we, of course, raise human rights issues with China at every opportunity. I'm sure that will be a part of the dialogue here.

QUESTION: But Madam, what message will you have for the --

MS. PSAKI: I think we have to move on, Goyal, because we've -- we'll have a briefing on the ground, then we'll send that transcript out to everybody.

Go ahead in the back.

QUESTION: Last week, Chinese president visited South Korea and held a summit with South Korean President Park Geun-hye. And you -- last week, you said that you were going to see the outcome of this summit and the two leaders shared the view on -- and they had showed some concern over Japan's remilitarization, including exercising the collective self-defense, while not resolving historical issues. What is the reactions to this?

MS. PSAKI: Well, our view on Japan's recent announcement is as I stated a few minutes ago, so that hasn't changed. We obviously, as I stated I think last week, we certainly encourage dialogue between countries in the region and strong relationships between countries in the region. We feel that's the best -- in the best interests of the region itself. So obviously, there were a range of issues discussed over the course of the weekend. I don't have any other further readout since we weren't involved in them, but if you have anything more specific, perhaps I can address that.

QUESTION: South Korean president was very critical of the Japan's exercises -- collective self-defense.

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think I stated our view. Our view hasn't changed.

July 1, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on Hong Kong/China
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Half a million people turned out in the streets of Hong Kong last night despite the huge tropical rainstorm. It's the largest demonstration – pro-democracy demonstration since the handover in 1997.

MS. HARF: Yeah. And this happens, I think, every year on July 1st, yeah.

QUESTION: It happens every on an annual basis, but this is the largest since 1997. What comment does America have on this, what reaction?

MS. HARF: Well yeah, look, we support Hong Kong's well-established traditions and basic law protections that include internationally-recognized freedoms such as freedom of peaceful assembly and freedom of expression. We do support democracy in Hong Kong in accordance with the basic law. We believe that an open society with the highest possible degree of autonomy and governed by the rule of law is really essential for Hong Kong's stability and prosperity. I know details about the election process for the chief executive in 2017 are still being worked out, but we believe that the legitimacy of this person will be enhanced if the – if universal suffrage is fulfilled and if the election provides a genuine choice of candidates that are representative of the voters' will.

QUESTION: Should Beijing be listening to what's happening in Hong Kong? Should they be taking note of these cries for greater democracy?

MS. HARF: Well, I'm sure they are.

QUESTION: You think they are?

MS. HARF: Not for me whether to say if they should or not.

QUESTION: But do you think they are taking note in the sense that they're going to become more democratic in China, or do you think they're taking note thinking this is something that we have to crack down on?

MS. HARF: As I said, we are very clear about what our position is. We support democracy in Hong Kong. We'll continue talking to them about it, but I don't have any more predictions for you to make about what this might look like going forward.

June 27, 2014

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

QUESTION: The South Korean Government announced today, the 27th, that President Xi Jinping will visit South Korea officially. It's a state visit on July 3rd and 4th. But historically speaking, Chinese president have visit – not visited North Korea before visiting South Korea. It is – today at this time, it's kind of unusual. So my question is: Do you think in President Xi Jinping's visit leads to the change of the political power balance in peninsula?

MS. HARF: Well, we've said that China needs to have good relationships with all the countries in the region, including South Korea. I haven't seen the specifics about the announcement, but I'm happy to see if there's more details we have to share.

QUESTION: And then how the United States expect that both leader are talking about the peninsula issues, North Korean issues?

MS. HARF: Well, we certainly share concerns that both countries have about the nuclearization of North Korea and share the commitment to denuclearizing the peninsula. So I don't have any predictions for conversations we're not going to be a part of, but clearly we've worked very closely with both on this issue.

...

QUESTION: I got to get in my street-renaming question here. Have you received from the Chinese a formal complaint about this proposal? And if you have, what's been your response?

MS. HARF: I'm not aware of one, but again, I can't rule it out. We're still checking with our folks to see if we have.

QUESTION: Would you reply to them that you don't comment on pending legislation?

MS. HARF: I'm not going to get into private diplomatic communications with them, Matt.

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: To use another one of your favorite lines.

QUESTION: But would you --

MS. HARF: I'm not going to tell you how we would reply to them, if we had received one, because that's a private diplomatic communication.

QUESTION: Uh-huh. Yeah.

MS. HARF: Just driving you crazy today.

June 26, 2014

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

QUESTION: And then, making good on my promise from yesterday, you have anything to say -
-

MS. HARF: Uh-oh.

QUESTION: -- about your position on the renaming of the street?

MS. HARF: Excuse me. Okay.

QUESTION: Yeah?

MS. HARF: So let's see. Well, much to your dismay, I am not going to take a position on the naming of the street. But I will say a few things about this gentleman. The Secretary put out a statement -- I believe it was December 9th, 2013 -- marking the 5th anniversary of this Nobel laureate and writer's detention; have called very clearly for his release from the Chinese authorities, to end his wife's house arrest, and to guarantee him and his family members all internationally-recognized human rights protections and freedoms.

So clearly, we think this gentleman has played an important role in advancing dialogue. And I think we'll probably leave it at that.

QUESTION: Which gentleman? Which --

MS. HARF: So the person they want to name the street after -- you want me to try and pronounce it? Is that what you're trying to get me to do?

QUESTION: I'm just trying to -- I'm wondering if you're not willing to say the name.

MS. HARF: No, I -- oh, no, no, no. I just didn't want to mispronounce it.

QUESTION: Okay. Oh, okay. Okay, that --

MS. HARF: It's Liu Xiaobo.

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: So --

QUESTION: So --

MS. HARF: My pronunciations aren't always the best, though, so --

QUESTION: I didn't --

MS. HARF: So in general, what I'm saying is, look, I'm not taking a position on the legislation. Clearly, we think that he -- this person has been a voice, should be released from prison. His wife's house arrest should end -- making very clear our feelings on him. I don't want that to be caught up in the confusion of the fact that we won't take a position on this legislation.

QUESTION: So you won't take a position on the legislation?

MS. HARF: I will not from here at this time, no.

QUESTION: But the Administration will and has?

MS. HARF: Publicly, we're not taking a position on it at this time.

QUESTION: Well, it -- will there come a time when you --

MS. HARF: There may.

QUESTION: -- will take a public -- given the fact that this street is --

MS. HARF: There may. Often, as you know, with legislation we don't take positions for some time, and then we eventually do.

QUESTION: Right. But given the fact that this is -- this street is under federal -- it's the federal government's street --

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- and you have jurisdiction over it, I would think that you would have an interest in -- an interest that shouldn't -- there's no reason for it to be a private position.

MS. HARF: Well, we're having those conversations with Congress. Again, I'm happy to take your advice about the fact that we should make those public back to them.

QUESTION: So you believe that this guy should be released --

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: -- but you're not -- but you won't say whether you think he should be -- whether it's appropriate to --

MS. HARF: For a street to be named after him, yeah.

QUESTION: Any street anywhere?

MS. HARF: I don't think I have any more on this street.

QUESTION: I mean, look --

QUESTION: So it sounds like you don't support.

MS. HARF: That's not what I said. I did not at all say that.

QUESTION: Well, if you're questioning the appropriateness of a street being named after him -
-

MS. HARF: I didn't say that. I didn't question it. I said I'm taking no position on whether or not this street should be named after him at all.

QUESTION: So do you know if the Chinese have made their public complaint to you guys in private?

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

QUESTION: Well, without taking a position on the legislation, do you think that such a move could aggravate your relationship with the Chinese?

MS. HARF: Well, I think by definition that would mean I was taking a position on the legislation if I did any analysis on it. So as I said, we think we've made very clear that he should be released. We've made very clear that we think he's played an important role in advancing dialogue in China, but again, nothing – no position on the proposed legislation.

QUESTION: I think we'll take that as a "No."

QUESTION: Right, but either the Administration thinks that it's --

MS. HARF: I think you can assume what you want, but you might be wrong.

QUESTION: The – I don't understand this at all. The Administration either thinks it's a good idea or an appropriate idea to honor him with – by renaming the street in front of the embassy or it thinks it is not appropriate or it takes no position. You say --

MS. HARF: I said publicly we are not taking a position, which happens all the time with proposed legislation. All the time, Matt. This is not breaking news.

QUESTION: Forget about the --

QUESTION: Well, it isn't all the time because sometimes you take a very public position on legislation.

MS. HARF: Actually, it – much more often, we don't take a position than we do. Much more often. It is the – actually the exception to the rule that we will take a position on pending legislation.

QUESTION: Marie, do you know who owns the street in front of the U.S. Embassy in Beijing?

MS. HARF: I don't.

QUESTION: Do you know who owns the street in front of the Chinese embassy in Washington?

MS. HARF: As you noted, I think it's been widely reported that it is the property of the federal government.

QUESTION: Would you object to the Chinese – if it is that the Chinese who own the street in front of the U.S. Embassy in Beijing, would you object to them doing the same thing?

MS. HARF: I am not even going to entertain that hypothetical.

QUESTION: Really? If the Chinese decided they wanted to come out and rename the street in front of the --

QUESTION: Edward Snowden Way. (Laughter.)

QUESTION: -- Edward Snowden Avenue or --

QUESTION: Benedict Arnold Boulevard? (Laughter.)

MS. HARF: I'd be happy to have that conversation.

QUESTION: -- or something like that?

QUESTION: Robert Hanson Way. (Laughter.)

MS. HARF: I'm sure the Chinese Government is taking all of your suggestions on board right now.

QUESTION: I'm sure that they had them – they were in their minds before.

MS. HARF: We're just not, at this point, look, going to take a public position on this.

QUESTION: I just can't see how it's helpful to your diplomacy with the Chinese not to take a position.

MS. HART: I will take your advice on board, Matt.

June 25, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on China and Hong Kong
Washington, DC

QUESTION: On Hong Kong, yeah. Could you just --

MS. HARF: Yes. Let me see what I have. Okay. So you asked a couple, and let me see if I answer them. And if I don't, please follow up. That we, in terms of elections, support Hong Kong's well-established traditions and basic law protections of internationally recognized fundamental freedoms, such as, of course, freedom of peaceful assembly and expression. The details of the election process for the chief executive in 2017 have yet to be worked out, is my understanding. But we do believe that the legitimacy of the chief executive will be greatly enhanced if the promise of universal suffrage is fulfilled and if the election provides the people of Hong Kong a genuine choice of candidates representative of the voters' will.

So I know there's still some details that need to be worked out, but in general, that's still our position. Of course, our longstanding policy -- and I think this was part of your first question yesterday -- is supportive of the principle of one country, two systems, and the high degree of autonomy maintained by the basic law, that that, of course, has not changed, and I think that -- maybe that answered all of your questions.

QUESTION: Okay. So have you communicated these opinions to the Chinese Government? Or is --

MS. HARF: Well, I think we've certainly been very clear publicly and privately about this. I don't have any specifics to share with you.

QUESTION: On China, you were asked yesterday about the move in Congress and also in DC city council to change the name of the road.

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: You've seen, not surprisingly, the Chinese are not very happy about this. Do you -- or do you guys take a position on kind of needling foreign governments with steps like this? Do you think it's appropriate?

MS. HARF: Well --

QUESTION: Do you think that it's helpful to your broader foreign policy aims?

MS. HARF: In terms of this pending legislation, at this point, aren't going to have any comment on it -- any position to share with you all. But if that changes, happy to let you know.

QUESTION: Can I ask why? The Administration routinely takes positions --

MS. HARF: Right.

QUESTION: -- and puts out statements of --

MS. HARF: And we routinely don't. In some cases we do, in some case we don't.

QUESTION: Well, this was one that seems to -- that seems like it would have -- it has a direct foreign policy element to it. It certainly intended to send a message. Do you think that renaming streets in this kind of way, that are designed to be provocative, in general is a good idea?

MS. HARF: I don't think I have a general comment on this, because you're trying to get me to weigh in on a specific issue, and we just aren't going to comment on this kind of pending legislation.

QUESTION: Okay. So that means that you --

MS. HARF: It doesn't mean we don't have a position, it just means I don't have one to share.

QUESTION: Oh, so you do have a position?

MS. HARF: I didn't say we did. I said it doesn't mean we don't, doesn't mean we do. I just don't have one to share.

QUESTION: But it's a secret position --

MS. HARF: Sometimes we make our --

QUESTION: -- from the most transparent Administration in history.

MS. HARF: Sometimes we don't -- most of the time, actually, we don't comment publicly on our positions on pending legislation. Sometimes we do, and sometimes we don't.

QUESTION: Well, but this is more than just pending legislation.

MS. HARF: But we clearly communicate -- no, it's not. It is by definition pending legislation.

QUESTION: This is -- but this is the renaming --

MS. HARF: I think by definition, that's accurate.

QUESTION: This is the renaming of a street --

MS. HARF: Okay. I will take your suggestion --

QUESTION: -- that is intended to provoke and annoy --

MS. HARF: -- on board.

QUESTION: -- a foreign government.

MS. HARF: I'm not going to have any comment on it.

QUESTION: And I'm just wanting to know if the State Department thinks that that's a good thing -- a good way to practice foreign policy.

MS. HARF: I'm not going to have any comment on this pending legislation.

QUESTION: You're going to -- I'm going to bring this up every day --

MS. HARF: Fine.

QUESTION: -- until you do.

MS. HARF: Happy for you to waste everyone's time in doing that when you know the answer.

QUESTION: No. It's not a waste of time.

MS. HARF: I'll let you know if the answer changes.

QUESTION: It is intended to get EAP or someone at your congressional liaison people -- me raising it every day -- to get a straight answer on what seems to be a pretty easy question.

MS. HARF: Matt, we don't always communicate our position on pending legislation publicly for a variety of reasons that you are very well aware with.

QUESTION: Marie, can I get this -- try maybe a different way. Without asking you to comment on the legislation --

MS. HARF: Yeah.

QUESTION: -- the Chinese embassy has said that it's an attempt driven by some personal interests and it runs counter to the efforts by an interest of the vast majority of people in both China and the U.S. to pursue a win-win cooperative partnership between the two countries. Do you have a comment -- would you like to assuage the Chinese embassy that their concerns are unfounded?

MS. HARF: I'm just -- I'm not going to comment on the pending legislation. We've been very clear about the fact that we would like to have and do have a constructive and productive relationship with China. You've seen that from a variety of senior officials, including, of course, the President's conversations with his counterpart. So --

QUESTION: So you would communicate to the Chinese that this shouldn't impact the relationship --

MS. HARF: I am not commenting on this one way or the other.

QUESTION: No, I'm not asking you to comment on the legislation itself.

MS. HARF: On just what they should think of it?

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: Right. So I'm not going to comment on that either. But good try.

QUESTION: So you still expect the S&ED in Beijing to go along just swimmingly after the indictment of the PLA guys who will never, ever be tried in the United States and efforts like this in --

MS. HARF: Well, we certainly expect the S&ED will -- is an important forum. We're looking forward to it, as are the Chinese. Look, that doesn't change the fact that when we disagree on things, including cyber issues, we won't make that clear.

QUESTION: Right. Well, it's just a question of whether you agree or disagree with Congress, which seems to want to annoy, intentionally provoke a response from the Chinese. And if you're fine with that, okay.

MS. HARF: I didn't say we were or weren't.

June 24, 2014

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

QUESTION: Do you have a response to the House Appropriations Committee decision to approve an amendment that would rename the street in front of the Chinese Embassy after Liu Xiaobo?

MS. HARF: I saw that. I don't have anything from our folks on that one way or the other. I'm happy to check and see if there's more to share. I did see that happened. That finally passed today?

QUESTION: Yes.

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: Are you concerned that it could lead to – so the Chinese Embassy said that it doesn't think that citizens of DC would react kindly to a street in their city being named after a criminal, or some statement to that effect.

MS. HARF: I'm happy to check and see if we have a position on this. I'm just not aware.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: I have a couple of questions regarding Hong Kong.

MS. HARF: Okay.

QUESTION: Because recently, China published the white paper on Hong Kong, and many people are concerned that it's renegeing China's pledge of high degree of autonomy Hong Kong, and also renunciation of the one-country/two-system policy. So I'm wondering if you have any stance on --

MS. HARF: I haven't seen those reports. I'm happy to check and see if we have any further comment on them.

QUESTION: Mm-hmm. Because the white paper was released about two weeks ago --

MS. HARF: Yeah, I'm sorry, I don't have that. Let me just check and see if we can share something.

QUESTION: Okay. Just another related question, because so far 730,000 Hong Kong people have already cast their votes in this Occupy Central referendum, and they are asking for public nomination of chief executive candidates of Hong Kong for 2017 universal suffrage election. Chinese Government called the referendum invalid and illegal. So do you take any position on --

MS. HART: Again, I'm sorry, I don't have the details on that in front of me. I'm happy to take all of your questions and get you an answer after the briefing and get more details if we can share them.

QUESTION: Okay, thank you.

June 20, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Vietnam
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Yeah, on China, I just wanted to see if you have a reaction to their decision to move now, it seems, multiple other oil rigs off the coast of Vietnam.

MS. PSAKI: Well, we've seen those reports.

QUESTION: I think two were near Taiwan. One I think is just outside Vietnam's exclusive economic zone. And the third one – the fourth one, I can't remember right now. But --

MS. PSAKI: Right. In our – we are of course aware of the reports that China's towing additional oil rigs to different locations in the South China Sea. As Arshad mentioned, there's – I think there's not a great deal of information at this point as to where they're headed. If a rig were placed in disputed waters, that would be a concern. And we certainly have a national interest in the maintenance of peace and stability in the region. So at this point we don't have enough information about the intended destinations of these rigs, so we'll hold back judgment until we know more.

QUESTION: I think they have posted the latitude and longitude locations.

MS. PSAKI: I had not seen that before I came down, and I'm happy to see if there's more we want to convey on this issue.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. PSAKI: Go ahead.

QUESTION: But it's okay with you if the oil rigs are within the Chinese continental shelf?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think our concern all along here has been when it travels into disputed waters and some of the aggressive actions that have been taken. So we will be watching closely, and if we need to speak out further about it, I'm certain that we will.

QUESTION: And I wondered, do you have any reaction, given that the Chinese Councilor State Yang Jiechi just visit Vietnam, but it seems there was – no progress has been made between China and Vietnam on the oil rig issue?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we support diplomatic means of resolving these issues, and we certainly hope they will continue until they're resolved.

QUESTION: Jen, when the first – sorry, when you – the first Chinese oil rig was deployed off the coast of Vietnam, you said it was – I can't remember if it was you or Marie – but you said it was a provocative and destabilizing move.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm. Yes.

QUESTION: Would you say that these most recent actions – would you use those same words to characterize these most recent actions?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I want to know more about where they are and what they're doing, and we stand by the comments we've made and I think we've both repeated those. So we're certainly encouraging Chinese and both sides to refrain from provocative actions.

June 12, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Japan
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: I asked about this yesterday, but today the Chinese and the Japanese are trading accusations over who was responsible for the close encounter that the Japanese protested recently. The Chinese defense ministry actually released a video that they say suggests that the Japanese are responsible for this. I wanted to know if you've seen the video and if you had any comments on it.

MS. PSAKI: I have not seen the video. I will just reiterate that we urge all states to ensure that they respect the safety of aircraft in flight. These reports reinforce the need for China and its neighboring countries to develop crisis management procedures that can avoid miscalculations or further incidents at sea or in air. And any attempt to interfere with freedom of overflight in international airspace raises regional tensions and increases the risk of miscalculation, confrontation, and unintended incidents.

QUESTION: Does the State Department attribute any blame on either side for this encounter?

MS. PSAKI: I think, again, we've been clear that we've expressed concerns in the past about China's declaration of an ADIZ. I don't know that this was part of that, but we continue to urge all sides to ensure that they respect the safety of aircraft in flight, and obviously I don't have additional details on this specific incident.

June 11, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Japan
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: So the Japanese defense minister announced that he has formally protested over a close encounter that Japanese jets had with Chinese jets in the East China Sea. I wanted to know if you had any comments on it.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm. I think I do, one moment.

We have seen the reports of Chinese and Japanese aircraft in close proximity. We urge all states to ensure that they respect the safety of aircraft in flight. All parties need to take steps to peacefully manage their differences and develop crisis management procedures that can avoid miscalculations or further incidents at sea or in the air. Any attempt to interfere with freedom of overflight in international airspace raises regional tensions and increases the risk of miscalculation, confrontation, and unintended incidents.

June 6, 2014

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

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: China today said that it is open to having talks with the Tibetan leaders about the future of Dalai Lama, but it has ruled out giving any autonomy to the Tibetans. Have you seen that? What's your comment on it?

MS. HARF: I have seen some of that. Well, as we've long said, we are deeply concerned about the poor human rights situation in Tibetan areas of China. We have continued to urge the Chinese Government to engage in substantive dialogue with the Dalai Lama or his representatives without preconditions as a means to reduce tensions, obviously urge China to address policies that have created tensions in Tibetan areas and that threaten the Tibetan unique culture.

QUESTION: And was this an issue of discussion when Assistant Secretary Nisha Desai Biswal --

MS. HARF: I can find out. Not to my knowledge. I don't think it was, but let me check.

QUESTION: Do you have any update on your attempts to open a consulate in Lhasa?

MS. HARF: Let me see. I think I have something on that. As envisioned in the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002, we continue efforts to open a consulate in Lhasa, also continue to request the Chinese Government allow a consular officer to visit Tibet and ethnically Tibetan areas of China. No other update.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. HART: Thanks, everyone.

June 5, 2014

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

QUESTION: I asked about this yesterday, but I wanted to follow up on my question about U.S. engagement on this issue. Are you communicating your concerns to the Chinese about their reluctance to participate in the UN tribunal?

MS. HARF: We've certainly discussed a range of issues related to this with the Chinese. I won't get into specifics. We do think that this specific tribunal request is a good opportunity for China to clarify the legal basis for I think what we would call the ambiguous nature of its maritime claims in the South China Sea and to align those claims with international law. So we hope they will avail themselves of this opportunity.

QUESTION: I have a follow-up, also on Vietnam. So the Philippine defense ministry announced their discovery of Chinese efforts to reclaim two reefs located in the South China Sea with a possible intent of militarization of these reefs. Do you have any comment on that?

MS. HARF: You're referring to the Gavin Reef, that area?

QUESTION: That's correct. And --

MS. HARF: Uh-huh. Well, we're obviously aware of the reports, believe that all parties to the Declaration of the Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea should fully and effectively implement it, especially with regard to exercising self-restraint in the conduct of activities that would complicate our -- or escalate disputes, obviously, to work towards an early conclusion of a code of conduct.

QUESTION: Thank you.

...

QUESTION: Yeah, I'll keep it brief. So the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs has launched -- has said some pretty strong things about your statement on the 25th anniversary of Tiananmen and said they lodged an official protest. I was wondering if you could confirm that that took place.

MS. HARF: I can't confirm an official protest. I saw some of the press reports. I think, look, we've made our position very clear. We've made it very clear since Tiananmen Square and aren't going to change it.

QUESTION: So no direct calls or --

MS. HART: I can check.

QUESTION: -- summoning of the ambassador or --

MS. HART: I can check. Not that I'm aware of, but let me double-check.

June 4, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on Philippines/China
Washington, DC

QUESTION: On South China Sea. Yes. So in the past, the Department has urged for a diplomatic resolution of the maritime dispute in the South China Sea. And today China rejected a – or rejected a step that would've sent – that required them to send evidence to a UN tribunal for a court in the maritime court. Is the U.S. concerned that the --

MS. HARF: Is this in the Philippines filing?

QUESTION: Yes, the Philippines filing. So is the U.S. concerned that China's not genuinely interested in seeking a diplomatic resolution to the case?

MS. HARF: Well, as we've said, the Philippines and other state parties have the right to avail themselves of the dispute resolution mechanisms provided for under the Law of the Sea Convention. We think this is a good thing. We think states should work through a rules-based system to resolve their disputes. So we have said, broadly speaking, that we are concerned about China's actions there, about an increasing pattern, it seems, of destabilizing actions there, and again, believe that this kind of dispute resolution mechanism is a good way to handle these things.

QUESTION: And the court has set a deadline of December 15th for China to offer its evidence in its dispute. Is the State Department engaging with China at all to encourage them to take this step?

MS. HARF: I can check and see. I would imagine we are. Let me check and see.

QUESTION: Okay. Thank you.

June 3, 2014

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

QUESTION: This is a different investigation, but it's already been announced, so you can talk about it.

MS. HARF: Great.

QUESTION: As you know, two weeks ago the U.S. announced indictments against five Chinese generals for – or military officials for hacking into U.S. companies.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: We've not seen any evidence that any other international partner has taken similar steps against these five or even raised concerns on them. Do you have any --

MS. HARF: I haven't heard of anything. I'm happy to check.

QUESTION: Okay. Does that concern you that the U.S. is kind of going alone on what would seem to be an egregious action?

MS. HARF: It doesn't, but let me check.

QUESTION: Okay. Thank you.

...

QUESTION: And so in light of mutual cyber espionage accusation between U.S.-China, I heard we are discussing a binational computer behavior agreement. So would you please let me know what may be in there?

MS. HARF: Might be in a – what kind of an agreement?

QUESTION: It's – it seems like a bi-national computer behavior agreement.

MS. HARF: I haven't heard anything on that. I'm happy to check with our team and see if we can say anything.

QUESTION: Yeah. And also, have you ever noticed – there is a recent report from China and says U.S. has breached international laws and put global cyber security at risk.

MS. HARF: Again, on cyber issues, we've been very clear with our concerns about what's been happening in China. You heard that with the announcement of the indictment. I'll see if there's more to share. I just don't have anything else.

...

QUESTION: Congress wants to name the street in front of the Chinese embassy after jailed Nobel Prize winner and dissident Liu Xiaobo.

MS. HARF: The embassy here in Washington?

QUESTION: Right. Here in -- are you at all worried that China --

MS. HARF: Clearly, I'm not aware of that.

QUESTION: -- might not like it?

MS. HARF: I'm happy to check. I hadn't been aware of that.

QUESTION: Can I ask another China-related question?

MS. HARF: Uh-huh. Just doing China now. Uh-huh.

QUESTION: Yeah. There are quite a few reports emerging of intimidation and harassment of the press the day before the anniversary of Tiananmen Square --

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: -- as they're trying to do reporting on this. Do you have any comment on this?

MS. HARF: Yeah. And I think we will be saying more about the anniversary probably later today and tomorrow from here and I'm sure elsewhere in Washington. So stay tuned for that.

We very clearly called on the Chinese authorities to release all the activists, journalists, and lawyers who have been detained ahead of the 25th anniversary, which as you said is tomorrow. Look, this is something we've been very clear about. China is a growing country. We've talked a lot about the fact that this is not a zero-sum game here. And as they grow, I think it's time to allow some more space, quite frankly, for discussion in their own country, particularly around this kind of anniversary.

QUESTION: I'm sorry. You said what? What's not a zero-sum game?

MS. HARF: The relationship between China and the United States. We talked about that a lot. And look, as they grow, we think that this is time to probably allow a little more space.

QUESTION: Is this an issue that you're also raising directly and privately with the Chinese Government?

MS. HARF: We've certainly raised it. We've certainly raised in general freedom of speech and expression with them directly. I'm happy to check and see if we've raised this specific arrest related to Tiananmen Square.

QUESTION: China for 400? (Laughter.) There --

MS. HARF: Should I go all day here?

QUESTION: Yeah. A senior advisor to the Chinese Government, but not a member of the Chinese Government or bureaucracy, has suggested that China is considering implementing an absolute cap on its carbon – on its CO2 emissions for 2016. And this is being taken, particularly after the White House announcement, as being a sign that there may be progress in those wider talks. Do you have any comment on what he said?

MS. HARF: I haven't seen those comments. I'm happy to check. Obviously, if this were to happen it would be, I think, probably a good thing. But let me check on the specifics. And then – I'm going to Lucas.

...

QUESTION: This is a slightly whimsical question --

MS. HARF: Uh-oh.

QUESTION: -- but I see a tweet suggesting that the U.S. ambassador to the United Kingdom has --

MS. HARF: You're asking about nap rooms, aren't you?

QUESTION: Yes. Is there anything to that?

MS. HARF: I was going to make a joke, but I'm not. Actually, I might still.

QUESTION: Do you have guidance on this?

MS. HARF: Yeah, I have guidance.

QUESTION: Amazing.

MS. HARF: And I wrote at the top: Our diplomats are tireless advocates for our foreign policy. It's pretty good, right? Nap room, tireless, no? Okay, fine. No one liked my joke.

QUESTION: I liked it.

MS. HART: Thank you, Elise. So yes, I do have guidance on this. In a private talk yesterday, U.S. employees at the Embassy in London – Arianna Huffington touted the productivity benefits of getting more sleep – something we can probably all attest to – and urged the ambassador to follow the Huffington Post example of installing nap rooms. The ambassador graciously and diplomatically said he would look into it. While we are not considering establishing nap rooms at Embassy London or any of our diplomatic missions at this time, we obviously think that work-life balance is important, and someday I will attempt to find it.

QUESTION: Thank you.

May 30, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Japan
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: I have a question about Shangri-La Dialogue. So Mr. Hagel said he will use the summit to raise issues where he think China is overplaying its hand and presenting new challenges. Do you have any comments, and what's your expectation about this dialogue?

MS. PSAKI: I would – I don't think I have anything to add to what Secretary Hagel offered.

...

QUESTION: Yesterday, you said in a comment about the Japanese aircraft and the Chinese jet fighters encounter.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: A follow-up on that: A Japanese defense minister today in Singapore met with the Chinese defense minister and asked Chinese to build maritime communication channel to avoid miscalculation. It seems like Chinese are super-reluctant, like saying Japan has to do more things before asking those kind of things. Do you have any comment on that?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have anything to add to what I stated yesterday, which is that we've seen the reports of the Chinese and Japanese aircraft in close proximity. We also urge all states to ensure that they respect the safety of aircraft in flight. As we've long stated for months now, we don't accept China's declaration of an ADIZ over the East China Sea, and we urge China not to implement it. So steps that are, again – contradict that, certainly we'd be opposed to.

...

QUESTION: One, on China, did you look – have you informed yourself about the Vice President's comments, his disparagement of Chinese innovation yesterday? And are you aware of any – or two days ago? And are you aware of any complaints from the Chinese about anything?

MS. PSAKI: Not aware of any, Matt.

...

QUESTION: I just to ask if you'd set a date for the S&ED?

QUESTION: Yes.

MS. PSAKI: We have been in touch with the Chinese about that, but we'll announce the date with Treasury and then when it's appropriate. I don't have any announcements.

May 29, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Japan
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Yeah, actually I asked you about this on Monday, I believe – not Monday but Tuesday – about the encounter between the Japanese and the Chinese fighter jets, and I just wanted to give you a chance to elaborate on your comments from earlier this week. Could you make a comment about the territoriality of the water they were in? Was it international waters or just --

MS. PSAKI: I don't. Well, I appreciate the opportunity.

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. PSAKI: I don't think I have anything to add to what I said the other day. You know where we stand on territorial – these territorial issues and where we don't take positions. So I don't know that I have anything to add to the other day.

QUESTION: Okay.

...

QUESTION: One of the things he said was that he challenged his audience to name one innovation produced by China, suggesting that the Chinese are not an innovative country, that they don't produce anything that's revolutionary or that would – I'm just wondering if people in the State Department think that this is an appropriate description of China, which is after all the inventor of quite a few things – gunpowder, printing press, the compass --

MS. PSAKI: Matt, I'm happy to go take a look at the full context of comments.

QUESTION: You haven't heard any complaints from the Chinese about this?

MS. PSAKI: Not that I'm aware of.

QUESTION: No?

MS. PSAKI: And I will say the Vice President has a great deal of pride in American innovation. So perhaps that's what he was speaking to.

QUESTION: One more.

MS. PSAKI: Okay, go ahead.

QUESTION: Sorry, sorry. So the question which I asked a couple days ago --

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: The Chinese assistants of Nikkei newspaper has detained two weeks ago. It's about -- she tried to have a contact with Pu Zhiqiang (inaudible). Do you have -- did you ask some --

MS. PSAKI: I don't have anything new to add.

May 27, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Japan/Vietnam

Washington, DC

QUESTION: So the Chinese and the Japanese fighter jets had a very close encounter over the weekend, and they're each accusing each other of taking provocative actions in regards to disputes in the East China Sea. Do you have any comments about that skirmish?

MS. PSAKI: I believe I do. Let's see.

Well, let me say first that – you're talking about the planes flying --

QUESTION: That's correct.

MS. PSAKI: -- clearly? Okay. Well, we believe that strong and constructive relations between countries in the region promote peace and stability – promoting peace and stability are in the interests and in the – of both countries as well as the United States. We encourage dialogue and diplomacy to resolve any areas of disagreement. That's what we feel is the appropriate step forward.

...

QUESTION: So a Vietnamese boat was sunk after a collision with a Chinese vessel in the South China Sea, and the Vietnamese have accused the Chinese vessel of intentionally colliding into the ship to sink it. So does the State Department have any comments on that? Do you assess that it was the fault of the Chinese for the sinking of the ship, or --

MS. PSAKI: Well, we're aware of the report of the sinking ship. We don't have independent information on that front, and so we're seeking additional information. We remain concerned about dangerous conduct and intimidation by vessels operating in this area by the Chinese. We continue to call on all parties to exercise restraint and take steps to lower the tensions and conduct themselves in a safe and, of course, professional manner.

QUESTION: And lastly, the Vietnamese media is reporting that the Chinese have augmented its South China Sea oil rig contingent with an attack missile boat and also a minesweeper. Has the State Department seen any indications to corroborate that?

MS. PSAKI: We're aware also of these reports. We're also seeking additional information. If China continues to maintain the rig and escalate tensions in these disputed waters, our position will remain the same, which is that these are provocative actions that continue to raise tensions and we'll continue to express concerns at the appropriate level.

QUESTION: (Inaudible) China?

QUESTION: You express concern about Chinese actions in the area; do you have any concern about Vietnamese actions? Do you believe that anything Vietnam has done is provocative?

MS. PSAKI: We --

QUESTION: I'm just curious if it's both sides or if it's just the Chinese who's --

MS. PSAKI: It's -- the provocative actions have largely been from the Chinese side.

QUESTION: Okay. And then when you say you're seeking additional information about this incident -- from whom? From the Vietnamese, from the Chinese? Do you -- from anybody?

MS. PSAKI: From any party that has additional information, Matt.

QUESTION: Okay. To the -- for -- to what end? I mean, will there be some kind of consequence if it's --

MS. PSAKI: Well, simply what I mean is we can't confirm the details because we don't have the -- I don't have those -- we don't have --

QUESTION: Okay. But it's not like some kind of an investigation that could have a policy implication or something.

MS. PSAKI: No, I wasn't inferring that.

QUESTION: Okay. All right.

MS. PSAKI: Obviously, as these continue to escalate, that continues to be concerning to all of us.

...

QUESTION: Yes. I'm not sure you are aware of this. The Chinese assistant of Nikkei newspaper in Chongqing bureau in China was detained about two weeks ago. According to the explanation of Chinese press department -- Beijing Chinese press department -- was she was suspected making some trouble in society or something like this. And I did -- it is reported that she's tried to have a contact with Pu Zhiqiang, who is a very famous lawyer and activist for freedom of press or democracy. Yeah, actually the suspect is the same as the Chinese assistant of Nikkei newspapers. How do you and does the United States see these issues and have some comment on this?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we are -- let me see if I have anything on this specific case. I'm not sure that I do, so why don't I talk to our team about that and see if we can get more clarification?

QUESTION: Okay. Thank you.

MS. PSAKI: Scott?

QUESTION: Chinese oil rigs.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: You're careful to say that the United States doesn't have a position on these disputed waters.

MS. PSAKI: Correct.

QUESTION: Does the United States have a position about the location of this Chinese oil rig being – is it 150 miles off shore, and is it within Vietnam's exclusive economic zone?

MS. PSAKI: We don't take a position on the sovereignty, as you know, of this area, so that hasn't changed. And I'm not going to speculate on kind of the distance between islands and what that means. Our issue here is about the provocative actions taken by the Chinese as it relates to the Vietnamese fishing boats and reports of aggression from their end. So again, we encourage the sides to maintain dialogue with each other, but we're not going to weigh in on speculation about their location and what it means.

QUESTION: Different – just a little different. I'm just wondering if planning for the S&ED is continuing apace?

MS. PSAKI: It is continuing, yes.

QUESTION: It is? Okay.

MS. PSAKI: Absolutely.

Any more on China? China. Go ahead.

QUESTION: Just (inaudible) Assistant Secretary Kin Moy came back. Does he said anything about this ongoing cyber thing having an active impact on the upcoming S&ED, John Kerry, Jack Lew is going? And also, do you have a comment on China's report yesterday on so-called U.S. Global Surveillance Record Report by the government international media research? Obviously, there's a lot of trading of accusations. This report accused the U.S. not just targeting Chinese government leaders, but also companies. I mean, Snowden also said the U.S. spying is not just to – for national security but for the national interest as well.

MS. PSAKI: Well, let me address your first question first. EAP Deputy Assistant Secretary Kin Moy returned last week from consultations and planning for the S&ED. Those were productive meetings, and they – he was – he certainly heard the concerns that they've had, that they've expressed publicly. But there are a range of issues that will be on the agenda, and planning is very much continuing as it relates to the S&ED.

I have not seen that report, so I can't speak specifically to it. I can check and see if we have a specific comment on it. Our intelligence activities are focused on the national security needs for our country. We collect signals intelligence exclusively where there's a foreign intelligence or counterintelligence purpose, and that is our process. But I will see if there's more we have to add on that specific report.

Ali.

QUESTION: And also on China, wanted to know if you saw and have response to a report from Friday that said a Chinese blogger who met with Secretary Kerry during his trip to China was arrested after he made critical remarks about Chinese propaganda laws and censorship.

MS. PSAKI: I had not seen that report. As you mentioned, the Secretary did meet with a range of bloggers while he was there. He very much enjoyed the conversation. We would be certainly concerned about arrests of individuals for simply speaking their mind, but we can look further into that as well.

...

QUESTION: I was wondering – yeah – if the Department had any comment on these reports that the Chinese Government is asking IBM to – or ordering IBM to stop using their own servers and use government-provided servers. Thank you.

MS. PSAKI: Well, we've seen that report. As we've said from the beginning, we expect the Chinese Government to understand that the Department of Justice's May 19th announcement relates to a law enforcement investigation of individuals who have allegedly stolen intellectual property from the U.S. businesses. It doesn't provide, in our view, any justification for retaliation against U.S. businesses or the U.S. Government. And we continue to believe that a dialogue about cyber-related issues and concerns we have and certainly concerns they have is the best path forward. And we're hopeful that is one we can resume in the future.

QUESTION: Well, but do --

MS. PSAKI: Follow, Nicole? Go ahead. Go ahead, Elise.

QUESTION: I mean, also though, just the fact that you made this kind of declaration about this investigation, I mean does – would it give you any confidence to use government-provided servers, given that you're looking at Chinese individuals for corporate espionage?

MS. PSAKI: Would the – it give the Chinese Government --

QUESTION: No. Would it – you. Would it give you – I mean, would you – even if you would consider such a move, I mean, would it – do you think that the U.S. should have any confidence in Chinese Government servers?

MS. PSAKI: In Chinese-issued servers?

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. PSAKI: Well, we take our own range of cyber precautions around the world, but I don't – I'm not sure – because these are IBM in China.

QUESTION: Right.

MS. PSAKI: They're not here.

QUESTION: Right. But IBM is a U.S. company. So --

MS. PSAKI: Understood. So sorry, repeat your question. Maybe I'm not understanding what you're asking.

QUESTION: No, I'm just wondering like – I mean, it sounds like on the face of it that would be – for any American company, given the fact that you're looking into possible Chinese espionage, that you would not have any kind of confidence in their servers to begin with?

MS. PSAKI: I don't want to speculate on that because I'm not a technology cyber expert up here. But --

QUESTION: Jen --

QUESTION: All right. Hold on. Just on this. You said that the indictments don't provide any justification for retaliation against the U.S. Government to --

MS. PSAKI: That's our view, yes.

QUESTION: I understand that's your view. But certainly you're not surprised that this kind of thing is happening, and surely you knew or should have expected that the Chinese would, in fact, take retaliatory action whether or not it's justified in your – in the mind of the Administration. No?

MS. PSAKI: Well, regardless, we don't feel it's justified, so that was the point I was making in response to Nicole's question.

QUESTION: No, I understand that. But I mean, it just goes to the whole announcement of these indictments which are never going to be prosecuted. It seems to have invited retaliation even when – even if you don't think it's justified. Is that not correct?

MS. PSAKI: We don't feel it's invited it. We feel that they should look at it as five individuals who allegedly --

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. PSAKI: -- violated the law --

QUESTION: And last one on --

MS. PSAKI: -- and that's why we're going after them. Go ahead.

QUESTION: And have you had -- made any progress in getting the Chinese to turn these five people over for prosecution?

MS. PSAKI: I --

QUESTION: Have you even tried since the --

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any update for you, Matt.

May 23, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Russia/Ukraine/South Korea
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: In an interview with – in St. Petersburg, he was asked about that President Obama is saying that he is lying about Russian involvement in Ukraine, and he said, who is he to judge, and that if he wants to be a judge, why doesn't he find a job in a court or something like that? So do you have any reaction to that?

MS. HARF: Well, first I would say that as the leader of the United States, he cares very deeply about international law and international norms. That's a big part of his job as the leader of this country, as our Commander-in-Chief, as someone who goes to the UN General Assembly every fall and talks to the rest of the countries in the world about how we all live up to our obligations and how we all play by the same rules and how we uphold international norms.

So I think that that's an exactly appropriate thing for him to comment on, and I would take notion with the fact that if there's no Russian involvement in Ukraine, pull the rest of your troops back then. Put your money where your words are. Come on.

QUESTION: Yeah, but the troops are on the Russian side of the border, correct?

MS. HARF: There are a number of troops amassed on the Russian side of the border. They've also annexed Crimea, which is part of Ukraine, and the separatists, the pro-Russian separatists, wreaking such havoc right now in the east have a great deal of influence in – are influenced a great deal by President Putin and by the Russian Government. So I think it just defies logic. A lot of things he said in that article do.

QUESTION: And about your sanctions, he said that, like, why?

MS. HARF: Because you don't get to break the rules and get away with it. That's not how it works. In 2014, you don't get to annex another country's land, amass your troops on the border, create instability – which, by the way, he also said something about how Crimea is unstable today because of our actions. Well, Crimea was stable before Russia annexed it. Let's remind people of that. It was calm. This all happened because of what the Russians did.

So I think that something that's very important to us, again, is the notion that there are rules, there's international norms, there's international law, and if you break them, there will be consequences. And what you've seen with Russia is the rest of the world united in saying that's not acceptable and that's not okay. And to be fair, there will be further consequences if this action escalates or continues.

QUESTION: Are these sanctions going to affect the deal with China?

MS. HARF: The gas deal?

QUESTION: Yeah.

MS. HARF: Our sanctions? I don't know how ours would. I mean, you heard the Secretary speak about this in his press avail in Mexico. This is something that's been – they've been talking about for a decade, don't really see it related to this. But I think what you have seen is Russia increasingly isolated from the rest of the international system by our sanctions, by EU sanctions. You really have seen them start to be cut off, and that's not what the Russian people want. That's not what's best for the Russian economy. And we've said if there are further actions, we're looking at other sanctions, including sectoral sanctions.

QUESTION: Change of subject?

QUESTION: Well, hold on. I just want to – we have seen them become more isolated? I mean, President Putin just had a huge international conference.

MS. HARF: Their economy has become much more isolated. Their credit ranking has gone down.

QUESTION: Right.

MS. HARF: They aren't – their money is – their currency is falling. They aren't able to do business in many places they wanted to be able to do before. Yes, and that will increasingly become the case. Businesses don't want to do business there. They can bring people together for a conference; that doesn't mean people will want to do business with Russia today.

QUESTION: Okay. Well, I mean, that may be the case.

MS. HARF: Yeah.

QUESTION: I just don't – is there anything that you have to back that up?

MS. HARF: Well, I think the statistics we've seen from their economic indicators have been increasingly negative since this started, so --

QUESTION: Well, I mean, I noticed that --

MS. HARF: I haven't seen anything tangible to come out of the St. Petersburg event in terms of changing their economic outlook.

QUESTION: Well, I mean, they just signed an \$800 billion gas deal with China, so --

MS. HARF: Right, which they've been talking about for 10 years, and again, doesn't change our assessment of their economic situation.

QUESTION: No, I – right. Okay. But you’re not aware if there are new statistics that would show this isolation?

MS. HARF: I think we’ve seen it in the statistics for the last few months. I haven’t seen anything otherwise, no.

QUESTION: Right, but what I’m talking about is I haven’t heard from – at least from the U.S. Government, from you guys or Treasury or the White House, any new – I mean, after the China gas deal went through, I mean, at least Gazprom stock went up.

MS. HARF: I don’t think it has – I don’t think it’s changed our long – or medium-term projections about the Russian economy in any way. And I think one thing to keep in mind is in some ways, this is a medium-term and long-term game, right, that the Russian economy – the longer sanctions are in place, the more damage they do to your economy. We’ve seen that other places as well.

QUESTION: Well, you’re referring to Iran.

MS. HARF: In one instance, yeah. So the longer sanctions are in place, the more damage they do, the more isolated you become. We put more on; other countries put more on. And that’s not the direction that we think is best for the Russian economy, but that’s their choice to make.

QUESTION: Change of subject?

QUESTION: Are you concerned that this gas deal may actually bring the Russians and the Chinese much closer together, and they can actually ally themselves with countries like Iran and other places – and other --

MS. HARF: I think that’s a really simplistic read of it, Said. I think this is something they’ve been working on for 10 years. It’s a business deal, quite frankly. Russia needs some of these resources. So I don’t think in any way geopolitically or strategically it changes the question you asked right there.

...

QUESTION: How do you describe the current situation of South Korea – South China Sea? Secretary Kerry urged China to stop unilateral --

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: -- introduction of oil with numerous amount of vessel. Do you think that China took some constructive movement, action after that?

MS. HARF: Well, we have seen what I would call at this point a pattern of unilateral moves by the Chinese Government in the region. We’ve talked about them with the oil rig; we’ve talked about them in other cases as well. And what we said is this is not the way we need to do business

there, that we need to resolve disputes through diplomatic means. Again, going back to this notion of international norms, international rules of the road. There are ways we manage disputes, and it's not by provocative actions, it's not by escalatory actions. And unfortunately, we've seen China take a number of those steps recently.

We're working with them, talking to them, and to our other partners in the region about how we can maybe get to a better place.

May 22, 2014

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

MS. PSAKI: United States strongly condemns the violent terrorist attack today, May 22nd, against innocent citizens in a market area near People's Park in Urumqi in the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region of China. We offer our deepest condolences and sympathies to the victims, their families, and all of those affected by this tragedy.

...

QUESTION: So just to clarify, it is the determination of the State Department that this was a terrorist attack?

MS. PSAKI: That is what I stated in my statement.

QUESTION: And is the State Department getting concerned – because this latest attack seems to be part of a pattern of escalating attacks within the province, is there a concern that there are going to be further attacks or the implications if this continues?

MS. PSAKI: Well, based on the information reported by the Chinese media, this appears to be an act of terrorism targeting random members of the public. We don't have further information about the attack, so I wouldn't want to draw any conclusions about its meaning.

QUESTION: And lastly, has there been any anti-terror cooperation with the Chinese or any plans to engage in it?

MS. PSAKI: We engage with the Chinese on a range of issues. I don't have anything specifically new to announce today.

QUESTION: Except for cyber security.

MS. PSAKI: We do – we – our preference is to engage on cyber security.

...

QUESTION: One on Vietnam. We have a story out of Hanoi quoting the Vietnamese prime minister as saying that Vietnam will take various steps to defend itself in the territorial disputes with China, including potentially taking legal action under international law. The Administration has long taken the position that this should be resolved through international law. Is taking some kind of legal action the kind of thing you'd like to see Vietnam do?

MS. PSAKI: I have not had a chance to talk to our team about this, Arshad. As you know, our belief – bottom line here is that dialogue between the parties is the right path forward. But it's a fair question and I will check with them and see if we have anything further to convey.

May 21, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Russia

Washington, DC

QUESTION: There was a report yesterday, which I believe you've seen, that that State Department denied visas or did not act on visas for a bunch of Chinese scientists who were supposed to attend a space – some kind of a space – outer space conference in Colorado last week. The – according to the report, the president of this – the CEO of the group that was organizing this, the Space Foundation, said that this was – that you didn't do it because you knew of these pending indictments from the Justice Department and that is the reason why.

Can you say, without getting into anything that would violate visa confidentiality, whether or not this report is correct, that the visas were denied or simply not acted on? And secondly, if it's true, was it related, in fact, to the indictments being announced?

MS. PSAKI: Well, the visa law and limitations do significantly tie my hands. As you know, these records are confidential and we can't confirm details about these applications. But what I can say, broadly, is that millions of people from China apply for visas to the United States every single year, and I would caution anyone from drawing a connection between two events related to our relationship with China, even though chronologically they may appear to have taken place in the same timeframe.

QUESTION: The two events here you're talking about are the denial of visas and the announcement of the indictments?

MS. PSAKI: Right, because visas are adjudicated on an individual basis. There's a range of criteria, as you know.

QUESTION: Now, have you all made a formal request to the Chinese for them to turn over these five indictees?

MS. PSAKI: I would point you to the Department of Justice for any formal steps in the Department of Justice law enforcement process.

QUESTION: So more broadly, in the absence of an extradition treaty with a country, is it the Justice Department that does this on its own? It doesn't go through State? Is that what you're saying?

MS. PSAKI: There is obviously an interagency process for a range of these steps, but I don't have that level of detail. They're the lead, so they're still the appropriate place to inquire.

QUESTION: In a case of a normal extradition request, am I not correct in thinking that you are the transmitter of that request? It starts at Justice, they give it to you, and then you go to the foreign ministry or wherever --

MS. PSAKI: That's my understanding, but --

QUESTION: Is that not the case in this situation since there's no extradition treaty?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any additional information, and as you know, in normal cases we also don't discuss the specific timing of those steps, so --

QUESTION: Unless it's Manuel Noriega.

MS. PSAKI: There are exceptions to every rule.

QUESTION: Exactly. Well, so I thought I'd ask is --

MS. PSAKI: Go ahead.

QUESTION: Could you make an exception in this rule? And the other thing is: Have you contacted Interpol on behalf of the Justice Department about --

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any other detail. Again, I don't expect we will. I'm happy to circle back and see if there's anything more we can share on those steps.

...

QUESTION: You probably saw today that Putin has signed and China have signed a large \$400 billion gas deal at a time when the U.S. and the West is trying to put a squeeze on Russia regarding Ukraine. Is this in any way -- I mean, he doesn't -- you can put as many sanctions on him as you want to. A \$400 billion gas deal is pretty lucrative at this time. Does this in any affect your strategy on how you're going to influence him in any way?

MS. PSAKI: It does not. Russia and China, as many of you know, have been negotiating for more than a decade about a natural gas deal. I know there have been a range of reports about whether it's been locked in or hasn't been locked in, and so obviously I don't have any conformation of what the specifics are. But energy is a global market. There are always new deals getting signed, particularly with major consumers and producers like China and Russia, and so we will continue to pursue our strategy as it relates to putting pressure on Russia.

QUESTION: So even if you put sectoral sanctions on Russia, I mean, they could still go ahead with this and Russia could be fine.

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think it depends on what those look like. And obviously, I don't want to speculate on that given that decision hasn't yet been made.

QUESTION: Do you think it's the right moment to -- for China to make this agreement, Gazprom agreement? Is this --

MS. PSAKI: Again, energy is a global market and there are negotiations about deals happening all over the world, especially between major consumers and major producers and that looks like – it looks like the discussion was about exactly that. Again, I don't know the specifics of what's been finalized or not between the two countries.

QUESTION: Is it safe to say that the development makes it even safer to say that China is not cooperating with the United States in the effort to affect Putin's calculus vis-a-vis Ukraine?

MS. PSAKI: It is not. Our view is, again, that there are – these negotiations have been going on for about 10 years, and certainly there are decisions that China needs to make, many countries make, based on their economic needs, their energy needs. But they continue – as you know, they signed a joint statement yesterday about intervention, and so we're hopeful that the Russians will follow through with that.

QUESTION: So since money is fungible, isn't it safe to say, though, that a deal like this, which is going to pump all kinds of money into Kremlin coffers, serves to offset the impact of the sanctions that the U.S. and its European allies have been imposing? Isn't that indisputable?

MS. PSAKI: Well, James, I'm not an economist and I'm not aware that you are either, although who knows? And I think we've already seen from --

QUESTION: One of your many talents.

MS. PSAKI: One of his many hidden talents. That's his next book coming out. But --

QUESTION: My talents are not so hidden, but let's proceed.

MS. PSAKI: Okay. What we have seen by the economic consequences we've already put in place, that even with a range of individuals and financial entities we've seen a dramatic impact on the Russian economy. So whether this specific deal, if there is a deal, would impact, I don't think we're prepared to jump to that conclusion. We still believe we have a range of tools at our disposal. The executive orders the President has signed has given us those, and we're prepared to put in place consequences if needed, as the Vice President said just yesterday.

QUESTION: Is it a welcome development?

MS. PSAKI: Again, I think it's not a development that we are spending a great deal of time focusing on. We believe that there are deals that countries have been negotiating around the world for years, and in this case a decade. It's a global market and we'll continue to work toward our goals as it relates to our relationship with China and our concerns about Russia.

...

QUESTION: Well, it's just more broadly, though, are you at all – is the administration at all concerned about this – what appears to be a growing closeness between the Chinese and the Russians at a time when you were hoping to exploit what had appeared to be a rift over the

situation in Ukraine, specifically regarding Crimea, with the Chinese abstention in the Security Council?

MS. PSAKI: Matt, our view is that there are global relationships that many countries have – Russia and China, the United States and Russia, the United States and China – and we – it is not a surprise to us that countries that are relative neighbors would be communicating about how to work together.

QUESTION: They are neighbors.

MS. PSAKI: Okay – neighbors – communicating about how to work together, whether that's through an economic partnership or otherwise.

QUESTION: Okay. Well, you mentioned three relationships there: United States-Russia, United States-China, Russia-China.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Of those three, which one do you think is the most robust at the moment?

MS. PSAKI: I --

QUESTION: Which one is getting – which one is improving and which one is – which ones are not improving?

MS. PSAKI: I appreciate the opportunity to rank, which obviously I'm not going to take you up on. But --

QUESTION: Well, let's put it this way.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Since the announcement of the indictments on Monday, have cooperation and coordination with China improved?

MS. PSAKI: Well, actually, Matt, Kin Moy was just in China – he may actually still be there now – for planning discussions about the S&ED talks that we have upcoming that are a very important part of our strategic relationship with China.

QUESTION: I mean, it was an honest question. Can you say – is that an improvement in relations or is the suspension of the cyber working group, which of course this is all about, is that problematic to you? And can you say that your relations with Russia are on a good footing right now?

MS. PSAKI: I think it's – we've clearly expressed our concerns about steps Russia has taken. But at the same time, we're still working with them on a range of global priorities, whether that's

the P5+1 negotiations, continue to pressure on the Syrian regime as it relates to chemical weapons removal. And again, preparations are ongoing for the S&ED talks upcoming in July, and we had high-level personnel on the ground there in the last couple of days.

QUESTION: Okay. So you would say the Administration overall is pleased with Russian cooperation on Syria, or Russian cooperation on Syria only as it relates to chemical weapons?

MS. PSAKI: I don't think we've made a secret of our concerns as it relates to broad challenges, as with Syria and moving the ball forward, and Russia and the fact that they could do more. But we have been working together on CW removal and that continues.

QUESTION: How about the Chinese in the specific cases of Syria and Ukraine? Have they been – have they been helpful to what you believe is the correct path forward?

MS. PSAKI: You're familiar with the last steps the Chinese took as it related to the UN Security Council vote, their broad views on intervention. There was a joint statement signed yesterday. So again, we work with a range of global partners, including China and Russia, on issues where we agree. We express concerns when we disagree, whether that's through diplomatic steps, legal steps. There's a range of tools we can use.

...

QUESTION: How about Chinese cooperation on cyber? How much progress had you actually made since the launch of this cyber working group a year ago?

MS. PSAKI: Well, it was just launched a year ago, and clearly because this is a concern that the President, Secretary Kerry, others in the Administration have had growing concerns about. And there are a range of tools that we can use to make those concerns known. There are diplomatic tools; there are legal tools, obviously through the Justice Department. So this is evidence of our ongoing concern about the actions of China. But we believe dialogue is the right way to proceed forward, and we certainly hope that that is the path we can proceed down.

QUESTION: So would it be correct to surmise that you hadn't made enough progress in the cyber working group, which is why you decided to go ahead with the --

MS. PSAKI: No, it's not. It's not. Dialogue and having this discussion with the Chinese is obviously an important part of our strategy given this is – there have been rising concerns over the last couple of years about cyber security. That was a mechanism for doing that. But these are individuals who broke law – broke the law by stealing U.S. trade secrets. And so it's not one or the other. There are a range of paths that we're pursuing and will continue to as it relates to this issue.

...

QUESTION: Did you give the Chinese authorities a heads-up that these indictments were coming then?

MS. PSAKI: We did. I talked about this a little bit yesterday. As part of our – we routinely approach foreign governments prior to unsealing indictments to request their assistance. And obviously the State Department is involved in communicating with foreign governments, and this case is no different.

QUESTION: But so you did request assistance.

MS. PSAKI: In terms of – as – in terms of dealing with the process moving forward, absolutely. Yes.

QUESTION: Okay. Well, but such assistance, in this case, I mean, I can't imagine it would be anything other than turning them over. Right?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I'm not going to get into any greater level of detail.

QUESTION: Well, but assistance in this – would it be wrong to assume, even if you don't want to say it, that when you asked for assistance, what you mean is, "Give us these guys to try"?

MS. PSAKI: Certainly when individuals are indicted, then our hope is that they will be turned over to face legal action. Yes.

QUESTION: And should we – is it safe to assume then that such a desire would be communicated to the Chinese --

MS. PSAKI: I'm not going to --

QUESTION: -- when you asked for assistance?

MS. PSAKI: -- get into any greater level of detail about our communications.

QUESTION: I have one on a China-related topic.

MS. PSAKI: China? Okay, go ahead.

QUESTION: Yes. So during his keynote speech at the CICA summit, Xi Jinping said without acknowledging any specific countries that beefing up an entrenched military alliance aimed at a third party is not conducive to maintaining common security. And that echoes a sentiment recently expressed in an opinion piece published in Chinese state media that says that Asia is home of the Asians. So I wanted to know if you can respond to that, and do you think that there is a role for the U.S. in Asian security?

MS. PSAKI: I think most countries in Asia, including China, would say that there is. And so – and that's an important part of the dialogue we have with a range of countries in Asia. So I think that ongoing dialogue answers your question.

Do we have any more on China? Lesley, go ahead.

QUESTION: I thought I should just double-check again that there's – that the dialogue is still going ahead next --.

MS. PSAKI: Yes. We just – and let me get the specifics here because I mentioned it, but --

QUESTION: Any cyber security part of that?

MS. PSAKI: Well, the Chinese have made their own comments about that. But deputy – EAP Deputy Assistant Secretary Kin Moy just completed meetings in Beijing to discuss S&ED planning with his Chinese counterparts, and there's a range of issues that will certainly be on the agenda this upcoming July.

QUESTION: Would you think that the tensions over the cyber security would be – that that would be a good place for you to raise them, even if the Chinese don't want to?

MS. PSAKI: Well, it was planned to be on the agenda. We're certainly open to it being on the agenda, but there are also a range of issues that can be discussed.

QUESTION: Or do you know, did the Chinese raise this issue in the talks that the deputy assistant secretary had?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any additional readout. I can check and see if there is more we would convey.

QUESTION: But did he report back to Washington that everything is going along just fine, and with the exception of this one working group?

MS. PSAKI: We are proceeding as planned as – in planning for the July S&ED talks.

QUESTION: Do you have a date, a precise date for those yet?

MS. PSAKI: I do not. We will wait to announce that, of course, with our friends over at the Treasury Department. I expect hopefully we'll have more on that in the coming days.

QUESTION: Around July 32nd or 3rd?

MS. PSAKI: 32nd? Ha ha. (Laughter.) Got it.

May 20, 2014

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

QUESTION: And I'm wondering if you got answers to the questions I had about whether or not there was coordination between the State Department and the Department of Justice on the indictments of these five Chinese computer – alleged computer hackers.

MS. PSAKI: Well, the State Department did receive advance notice of the law enforcement action. The United States routinely approaches foreign governments prior to unsealing indictments to request their assistance. The State Department is involved in communicating with foreign governments on these matters. This case was consistent with that approach so it shouldn't have come as no surprise.

QUESTION: Okay. So in other words, what you're saying is the Department of Justice came to you and said we're going to do this, and you said – the building said okay, and then you went and told the Chinese – before the announcement? Is that --

MS. PSAKI: That's not – well, that is --

QUESTION: Well, it --

MS. PSAKI: -- about the timeline of things, yes.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. PSAKI: We consult with governments on a regular basis as the State Department.

QUESTION: Did the State Department think that it was a good idea to do this?

MS. PSAKI: As – Matt, as I said yesterday, this announcement is consistent with the concerns that we have expressed publicly many times about the actions of China as it relates to cyber security, and we certainly are supportive of this announcement.

QUESTION: Okay. Given the reaction of the Chinese Government to indictments that even the Justice Department doesn't think it will ever be able to prosecute, and the fact that it happened as President Putin was flying to China, can you explain how this was not an – what seems to be just an epic timing disaster?

MS. PSAKI: Well, Matt, again, we are supportive of steps taken – the President has been supportive, the Secretary has been supportive – as it relates to stating concerns and taking actions as it relates to concerns about China's actions. And this is consistent with that.

QUESTION: Okay. But you are – correct me if I’m wrong – seeking Chinese help, cooperation on any number of issues, ranging from North Korea to Iran to Syria to wherever. Is that right? Even Ukraine.

MS. PSAKI: We are. But that doesn’t change the fact, Matt, that with China or any country, when we have concerns or are – when there is a law enforcement action that needs to be taken, that still precedes.

QUESTION: And at the same time, you are engaged in preparatory discussions for the S&ED, which is going on.

MS. PSAKI: We are.

QUESTION: So I don’t know. I just find it very difficult to believe that the State Department would say to the Justice Department: Okay, yeah, this is a good idea; let’s announce these indictments, which we’re never going to prosecute; it’s just for show. As the Attorney General said, this is a wakeup call to the Chinese. And you just basically drove the Chinese into Putin’s arms. You’re not --

MS. PSAKI: I think that is combining a few things, in our view. The – President Putin is on a trip to attend the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia. Obviously, any country – including Russia – can, of course, establish good relations with any country they choose. Our view here and the view of, of course, the Justice Department, was that these illegal actions required – activities required action. And we’re hopeful that we can maintain a dialogue with China about cyber security and a range of other issues.

QUESTION: Well, okay. So you’re hopeful that you can maintain a dialogue. The Chinese have canceled it – suspended the working group, so that’s not happening. The Chinese and the Russians put out a joint statement today about Ukraine, which has certainly got to be disappointing to you, since you were hoping to exploit what was – what some people perceived to be as a rift between the Chinese and the Russians.

I just don’t understand how someone in this building didn’t say to the Attorney General: This is incredibly shortsighted. If we must announce indictments of people that we know is going – that we know are going to infuriate the Chinese and make them less likely to cooperate, and at the same time we also know that we’re never going to prosecute them because the Chinese are never going to turn them over – I don’t understand how someone didn’t say: Wait, this is not a good idea; Putin is flying there right now; this is going to make the Chinese more willing to deal with him. And two, the S&ED is being – the Strategic and Economic Dialogue is being prepared right now. The Secretary and Secretary Lew are heading to China in six weeks. How is this not really shortsighted? Why not wait to announce these indictments, which you’re never going to be able to prosecute, until after at least the S&ED?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we expect China to understand that these are a handful of individuals who have broken the law and that’s why (inaudible).

QUESTION: Right. Well, given the fact that they've protested, that they've suspended this dialogue, and now they're talking about military – there'll be military – ramifications for military cooperation, do you – and they've hauled your ambassador in to be – to hear their complaints. The Chinese ambassador has come here to complain. How did it go?

MS. PSAKI: The views of the Chinese were shared with our ambassador and I'll simply leave it at that.

QUESTION: And you still expect the Chinese are going to be cooperative with you after this?

MS. PSAKI: We believe there are a range of issues that we work closely together on.

Go ahead. Another one. Oh, sorry --

QUESTION: And you haven't seen – so you haven't – well, you haven't seen any deterioration in the relationship since yesterday when this announcement was made?

MS. PSAKI: Again, Matt, we've seen the concerns they've expressed. We believe we have a relationship on a range of important economic, strategic security issues. And we're looking forward to the S&ED.

Go ahead.

QUESTION: All right.

QUESTION: A follow up. So according to the Chinese Foreign Ministry, the U.S. Ambassador to China was summoned yesterday, after the announcement of indictment. And according to the statement about this meeting – it says the U.S. has long been involved in cyber security activities, including against China. And the U.S. – and the Chinese Government demands the U.S. Government to make a clear explanation about what it has done and immediately stop such activities. So I wonder, are you considering kind of making explanations? And how will you deal with these demands?

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, I would reiterate what I said yesterday, which is that we expect the Chinese Government to understand that yesterday's announcement relates to a law enforcement investigation of individuals who have stolen intellectual property from United States businesses. And there are a range of senior officials who have spoken to this from the United States Government, and I would leave it at their comments.

QUESTION: As you already mentioned, I – we understood this case is mainly handled by the DOJ.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: But obviously we can see that the elements of Sino-U.S. relations are deeply involved in this case. So in this case, which is in your field, of course, so will you work with

DOJ? Will you communicate with DOJ about this case? And so also, besides conducting dialogue with the Chinese Government, will you make other efforts to solve this problem?

MS. PSAKI: Well, this is a law enforcement action. As I stated a few minutes ago, we received advanced notice of the law enforcement action given the role the United States routinely approaches – plays in approaching foreign governments prior to unsealing indictments.

Again, we have a range of means of communicating with the Chinese, and we expect those will continue.

QUESTION: As we know, there is a – the Chinese Government wants you guys to withdraw the indictment. So you said that dialogue is very important with the Chinese Government, but in these dialogues, how will you address this issue? How will negotiate with them? What's your direction? You are trying to withdraw this case or persuade the Chinese Government --

MS. PSAKI: Again, it's a DOJ action --

QUESTION: -- to bring people back to the States?

MS. PSAKI: Sorry – DOJ action. DOJ action. It's consistent with the statements that the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and many across the Administration have made about our concerns. We believe dialogue is the best path to continuing our relationship, and so we're – we expect that will continue.

QUESTION: Also I wonder: Have you talked with the Chinese Government since yesterday, communicated with --

MS. PSAKI: Since yesterday? Obviously, we have a large embassy presence on the ground. As you know, the ambassador himself was speaking with the Chinese Government. So yes, we have been in touch with them.

QUESTION: Can I just you very --

QUESTION: Any details about the dialogue? Any details about --

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any more details. No, I'm not going to read those out.

Go ahead.

QUESTION: Very briefly, do you know – did anyone from this building suggest to DOJ that the timing of this was not – might not be appropriate? Do you know?

MS. PSAKI: I'm just not going to read out any internal deliberations or discussions, Matt.

QUESTION: Okay. Because the impression that you're leaving, and maybe you intend to leave it, is that the State Department was fully on board with this, knowing the kind of reaction that it

would provoke from the Chinese, knowing that the president of Russia who you're involved in a huge debacle with over Ukraine was going there and knowing that you have – were in the midst of very important preparations for the Security and Economic Dialogue. Is that correct?

MS. PSAKI: Well, those were pieces that you stated, not me.

QUESTION: Well, those are just facts.

MS. PSAKI: I said they were consistent – this action was consistent with comments we've made and concerns we've expressed.

QUESTION: Well, I understand that. But no one in this building thought that it might be better for the Department of Justice, if they were going to go ahead with this at some point and issue indictments that they're never going to be prosecuted, that they might wait? There was no suggestion like that?

MS. PSAKI: I'm just not going to get into internal deliberations.

QUESTION: The problem is – I understand that you don't want to get into internal deliberations. I think that you're gamely taking the heat here. But if there's something else going on behind the scenes, it would be very helpful to know, because it just looks like what I said before. I mean, it looks like an epic failure – or an – not an epic failure but an epic mistake in terms of timing. It seems to have not accomplished anything, and in fact, made the situation worse.

MS. PSAKI: I think it – again, it was an action taken by the Department of Justice that's consistent with the concerns we've expressed.

QUESTION: Jen, do you see the dialogue going ahead?

MS. PSAKI: The S&ED? Yes, absolutely.

...

QUESTION: Yeah, on President Putin's trip to China. And at the same time that China and Russia is having a military exercise in East China Sea, and it is reported that it is the first time – it's in East China Sea. Do you have some comment? And it is reported that this exercise is a kind of reaction against President Obama's Asian trip and rebalance to Asia. And I'm just wondering, how do you comment on that?

MS. PSAKI: I'm not going to speculate on that. Obviously, as I stated a few minutes ago, we believe Russia should seek to establish good relations with all of its neighbors. I would note that they issued a joint statement, and in that statement they called on all states to not interfere in other countries' internal affairs. And in that spirit, we again would call for Russia to stop its efforts to destabilize Ukraine.

QUESTION: Yes, on (inaudible).

MS. PSAKI: China?

QUESTION: Yes, on China. You referenced this earlier, but leaders across Asia are meeting for what's called the Conference on Interaction and Confidence-Building Measures in Asia. Do you have any comments on that conference?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any particular comment. No, I think it's a conference that many Asian countries – obviously, President Putin is attending, but I would point you to the attendees and the host for any specifics on it.

QUESTION: So the Russian president will be participating, but he'll be meeting with Xi Jinping. Are there any concerns that this could be used as an opportunity to isolate the U.S.?

MS. PSAKI: Again, Russia should seek to establish good relations with all of its neighbors. Obviously, we have our own relationships with China and a range of countries in the region.

QUESTION: Can I just go back to – considering you say that the dialogue would still – you're still – it's still likely to go ahead, do you think that this will – is that – that would be a good place to resolve these tensions? Is there any talk of maybe delaying that dialogue?

MS. PSAKI: There's no talk of that at this point. And again, there's a range of important issues that we work together with the Chinese on, whether it's issues that fall in the rubric of this building or the Treasury Department. And we expect we can have a full agenda at the S&ED conference.

...

QUESTION: Yeah, I mean, I – what is so new about China conducting industrial espionage against the United States? Or have you reached the point where enough is enough? I mean, is that what it is? I mean --

MS. PSAKI: Well, Said, we've --

QUESTION: -- have they not done that, like, for decades?

MS. PSAKI: We've consistently expressed our concern. So this is actually consistent with that. And this action by the Department of Justice is – relates to a handful of individuals who have violated the law.

QUESTION: (Off-mike) have a full agenda at the S&ED, does that mean you're hoping the Chinese will change their mind on the cyber security --

MS. PSAKI: Well, we'd certainly welcome that and we regret the decision they made. We think the discussion on cyber issues is important, of course.

QUESTION: I know. But right now, as of this moment right now, you expect that that – that there will be discussions on cyber security as part of the S&ED?

MS. PSAKI: That was on the original agenda.

QUESTION: I know, but --

MS. PSAKI: I understand. I can't make a prediction about whether they will be open to it in the next six weeks, but certainly we'd support that.

QUESTION: Okay. But if it gets taken off the agenda, which it seems to have been already, that's not – I mean, you're still ready to go even if they won't – even if they refuse to discuss this issue with you?

MS. PSAKI: Yeah. And there are a range of ways that we can discuss a range of issues, including cyber security.

QUESTION: Okay. So – I just want to – from the U.S. point of view, this is not an S&ED breaker?

MS. PSAKI: Correct.

QUESTION: Okay.

May 19, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Russia
Washington, DC

QUESTION: I want to start with the Justice Department's announcement from this morning. I've got a couple questions about it.

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: But the first one is: Have you asked the Chinese – I realize that this is a Justice Department thing, but you guys – this building is the courier, as it will – if you will – for extradition requests, that kind of thing. I don't believe there is a treaty. But have you asked the Chinese to hand over these five guys?

MS. PSAKI: Well, as you would expect and you predicted in your question, for specific questions related to this announcement I'd refer you to the Department of Justice. As you know, we don't speak to extradition requests regardless. But you may have other questions on this issue. Go ahead.

QUESTION: Yeah. Well, I – was the State Department involved at all or consulted at all by the Department of Justice in – or the Treasury Department that you know of?

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any level of detail on that. I can check on that and see if there's more to share.

QUESTION: Okay. Do you expect – the Justice Department says it expects – and I use that because they – I think they used the word "expect" – the Chinese to cooperate in this. Do you?

MS. PSAKI: We certainly would support the statements made by our DOJ colleagues, yes.

QUESTION: So you believe that the Chinese should turn over these guys?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we expect the Chinese Government to understand that today's announcement relates to the law enforcement investigation of individuals who have stolen intellectual property from U.S. businesses. It does not mean – we continue to believe – and this is relevant to us, our role here at the State Department – that we can have a constructive and productive relationship with China. We're ready to work with China to prevent these types of activities from continuing.

QUESTION: Right. But do you expect them – do you honestly think that the Chinese are going to look at the – read the indictment and say, "Wow, arrest these guys and send them over here to stand trial"? Do you really think that they're going to do that?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I'm not sure it will play out exactly that way, Matt.

QUESTION: All right. So the point I'm --

MS. PSAKI: But we do support the statements, of course, made by our DOJ colleague.

QUESTION: All right. But the point, I guess, is it doesn't look like this is going to have any impact at all on these guys. You're not going to get them. They're not going to be tried. So the impact would seem to be purely a negative one from the State Department's point of view -- at least correct me if I'm wrong. The Chinese have reacted very angrily, as you might expect. They've said that they're canceling the working group on cyber --

QUESTION: Working group.

QUESTION: -- yeah, cyber working group. So if it's clear to people that they're not going to hand these guys over and that they're never going to stand trial, what was the -- how could this building possibility have gone along with or agreed to something that really just unnecessarily puts a major crimp in the relationship?

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, Matt, this was a DOJ action. Obviously --

QUESTION: So you weren't consulted or you were?

MS. PSAKI: I will check and see if there's more to say on that question, but this was a DOJ action. It is consistent with the concerns we've candidly raised with the Chinese Government on these issues. So today's announcement reflects -- is consistent with those growing concerns. At the same time we believe that dialogue around these issues is something that we should continue to have and we believe we can have with the Chinese.

QUESTION: So do you have a specific reaction? Are you disappointed that they've decided to suspend --

MS. PSAKI: We do. We regret China's decision on the suspension of activities of the working group, but we continue to believe that dialogue is an essential part of resolving these and other cyber security concerns.

QUESTION: Do you agree with the Chinese that you -- that the U.S. has displayed a lack of sincerity in solving issues related to cyber security?

MS. PSAKI: We certainly would not.

QUESTION: No?

MS. PSAKI: We, again, believe that open and frank dialogue with -- on these issues is the best way forward.

QUESTION: The Chinese statement says that it is – “It is a fact known to all that relevant U.S. institutions have long been involved on large scale and organized cyber theft, as well as wiretapping and surveillance activities against foreign political leaders, companies, and individuals. China is a victim of severe U.S. cyber theft, wiretapping, and surveillance activities.” It goes on.

Is that correct?

MS. PSAKI: Well, our intelligence activities are focused on the national security interests of the United States.

QUESTION: So you --

MS. PSAKI: Obviously, again, we believe there should be a continuing dialogue on these issues with China which is why we’ve been so supportive of a working group.

QUESTION: So you cannot deny that – these allegations. Or can you? I don’t know, I’m just asking if you --

MS. PSAKI: We collect signals intelligence exclusively where there is a foreign intelligence or counterintelligence (inaudible).

QUESTION: So in fact – so you agree with the Chinese statement on this, but you don’t agree that you have shown a – that it is – displays a lack of sincerity on your part.

MS. PSAKI: I think I have made clear we believe that while this is a DOJ action, it’s consistent with our concerns we’ve expressed.

QUESTION: Okay. Last one: Do you expect the S&ED to go ahead as planned?

MS. PSAKI: We do, and we certainly think there’s a broad array of issues that can be discussed.

QUESTION: Including this one?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we again regret China’s decision, and we have two months, I believe, or about that, until the S&ED. So --

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. PSAKI: -- we’re hopeful we’ll continue to have that discussion.

Go ahead, Jo.

QUESTION: In that statement, they also – the Chinese also accuse the United States of manufacturing this evidence against the five people that they have indicted. Would you like to reply to that?

MS. PSAKI: I would point you to the Department of Justice for any specifics on this particular case.

QUESTION: And just to follow up: The timing's curious, because the S&ED was announced the backend – middle of last week, and now we – beginning of this week, we have this DOJ announcement. Just to follow up on Matt's **QUESTION:** How in six weeks' time, I think it is, will you be able to hold a comprehensive dialogue with your Chinese counterparts in Beijing when this – these charges have just been unveiled against five of their military?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I would remind you that obviously, the S&ED is a regular meeting that we have with China, with our – the Department of Treasury and the economic counterparts in China. And there's been a discussion about dates for several months now. So I wouldn't relate the two, but certainly we believe that there is a robust conversation we can have about a range of issues. We regret, of course, the decision about the suspension of activities related to the cyber working group, but we continue to believe that dialogue on these important issues is the best way forward.

QUESTION: But the working group was actually launched at one of these SEDs.

MS. PSAKI: That's true.

QUESTION: I think it was either the last year or the year before in Beijing. I don't remember exactly which. So it's a relatively new body that arose out of the talks that you have at this level. The fact that they've now suspended their participation in the cyber working group doesn't augur very well for the outcome of S&ED talks in Beijing in July.

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, Jo – and I'm sure we'll talk about this more as we get closer and preparatory meetings continue for the S&ED – but as you know, there's a broad agenda that is discussed and focused on at the S&ED. We have some time here. Obviously, a discussion around cyber issues is one that we think is important in a range of formats.

QUESTION: Can I just ask if Secretary Kerry has been in touch with anyone, with any of his Chinese counterparts at all, and got a heads-up or warning that this was coming today?

MS. PSAKI: He has not been. This is a DOJ action, so – go ahead.

QUESTION: Thank you.

QUESTION: You have mentioned the dialogue between the U.S. and the China is very important. So specifically, will you approach the U.S. – the Chinese Government to talk about this issue?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we have approached and we have been working with the Chinese Government over the course of the last several months on cyber issues, concerns we have about these issues. And we think that's the best venue for moving forward.

QUESTION: And also in the statement from the Chinese Government it says it jeopardize the U.S.-China cooperation and the mutual trust. So how will you maintain this cooperation, the mutual trust?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we've consistently and candidly raised our concerns on this issue. Again, this is consistent with those concerns. We do believe that dialogue is an essential part of resolving these issues and moving the process forward. So we're hopeful that that can continue.

QUESTION: And as you know, according to a lot of documents revealed by Snowden last year, actually China is one of the major targets of America's surveillance program, including Chinese Government, including Chinese institution and the companies. So do you think there is – the U.S. has a double standard in criticizing for Chinese for the same thing that the U.S. is doing? How would you explain that?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think I would point you to what the President has said about his concerns about cyber security and cyber-crime. We remain deeply concerned about Chinese Government-sponsored cyber-enabled theft of trade secrets and other sensitive business information for commercial gain. And again, this was specific to the actions of just a few individuals, and we hope that the Chinese Government can understand that.

QUESTION: Just to follow up with --

MS. PSAKI: Do we have more on China?

QUESTION: Yes.

QUESTION: Just to follow up – follow quickly --

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: According to the press reports and also think tanks, they're saying that this is not the first time the Chinese national had been stealing the U.S. secrets in one way or another way. So what happened in the past? Have you been talking to Chinese? Have they stopped?

MS. PSAKI: We – again, this – as I've said a couple of times, this has been a concern we've consistently and candidly expressed – expressed our concerns about.

Go ahead.

QUESTION: Thank you. So how much impact do you think it will have on the overall U.S.-China relationship?

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, we remain committed to developing a constructive and productive relationship with China. We work together on a range of issues. We're ready to work with China to prevent this activity from continuing. And we believe dialogue is the best way forward.

Go ahead, in the back.

QUESTION: As you said, you believe in dialogue, and the U.S.-China Government has been talking this.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: But by having make this movement, right, announce this indictment, does that mean your effort in a diplomatic channel is simply not working?

MS. PSAKI: No. Again, this was an action by DOJ. We expect the Chinese Government to understand that today's actions – today's announcement, I should say, relates to a law enforcement investigation of individuals who have stolen intellectual property from U.S. businesses. But again, we've had an ongoing dialogue. We think that's the right path forward, and we're hopeful that can continue.

QUESTION: But is it effective, your dialogue? Do you see any result or achievement?

MS. PSAKI: Well, we never said that it would be an issue that would be resolved overnight. We think that it requires more work, more dialogue, and we're hopeful that that can continue.

QUESTION: (Off-mike.)

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: -- a follow-up. So if this is not working – as you see the statement from the Chinese foreign ministry, they are kind of like furious. If this is not working, is sanction part of your choice in the future?

MS. PSAKI: We don't agree that it's not working. We believe – we regret the decision to suspend the activities of the working group, and we think that's an effective tool.

QUESTION: Can you rule out any possibility of sanction those individuals?

MS. PSAKI: I didn't put any on the table, and I'm not ruling anything out.

Go ahead.

QUESTION: Sorry, just a follow-up. But can we expect similar charges against other countries?

MS. PSAKI: We don't make predictions about law enforcement activities.

QUESTION: Okay. What is the difference between – because this, presumably, is not the first time that we've had people from other countries doing cyber espionage. But what is the difference between the past and now that led you to this action right now?

MS. PSAKI: I would point you to the Department of Justice. This was an announcement that the Department of Justice made. They will have the specifics for you.

QUESTION: Okay. Thanks.

QUESTION: Yes, we understand. But from the State Department's point of view, how does this advance or help having a productive and constructive relationship with China, if even the people who are bringing the charges don't think that they – that the people charged will ever be tried or ever be presented?

MS. PSAKI: I --

QUESTION: So how does the State Department see this as advancing the U.S.-China relationship?

MS. PSAKI: Matt, that is not a claim that I made. That is a point – that is a claim you made. Obviously, this is --

QUESTION: No, no. You just said --

MS. PSAKI: -- a Department of Justice announcement. They will see the process through. Again, what I was expressing regret about was the suspension of the dialogue.

QUESTION: Right. No, no. I'm sorry. What claim was it that I was making?

MS. PSAKI: That these – this would never be seen through.

QUESTION: I don't – you're telling me that there are people in this government who honestly expect the Chinese to arrest these five guys and send them over here to stand trial? That's what you're saying?

MS. PSAKI: We'll let the legal process see its way through.

QUESTION: Well, if people in this government think that, then there's a serious, serious problem. That's not going to happen. I mean, it's just – it's not going to happen. And you can tell even from the – I mean, the Chinese have said take – withdraw this indictment, or it's a mistake, or whatever. It says China launched a process with the U.S. right after this, correct its mistake and withdraw the indictment. So I think that we can all agree – I would hope, at least – that the Chinese aren't going to turn these people over.

So I want to know, from the State Department's perspective, if in fact you were consulted by DOJ about this, how exactly an indictment, which is essentially meaningless because it won't produce any convictions or even a trial, advances the cause of better relations between the United States and China?

MS. PSAKI: Again, Matt, this is consistent with the concerns that we've been expressing about the – with the Chinese Government on these activities. That's not new. I don't think it's new to the Chinese. But we think, obviously, a discussion about these issues is the best way forward.

QUESTION: All right. So can I just make a plea for you to take the question about whether or not the Justice Department was in touch with you guys in the weeks as these indictments were being prepared?

MS. PSAKI: I'm happy to see if there's more to convey.

QUESTION: And whether or not you – this building expressed any concerns about the damage that it might do, not just to the upcoming S&ED, which was just announced, but also to the broader relationship? Thanks.

MS. PSAKI: I'm happy to see if there's more to convey.

QUESTION: It's slightly reminiscent – although the scale is obviously different – of what happened with the Indian diplomat, Mrs. Khobragade, in which there was an indictment that was issued by the DOJ, and it had to be walked back several months later after a deal had been arranged between herself and the U.S. State Department. I mean, is this – following up from what Matt said, again, is this just seen as a shot against the bow of the Chinese authorities, and in the end what you'll have to do is walk it back and withdraw the indictment, as the Chinese have asked?

MS. PSAKI: I'm not going to speculate on what the Department of Justice will – may or may not do in the future. Obviously, this announcement was made this morning. It's consistent with the concerns we've expressed. We continue to believe from – through the diplomatic channels that there is an opportunity for dialogue, and that's what we're focused on in this building.

QUESTION: So it's not just a ploy? It's not a ploy to sort of show the Beijing authorities that you're serious in your concerns?

MS. PSAKI: I think the Department of Justice made clear through their announcement that this is related to the law enforcement investigations of individuals who stole intellectual property from the United States businesses.

QUESTION: Madam, can we --

MS. PSAKI: Oh, do we have any more on China? China.

QUESTION: One more.

MS. PSAKI: Okay. Last one on China. Go ahead.

QUESTION: Madam, if Chinese keep stealing U.S. secrets in one way or another, in not only the economics but also nuclear and cybers and all them, how can you continue do business with

China, unless they pledge that they will not continue and they will stop their stealing from the U.S. businesses?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I think, Goyal, we have – I've addressed the question by conveying this is consistent with the concerns we've expressed. And obviously, there are a range of ways that we're addressing it.

...

QUESTION: Yes. So President Putin is going to China this week.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Is the U.S. kind of concerned about China and Russia cooperation at this time?

MS. PSAKI: I know – I'm aware of the meeting – or the planned visit. I don't have anything in particular to comment on it.

QUESTION: And to follow up, what will the U.S. do to overpass this diplomatic fallout with China about the cyber security issue?

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, we continue to believe that having a productive working relationship is in both of our interests, and we have the upcoming S&ED, which, of course, the Secretary will be traveling for. As you know, we have a range of issues we work on, including concerns about the threat from DPRK, including concerns about climate change, and we hope they will continue.

QUESTION: Given President Putin's trip – upcoming trip to China, is it still the Administration's view – or the – this building's view that there is some kind of rift between the Chinese and the Russians over what the Russians have been doing or not doing in Ukraine?

MS. PSAKI: Well, what we've said in the past is obviously that China has not been supportive, traditionally, of the type of actions that has occurred in eastern Ukraine, so we'll let them speak for themselves.

May 15, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on Vietnam/China, via telephone
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: And so I just wanted to know if you guys are following the ongoing unrest in Vietnam. The riots and looting and protest to the Chinese actions off the coast have now spread to the central part of the country, and seeing reports that the number of dead could be more than 20. I was just wondering how you guys are responding – what guidance you’re providing to Americans, if any. Yeah, maybe if you want to get into that first, and then I’ll go on with my second one.

MS. HARF: Yes. So we are, obviously, closely following the protests that you asked about. And as we say frequently – as I say frequently – support the rights of individuals, people to assemble peacefully to protest. Obviously, all parties need to refrain from violence and exercise restraint here.

We are in close touch with national and local authorities; condemn any of the violence that we’ve seen and the loss of life that’s occurred. And again, would encourage people while they – everyone – while folks are exercising their right to freedom of expression to refrain from any further violence.

QUESTION: Any particular sort of warnings or guidance to U.S. citizens in the country or visiting U.S. citizens?

MS. HARF: Not that I’ve seen. We haven’t – not that I’ve seen. We haven’t seen any reports of U.S. citizens being targeted, but I’m happy to check with our folks and see. I just haven’t seen any specific warnings.

...

QUESTION: Hi Marie, thanks for doing this. Can I just go on back to the Vietnam protests for a minute? I certainly appreciate that the State Department supports the right of people to protest around the world, but these have been unusually large demonstrations for Vietnam and I’m wondering if the Department has a position on whether the protests are justified. That would be my first question.

Then there have been mounting sort of anti-Chinese fervor in Vietnam over the past week or so, particularly since China placed an oil rig off the coast of Vietnam. Does the Department believe that the Chinese may be violating Vietnamese sovereignty with this move and sort of pushing the Vietnamese to accept Chinese sovereignty claims over certain areas of the South China Sea? And I’d appreciate it if you could respond beyond just saying we support the right of people to --

MS. HARF: Yep.

QUESTION: Thank you.

MS. HARF: Well, on the oil rig issue, I've said and a bunch of us have said repeatedly that China's decision to introduce an oil rig accompanied by numerous government vessels in waters that are disputed with Vietnam is provocative and raises tensions, absolutely, and that this is a unilateral action that appears to be part of a broader pattern, quite frankly, of Chinese behavior to advance its claims over disputed areas in a manner that really undermines peace and stability in the region.

So we are very concerned about dangerous conduct and intimidation of this kind. We've called on all parties to conduct themselves in a safe and professional manner and address competing sovereignty claims peacefully and in accordance with international law. So I think we've spoken out very clearly about how that action was seen and could be seen as provocative and raising of tensions.

QUESTION: Could you --

MS. HARF: In terms --

QUESTION: Go ahead.

MS. HARF: Go ahead. No, no, go ahead. You can follow-up on that before I get to my next one.

QUESTION: Could you update us just on what the last communications or what level of communications is the Department having with the Chinese on this particular issue within the context of perhaps getting the Chinese to pull the ship out without losing face at this point?

MS. HARF: Well, we have raised this issue with both sides, including at high levels, during separate calls with both the Vietnamese deputy prime minister, who is also the foreign minister, and the Chinese foreign minister. The Secretary -- Secretary Kerry emphasized our strong concerns over recent developments in the South China Sea and stated our view that China's unilateral introduction of an oil rig was provocative; urged both sides to de-escalate tensions, engage in high-level dialogue, ensure safe conduct by their vessels at sea, and a host of other things as well.

So the Secretary's been engaged on it; other folks have been as well. I think the last time the Secretary spoke to the Chinese foreign minister was on Monday evening, where he again emphasized our strong concerns over recent developments in the South China Sea.

QUESTION: But that was -- when were the protests that time? Had they really gotten out of -- gotten big by Monday evening, or that was before the protests really got going?

MS. HARF: Well, we can -- I can check on that, but he was very clear about what was happening in the South China Sea and what behavior should not continue.

In terms of the protests, as I've said, we've been in close touch with national and local authorities and have absolutely condemned the violence and the loss of life that's occurred. What

I said, though – and I – it didn't sound like you really liked the answer, but it's true that we support the rights of individuals to assemble peacefully to protest, period. So that is something that is important to us, but at the same time, urge all parties to refrain from violence and to exercise restraint. Those are really things that underscore what we've said.

So while we support peoples' right to protest, we do not in any way support violence against Chinese-affiliated businesses or firms in Vietnam – absolutely are opposed to that, so --

QUESTION: Thank you very – no, I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

May 13, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Vietnam

Washington, DC

QUESTION: Sure. So yesterday, the State Department provided a readout of Secretary Kerry's call with Foreign Minister Wang of China.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm. Yeah.

QUESTION: And they discussed – what prompted the phone call yesterday, actually?

MS. PSAKI: Well, obviously, we remain in touch with China on several levels about a range of issues. We put a pretty extensive readout out last night about the call and what they discussed, and I'm happy to reiterate some of those points. They certainly discussed our commitment to working toward North Korean denuclearization. Secretary Kerry raised our strong concerns about North Korea's recent threats to carry out further provocations, and they also discussed our concerns about recent developments in the South China Sea. And the Secretary said China's introduction of an oil rig and numerous government vessels in waters disputed with Vietnam was provocative.

I would also note that he also spoke with Vietnamese deputy prime minister and foreign minister as well – let me just check what day that was. He spoke with him on Sunday and he emphasized during that call our strong concerns over recent developments in the South China Sea and stated our view that China's unilateral introduction of an oil rig and numerous government vessels disputed with Vietnam was provocative, just as he did on the call with China. He urged both sides on both calls to de-escalate tensions, to engage in high-level dialogue, to ensure safe conduct by their vessels at sea, and to resolve the dispute through peaceful means.

QUESTION: And did the Secretary outline any specific measures that the U.S. would take in response to further provocative actions from China?

MS. PSAKI: That – I don't have any further – anything further to add from the readout of the call we provided.

Let's just do two more here in the back. Go ahead.

QUESTION: I have a follow-up on this – it seems that Chinese foreign ministry wasn't quite happy with what the Secretary said, because last night during their press conference, and I quote here, the Chinese foreign ministry said, they are not taking – those provocative action were not taken by China. "It's nothing but the wrong words and actions made by the United States," and the U.S. "have emboldened some countries to take provocative actions," and the U.S. needs to "think hard." So will you? And will the U.S. consider to change its behavior in the South China Sea?

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, what we're referring to here is unilateral action that appears to be part of a broader pattern of Chinese behavior to advance its claims over disputed areas in a matter that, in our view, undermines peace and stability in the region. And we certainly think any member of the global community has a right to express concern over that, though we don't take a view of the – a position on the sovereignty over this area.

QUESTION: How do you characterize the atmosphere of the phone call?

MS. PSAKI: I don't think I have anything further to add.

May 9, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/ Vietnam

Washington, DC

QUESTION: I know that you were asked about this yesterday, but the Vietnamese have released more photos that they say is evidence that the Chinese were the ones who indeed instigated the clash that occurred last week. I wanted to know if the State Department has seen those photos and if you make anything of them.

MS. PSAKI: I think I've spoken pretty extensively to this and our concerns about the provocative actions. I don't have anything new to add today.

QUESTION: Okay. Well, I did have one more follow-up.

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: I don't think you have a comment on this, but the – China's Foreign Ministry did have a rebuttal to something you said from the podium here a couple days ago, essentially saying that the U.S. should butt out of this conflict because it doesn't specifically involve the U.S. I just wanted to know if you could comment on why the U.S. should not butt out.

MS. PSAKI: Well again, we don't take a position on the sovereignty, as you know, of these – these are disputed waters, and obviously, they have a difference of view on who has control over those waters or who has ownership over those waters. So I think we were speaking to – in response to a range of questions.

Our concerns about – any time there are provocative or unhelpful actions taken that put the maintenance of peace and stability at risk, and I think that's something that any country has the right to have concerns about.

QUESTION: Thank you.

QUESTION: And also, the foreign ministry spokeswoman this morning said that the United States was making irresponsible statements on this, and that you've ignored the facts and made a whole series of wrong remarks.

MS. PSAKI: Well, I would stand by our statements we've made and our views on this specific issue.

May 8, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Vietnam

Washington, DC

QUESTION: Yeah. I'd like to know if I can get some further comments on you on the increasing tensions between China and Vietnam. So the Chinese pushed back at the notion that there is a clash between China and Vietnam, and they reaffirmed that the disputed area belongs to China. Assistant Secretary Russel, he's currently in the region, and he said that he discussed this issue at length with the Vietnamese.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Could you elaborate on the message that he conveyed to the Vietnamese about this issue?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I believe he also spoke to this while he was there, which I'm happy to reiterate, and I put out an additional statement last night – or, we put out last night. What Assistant Secretary Russel conveyed is that we don't take a position on the relative merits of any country's claim in the South China Sea. But it's fair to say – and it's fair to say that both Vietnam and China claim sovereignty over that area, but there is a dispute. It's not for us to decide which position is stronger, but at the same time we believe that all sides should operate in a way that reduces tensions. And what we've seen – and obviously this is what we've spoken to – is that the unilateral decision by China to introduce its oil rig into these disputed waters, the dangerous conduct and intimidation by the vessels is concerning and certainly is representative of provocative actions.

QUESTION: And there's been an escalation recently in activity between the two sides. Is there a concern at the State Department that this could continue to escalate? And what is the State Department prepared to do to help resolve the crisis?

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, obviously, we continue to encourage both sides to take – to reduce the rhetoric and to pull back on provocative steps that are causing this level of tension in the region.

QUESTION: Same topic?

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: Have you been able to ascertain the veracity of the video that the Vietnamese foreign ministry showed to reporters? And have you been able to decide which side – which ships were the – actually the ones doing the ramming, the hostile actions?

MS. PSAKI: Which ships, in terms of whether they're Chinese or not?

QUESTION: Which – yeah. Whether they were Chinese or – because there's competing claims. Each side says the other side started it. So do you have any kind of independent --

MS. PSAKI: I think the statement we put out last night and the comments we've given make clear we think it's the Chinese side that is exhibiting provocative actions here.

May 7, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Vietnam

Washington, DC

MS. PSAKI: Hi, everyone. Happy Wednesday. I just have one item for all of you at the top. The United States is deeply concerned over reports that rights lawyer Pu Zhiqiang and other activists have been detained following their participation in a meeting to peacefully mark the upcoming June 4th anniversary of the violent suppression of demonstrations in and around Beijing's Tiananmen Square. We call on Chinese authorities to release these individuals immediately, remove restrictions on their freedom of movement, and guarantee them the protections and freedoms to which they are entitled under China's international human rights commitments.

...

QUESTION: I don't know if you saw the reports about the Vietnamese foreign ministry saying that Chinese vessels had rammed some of their ships in the South China Sea. And this is – I recall what you said yesterday about the oil rig. Do you have any fresh comment on this reported incident, which took place, I think, on Sunday?

MS. PSAKI: Sure. I mentioned this a little yesterday, but for those of you who were not here – and bear with me, I'll just repeat some of the points, but do have some new ones – given the recent history of tensions in the South China Sea, China's unilateral decision to introduce its oil rig into these disputed waters is provocative and unhelpful to the maintenance of peace and stability in the region.

As you referenced, Arshad, about some of the recent reports, we are strongly concerned about dangerous conduct and intimidation by vessels in the disputed area. We call on all parties to conduct themselves in a safe and appropriate manner, exercise restraint, and address competing sovereignty claims peacefully, diplomatically, and in accordance with international law.

Deb.

QUESTION: The Chinese Government – Vietnam Government announced China's basically intentionally (inaudible). What do you think about intentionally? You agree with that?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I'm not going to weigh in on that. Obviously, we oppose provocative or unilateral actions that jeopardize peace and security in the South China Sea. And as I referenced, we're concerned about the dangerous conduct and intimidation by vessels in this disputed area.

QUESTION: Did you see a video which was released by Vietnam foreign – minister of foreign affairs? Did you see that?

MS. PSAKI: Have I seen the video?

QUESTION: Yes, please.

MS. PSAKI: I have not seen the video. I have seen the reports, which is what I'm addressing.

Should we finish this and then we'll go to you Deb? Does that work? Okay, go ahead in the back.

QUESTION: Just one follow-up on the Chinese and the Philippine incident. Does Philippine have the rights to detain Chinese fishermen in disputed waters?

MS. PSAKI: Do they have the rights to?

QUESTION: Right.

MS. PSAKI: I think you're referring to the --

QUESTION: The fishing --

MS. PSAKI: -- fishing boats. Yes. So we of course have seen those reports that Philippine police have seized Chinese and Philippine fishing boats carrying illegally harvested sea turtles in the South China Sea, approximately 60 miles off the coast of the Philippines, and detained their crews. We urge both sides to work together diplomatically. Given the United States works with the international community to combat wildlife trafficking, we are concerned that the vessels appear to be engaged in direct harvest of endangered species of sea turtles. Beyond that, I'm not going to weigh in. I would point you to the authorities there.

...

QUESTION: I just wanted to clarify the concerns you raised before about Chinese activities in the South China Sea. Have you conveyed those directly to the Chinese Government through official channels?

MS. PSAKI: As I understand it, we have, but I don't have any other additional details on that.

QUESTION: Do you know if Secretary Kerry raised it in his meeting yesterday with the international department director of the party?

MS. PSAKI: The focus of that meeting was on -- mainly on North Korea.

QUESTION: Do you have a readout from the meeting yesterday with Wang?

MS. PSAKI: Sure.

QUESTION: Did he cover the (inaudible), or not at all?

MS. PSAKI: That wasn't the focus of the meeting or the intended focus of the meeting.

QUESTION: But you don't know if it covered it, or you just --

MS. PSAKI: I know it didn't.

QUESTION: It didn't. Thank you. That's all I wanted. Very easy. (Laughter.)

MS. PSAKI: I think I just told him that.

QUESTION: The readout from the meeting?

MS. PSAKI: Sure. As you know, Secretary Kerry met with Wang Jiarui yesterday, director of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee International Liaison Department. They exchanged views on U.S.-China relations as well as North Korea. That was the primary topic of the meeting.

QUESTION: On the South China Sea --

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: -- let me ask a little bit more about South China Sea. I don't know about the U.S. position to the nine-dot-line. As you know, China claimed they have a right to control within the nine-dot-line which covered 80 percent or 90 percent of the South China Sea. What's the position to that nine-dot-line?

MS. PSAKI: Well, as you know, these are disputed waters. Vietnam has declared a 200-nautical mile exclusive economic zone based on its -- on its coastline, in accordance with the Law of the Sea. And we call on China -- obviously, China has a different view on that. That's why we continue to call on both sides not to take provocative or unilateral actions, given this is occurring in disputed waters near those islands. And these events, of course, point to the need for claimants to clarify their claims in accordance with international law and reach agreement of what types of activities should be permissible within disputed areas such as these waters.

QUESTION: So China's State Council Yang Jiechi called yesterday to the Vietnam deputy prime minister and claimed the rig was operating within the Chinese water. So it's a kind of different -- it doesn't match the U.S. position. What's a comment on that?

MS. PSAKI: I don't think I have any further comment than what I've offered. Obviously, they have different views. But we are strongly concerned about dangerous conduct and intimidation by vessels in the disputed area, and we call on all parties to conduct themselves in a safe and appropriate manner, to exercise restraint, and to address competing sovereignty claims peacefully.

QUESTION: One more thing.

MS. PSAKI: Mm-hmm.

QUESTION: And the Chinese press secretary – no, spokesperson announced yesterday these issues is nothing to do with United States and U.S. doesn't have any right to say anything about Chinese internal affairs. What do you think about this?

MS. PSAKI: Well, obviously, as I've conveyed, we don't take a position with regard to competing sovereignty claims over islands in the South China Sea, but we do recognize that there is a dispute. You're obviously asking me about this now, so I would point you to that.

May 6, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Vietnam

Washington, DC

QUESTION: Yeah. Marie was asked about this yesterday, but the Vietnamese have been protesting the relocation of the Chinese oil rig in waters that they claim to be their territorial waters. I wanted to know if you had any comments on that.

MS. PSAKI: Well, we are, of course, aware of these reports and developments. We're looking carefully into this matter. Given the recent history of tensions in the South China Sea, China's decision to operate its oil rig in disputed waters is provocative and unhelpful to the maintenance of peace and stability in the region. These events point to the need for claimants to clarify their claims in accordance with international law and reach agreement about what types of activities should be permissible within disputed areas.

QUESTION: Thank you.

May 2, 2014

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

QUESTION: So the Chinese foreign minister expressed his displeasure at the Country Report that you issued yesterday. He said that the United States made irresponsible remarks and that you use double standards. Do you have any comments to that?

MS. HARF: I don't.

...

QUESTION: The second question is: would you say that you're more cautious about calling violent acts in public as terrorism if it involves minorities?

MS. HARF: No. I think, A, we condemn all violent acts against civilians, regardless of what we call them; and B, we use that word, "terrorism," if it's warranted after looking at the facts.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: So we look at each situation, look at the facts, and call it as we see it.

QUESTION: So do you have a standard procedure to determine what is terrorism or not? And do you use that across the board?

MS. HARF: Well, we certainly – I mean, read the lengthy Country Reports on Terrorism.

QUESTION: I did.

MS. HARF: We certainly used that word quite a bit. And yesterday, actually, I referred to the attack in the train station in China that appeared to be an act of terrorism.

QUESTION: In Q&A (inaudible) at the top.

MS. HARF: I would point that out as well. Yes.

QUESTION: But – okay. Thanks.

MS. HARF: Thanks, everyone..

May 1, 2014

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

QUESTION: Does the State Department have any information to suggest that this was a terrorist related incident, or is there an interpretation of whether or not this was a terrorist attack?

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. Based on the information we've seen, including that's been reported by the Chinese media, this appears to be an act of terrorism that targeted random members of the public. I don't have further information about the attack, about the identity or motivation of the attackers.

QUESTION: And yesterday, following the release of the Country Report on Terrorism, I believe you were asked about the cooperation with China on such terrorist attacks or incidents that occur within China. Has there been any cooperation or information-sharing from this most recent attack?

MS. HARF: Let me see what – I quite honestly don't know the answer. Let me see if we've talked about it with them.

April 28, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on the China/Department/Uzbekistan
Washington, DC**

MS. PSAKI: As I announced on Friday, we're launching our Free the Press – our annual Free the Press Campaign today. So today we have two journalists to highlight – see the visuals behind me – one from China, one from Uzbekistan.

Today we are – our first Free the Press Campaign case comes from China, where Qi Chonghuai, a prominent investigative journalist, remains imprisoned on charges of embezzlement, extortion, and blackmail. He was arrested in June of 2007 after the online publication of an article he wrote alleged corruption among local party officials in Shandong province. After documenting beatings and other prison abuses, he was tried a second time on charges of embezzlement, extortion, and blackmail on June 9th, 2011, convicted again, and sentenced to an additional eight years in prison.

We believe Chinese and foreign journalists should be allowed to operate freely in China and that censorship of the media and intimidation of journalists are incompatible both with China's aspirations to build a modern information-based economy and society with its commitments under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. We continue to urge China to respect internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedoms of press and expression, and to abide by its commitments under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

Our second journalist we're going to highlight today is from Uzbekistan. Muhammad Bekjanov is an Uzbekistani journalist who has been in prison since 1999. Bekjanov is one of the longest-imprisoned journalists worldwide, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists. In January 2012, shortly before Bekjanov's scheduled release, authorities scheduled – authorities sentenced him to another five years in prison for allegedly violating prison rules. His health has severely deteriorated over the last 15 years he spent in prison, and he is in urgent need of medical care. We call on the Government of Uzbekistan to provide this medical care.

April 25, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Japan
Washington, DC

QUESTION: The Chinese foreign ministry has recalled the --

MS. PSAKI: The Chinese ministry, did you say?

QUESTION: The Chinese foreign ministry --

MS. PSAKI: Okay.

QUESTION: -- has summoned the American ambassador in Beijing. Do you have any comments on that?

MS. PSAKI: I actually had not seen that before I came down here. Do you know what it was in regards to?

QUESTION: This is in regards to the joint statement that was issued by the U.S. and Japan following Obama's visit. The foreign ministry said that the statement reflects a Cold era mentality, and they take issue to the suggestion that the mutual defense treaty covers what China calls the Dialou Islands, and that it does not change the sovereignty of the islands there.

MS. PSAKI: Well, you're familiar with our position. I will check and see if there's more detail on the specific demarche you're referring to.

QUESTION: Thank you.

QUESTION: Can you also find out from your treaty office whether you care what the Chinese think about a treaty that they're not a signatory to?

MS. PSAKI: I'm certain I know the answer to that.

QUESTION: (Laughter.) Really? What would you think it is? No?

MS. PSAKI: (Laughter.) I'm not going to entertain it.

...

QUESTION: I just wonder, could you please explain why there is this necessity to have the U.S. President to reiterate the position on you call Dialou Island or Senkaku Island and we call Dialou Island for the first time? Why do you think it's necessary?

MS. PSAKI: I think we've stated this position dozens, if not hundreds, of times. I would point you to the White House on your line of questioning.

QUESTION: And also, I assume you know – you knew China would be irritated by this decision by specifically outline Senkaku Island into your joint statement. So have you ever taken China factor as – into your consideration?

MS. PSAKI: Well, as you know, we work with China on a range of issues. Again, I'd point you to the White House. It's the President's trip, so they're best to answer your question.

April 15, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

**Daily Press Briefing, selections on China/Russia
Washington, DC**

QUESTION: So Russian Foreign Minister Lavrov actually is visiting China, and he personally thanked China for Chinese unbiased position on Ukraine situation. Do you think China's position on Ukraine is helpful?

MS. PSAKI: Well, I would let the Chinese speak for their own position. Obviously, they didn't – they declined – they abstained in the UN vote several weeks ago. They have a history of not – of non-intervention, so we'll let them speak for themselves. But I don't have any other particular analysis on it.

QUESTION: But I – as I was saying, China and Russia's relation, the ties is getting closer as the Ukraine crisis is going on. What would you expect China to do?

MS. PSAKI: I'm going to let China make their own choices. Obviously, we are encouraging all countries around the world to respect the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine, and that's the same message that we're conveying to China as well.

QUESTION: New topic?

QUESTION: And one more. It was reported that when Russian President Putin visit China next month, the China and Russia may reach a deal on the gas supply. Do you welcome this deal or decision?

MS. PSAKI: China and Russia?

QUESTION: Yeah. They are going to reach a gas deal.

MS. PSAKI: I don't have any particular comment on that. If that happens, we'll be happy to speak to it at the time.

April 9, 2014

Jen Psaki, Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China

Washington, DC

QUESTION: So yesterday, Secretary Hagel wrapped up a trip in China, and he had a joint press conference with his Chinese counterpart in which his Chinese counterpart said that relations between Japan and China are confronted with severe difficulties and that Japan is to blame for this. He then goes on to say that he hopes the U.S. can stay vigilant against Japan and keep it within bounds and not be permissive and supportive.

Does the State Department agree with the assessment from the Chinese defense minister that the U.S. has been permissive and supportive of Japan's actions?

MS. PSAKI: I am certainly not going to engage that deeply in your question, other than to say that we believe good relations among China and Japan and all of their neighbors benefit everyone in the region. That's something we've consistently conveyed to all parties, whether that's the Chinese, whether that's the Japanese. And that's something the Secretary has done and Secretary Hagel has done as well. We regularly discuss with China and Japan and others ways to reduce tensions and build trust in the region. That will continue, and I'm certain that was a part of Secretary Hagel's visit as well.

QUESTION: And on that note, what more could the State Department do to aid or to ease tensions between Japan and China?

MS. PSAKI: Well, again, we are going to continue to convey our belief that that is – that reducing the tensions is to the benefit of all parties in the region, and we'll continue to have conversations with all countries.

April 4, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on North Korea/China
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Okay. A question on Assistant Secretary Daniel Russel's comment recently on North Korea and China. He said the most direct way for China to affect the U.S. military deployments and those strategic alliance plans is by applying China's leverage on North Korea. Is this some new thing the U.S. is offering China?

MS. HARF: No. This isn't a new thing at all. I mean, I think you heard – have certainly heard us say, have heard the Secretary and Assistant Secretary Russel say, that China is on the same page with us in terms of needing the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, and that because China has a relationship with North Korea, unlike other countries, that it does have a special role to play in terms of pushing the North Koreans to do things we'd like them to do. So this is in no way a new position.

QUESTION: But it sounds like he's indicating that the U.S. is willing to make concession if China is willing to put more pressure on North Korea.

MS. HARF: I don't think he was indicating anything like that, anything new. I think he was responding to a question on the Hill.

QUESTION: So can you confirm that if China is going to put more pressure on North Korea, the U.S. is going to decrease your military posture on Korean Peninsula?

MS. HARF: Well, a couple – well, no, I can't, because as I've said, we've repeatedly worked with China on this issue because they do have a special role to play. And I don't think that he was indicating anything new. In terms of our military posture, I'm happy to check with our Defense Department colleagues, but it's my understanding that the Assistant Secretary was not in any way indicating something like that. But I'm happy to check.

QUESTION: So you are denying – basically you're denying that the U.S. is going to make a concession?

MS. HARF: I'm saying I can't confirm that. I can't confirm that. I'm happy to check with our DOD colleagues. But again, this isn't about the U.S. making concessions. This is about us working with our international partners to see if we can get North Korea to take some steps to come back in line with their obligations. China has a special and unique role to play in that. That's my understanding that's all he was saying. Again, I'm happy to check and see if there was more that people should be reading into it.

April 2, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on Philippines/China
Washington, DC

QUESTION: Okay. Have you seen the Chinese Ambassador during Philippines statement on China is rejecting Philippines proposal to bring this issue to international arbitration? What is your response to that?

MS. HARF: Yes. Wait, which issue specifically? Are you talking about the Second Thomas Shoal?

QUESTION: Yes.

MS. HARF: Yes, I do think I have that.

QUESTION: And (inaudible) see if --

MS. HARF: Let me check and see if I still have that.

QUESTION: Okay.

MS. HARF: Let me see what I have. We obviously believe this is an issue that should be resolved with international resolution. I'm not sure I have the specifics about the -- what you mentioned in terms of the filing. I can get that for you, though.

QUESTION: But if China is rejecting to go to the international arbitration, what's the next step?

MS. HARF: Let me check with our folks and see. I know they have some more details on that. I'm sorry I don't have it for you.

March 31, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson
Daily Press Briefing, selections on Philippines/China
Washington, DC

QUESTION: I have a couple of questions followed up on the statement on Philippine and China.

MS. HARF: Uh-huh.

QUESTION: First of all, I think that Philippine maintain its presence on the Second Thomas Shoal since 1999. It is based on abandoned Filipino ship?

MS. HARF: Is it based on what way? Is that the presence you're referring to?

QUESTION: The evidence, yeah.

MS. HARF: That's my understanding, yes.

QUESTION: But don't you think it doesn't make sense? Because that's a disputed area. Why Philippines shouldn't move the ship?

MS. HARF: Well, as we've also said, we don't have any comment on the merit of specific claims in terms – and some of this has been talked about in terms of the Philippines just filed a legal filing on the same issue. So I don't have any more for you than that on it. Obviously, we believe that they should be able to resupply the folks that are there, that we do not believe that that is – what is the word we use here – a disruption of the status quo.

QUESTION: But you do recognize their presence there by abandoned Filipino ship?

MS. HARF: As I said at the top, yes, we recognize their presence at the Second Thomas Shoal. We believe they should be able to resupply the folks that are there. And that's not a change in the status quo.

QUESTION: Okay. And what is the intention of the U.S. sending its – for the first time, sending a Naval – a Navy plane in the past weekend on the space of the disputed area?

MS. HARF: I'd refer you, I think, to my colleagues at the Department of Defense for that one. I'm happy to check with them too. I don't have any details on it.

QUESTION: But by making that move, are you still saying that you are neutral and you don't --

MS. HARF: Our position on this hasn't changed in any way. For why the military does things, I'd refer you there.

QUESTION: Is it fair to say that that's the national airspace?

MS. HARF: Check with the military guys. I don't fly those planes. State Department doesn't fly those planes.

QUESTION: And could you explain why the U.S. is not supporting the Philippine and China to talk bilaterally to solve this problem, difficult --

MS. HARF: Is not or is?

QUESTION: Is not?

MS. HARF: Well, we've said repeatedly that there needs to be a peaceful management and resolution of disputes, including the Second Thomas Shoal. I mentioned at the top working within ASEAN to get a meaningful code of conduct. We also have the 2002 Declaration of Conduct of Parties in the South China Sea. So we want there to be de-escalation here. We don't want there to be conflict. And we think there are peaceful ways to go about resolving that through a whole variety of different mechanisms.

QUESTION: Do you encourage them to solve this issue bilaterally?

MS. HARF: I can check with our team and see if that's one of the ways we're talking about. I mentioned the ASEAN and through the wider code of conduct as well.

March 24, 2014

Marie Harf, Deputy Spokesperson

Daily Press Briefing, selections on China

Washington, DC

QUESTION: The Chinese foreign ministry expressed some indignation at these allegations that the NSA infiltrated the servers of Huawei, the telecommunications company. I think President Obama and President Xi also discussed it in their meeting as well, but I was wondering if you have a reaction and whether you're planning to provide any more explanation to the Chinese side.

MS. HARF: Well, I know it won't surprise you that I can't comment on specific collection activities or on intelligence operations of specific foreign countries. But I can say a few things.

One is that our intelligence activities are focused on the national security needs of our country. Two, we collect signals intelligence exclusively where there is a foreign intelligence or counter intelligence purpose. PPD-28 is clear that the collection of foreign private commercial information or trade secrets is authorized only to protect the national security of the United States or its partners and allies. So in other words, we don't collect these things to give U.S. companies economic advantage. We've said that for months now.

And obviously, as we've said, many other countries can't say the same thing and don't say the same thing. So we've been very upfront about – without talking to specifics – why we would collect certain information.

QUESTION: Sure. I mean, just to follow up, though, there have been some instances where the Administration has acknowledged that it perhaps overstepped some boundaries and thus decided to review or curtail certain intelligence-gathering operations – spying on heads of state, for instance, dragnet surveillance domestically, those kinds of things. But you're saying that this instance is not one of those things?

MS. HARF: Well, I'm not speaking to this specific instance. What I am saying is that when we collect, broadly speaking, signals intelligence, there needs to be a foreign intelligence or a counter intelligence purpose, and that if we do this in the economic realm – right – it's not to give U.S. companies economic advantage; that it's to protect the national security of the United States.

And what I would say on the first part of your question is that the review was really about looking at what we collect and making sure we have to have it, not just that we can – right – collecting what we need, not just what we can collect. And as you said, retooling some of our efforts to make sure we were focused securely on what – solely, I would say, rather, on what makes our nation more secure, and again, not just collecting information because we can.

QUESTION: Will you be following up with the Chinese to address their complaints on this?

MS. HARF: I can check with our folks and see. I don't know.

QUESTION: Marie, you do understand, though, it's not a question of whether or not it is written in the U.S. law that this is not supposed to be done. It is the fact that countless time, in other instances, that law has been broken or it has been bent or --

MS. HARF: I don't think everyone -- anyone's talked about the law being broken in terms of surveillance.

QUESTION: And -- well, no, in terms -- I'm talking about in terms of any law that this Administration --

MS. HARF: Okay. But let's talk about surveillance.

QUESTION: Right, but this Administration would argue that -- argues that waterboarding is torture and --

MS. HARF: No, but we're talking about surveillance here, which is different.

QUESTION: Well, fair enough.

MS. HARF: You can't combine all intelligence under one umbrella.

QUESTION: Well, I'm not trying to -- hold on. I'm not trying to say that --

MS. HARF: No, but they're different things.

QUESTION: Well, no, they are different things.

MS. HARF: Mm-hmm. And when --

QUESTION: But the problem is, is that the U.S. Government has shown itself, on occasion -- and I think some would say on more than just small numbers of occasions -- to violate laws that it -- that are supposed to -- that exist to regulate what it can and can't do.

MS. HARF: Well, let me say one thing about surveillance. What the President said when he announced the findings of the review was that there were no indications that --

QUESTION: Right.

MS. HARF: -- people did anything wrong here. It was a question of whether we should be collecting what we were collecting.

QUESTION: Right, right.

MS. HARF: And that's an important distinction, I think.

QUESTION: But – well, fair enough, but the concern is, is that the rules aren't always followed or may not always be followed, and it's very much --

MS. HARF: Well, we have no indications they weren't followed here.

QUESTION: Right, but it's very – but that's the concern, and --

MS. HARF: Well, I'm telling you we have no indications that happened here.

QUESTION: Okay. Well, that's what you say today, but who knows what's going to happen? You can't predict the future any more than – anyway, are we done? Because I want to shift gears to --

QUESTION: (Inaudible.)

MS. HARF: Yes.

QUESTION: The Chinese --

MS. HARF: And then you shift to whatever you want to shift to, yes.

QUESTION: The Chinese foreign ministry also, I think, quite interestingly demanded a – well, demanded that Washington stop its cyber espionage activities. Do you have any reaction to that claim?

MS. HARF: Well, I didn't see those comments. I think a few things. The President today had, I think – he has had up until this point, and I'm sure had today, very good discussions with the Chinese about a whole host of issues and about the whole breadth of the relationship. So I understand the focus on this aspect of it, but our relationship is much broader, and obviously, they talk about much broader things.

I would also point to the fact that, as the Director of National Intelligence has said, we do not give intelligence we collect to U.S. companies to enhance their international competitiveness or increase their bottom line. And I would remind you that's a claim that many other countries cannot make.