

INTERNATIONAL SECURITY UPDATE

April 22 - 28, 2015

1. [Carter: U.S, Japan Defense Guidelines 'Break New Ground' \(04-27-2015\)](#)
2. [Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference \(04-27-2015\)](#)
3. [DoD Sends Aircraft to Support Disaster-Assistance Operations in Nepal \(04-26-2015\)](#)
4. [Carter Visits Silicon Valley Companies to Enhance DoD Technology Innovation \(04-25-2015\)](#)
5. [Renewing U.S. Leadership Through Economic Strength \(04-23-2015\)](#)
6. [Amb. Baer's Response to Russia at OSCE on Training in Ukraine \(04-23-2015\)](#)
7. [Work Praises U.S., Australia, New Zealand Partnership \(04-22-2015\)](#)
8. [Meeting With Former Lebanese Prime Minister Hariri \(04-22-2015\)](#)

1. [Carter: U.S, Japan Defense Guidelines 'Break New Ground' \(04-27-2015\)](#)

By Jim Garamone
DoD News, Defense Media Activity

NEW YORK, April 27, 2015 – American and Japanese national security leaders unveiled the new guidelines for U.S.-Japan defense cooperation today, saying the new rules will promote peace and stability not only in the region, but worldwide.

Secretary of State John Kerry, Defense Secretary Ash Carter, Japanese Foreign Affairs Minister Fumio Kishida and Japanese Defense Minister Gen Nakatani announced the results of the Security Consultative Committee meeting here today.

Known as the “2-plus-2” meetings, the discussions covered all aspects of the U.S.-Japanese alliance, but the revision of the defense guidelines -- the first since 1997 -- took precedence.

The guidelines lay out how the United States and Japan will work together, and come after the Japanese government reinterpreted their constitution to allow a greater international role, including greater military cooperation.

Japanese leaders see the guidelines as strengthening the U.S. rebalance to the Asia-Pacific. “Though we live in different hemispheres, at opposite ends of the globe, the United States could ask for no better friend and ally than Japan,” Kerry said during a news conference.

He added that the U.S. alliance with Japan has been the cornerstone of peace and prosperity in Asia since the end of World War II.

“The guidelines will enhance Japan’s security, deter threats and contribute to regional peace and stability,” the secretary of state said. “The United States and Japan stand together in calling for disputes in the region to be resolved peacefully. We reject any suggestion that freedom of navigation, overflight and other lawful uses of the sea and airspace are privileges granted by big states to small ones.”

Guidelines Fit Japan’s Expanded Role

Carter stressed that the revisions were a necessary process, given how much has changed in the world since 1997. Both the United States and Japan have new capabilities, and new threats have emerged, including a whole new domain of warfare in cyberspace, he said.

“The Asia-Pacific region has changed,” the defense secretary said. “Its weight in world affairs has increased, and that is reflected in the U.S. rebalance to the Asia-Pacific including its expression in our own defense capabilities.”

Carter noted that Japan is taking on a bigger role in world affairs. “These guidelines allow us to modernize the U.S.-Japan alliance at the same time, by breaking new ground on existing areas of military cooperation and helping us open new areas of military cooperation both in the Asia-Pacific and around the globe,” he said.

Carter and Nakatani will continue their consultations in Washington tomorrow with discussion on establishing a bilateral space cooperation working group. “The approval of the defense guidelines mark an important step in the rebalance’s next phase,” Carter said. “There will be many more.”

Kishida said through an interpreter that the revisions reflect “the enhancement of solidarity and the expansion of cooperation between Japan and the United States.”

The guidelines are the logical outgrowth of Japan’s new policy of “proactive contribution to peace based on the principle of international cooperation and the rebalance policy on the U.S. side,” the foreign minister said. “The new guidelines will enhance synergies of both policies.”

Other Business

Other business in the meetings included the U.S. affirmation that the Senkaku Islands are territories of Japan and fall under the U.S.-Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security.

They also stressed the importance of cooperation in ballistic missile defense. This includes basing two more U.S. ballistic missile defense destroyers in Japan and continuing deployment of a second X-band radar in the country.

The two sides discussed ways to expand tri-lateral and multi-lateral cooperation. This includes Australia and South Korea and the countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations.

The ministers also talked about the realignment of U.S. forces based in Japan including relocation of Marine Corps Air Station Futenma on the island of Okinawa.

Biographies:

[Ash Carter](#)

Related Sites:

[Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation](#)

Related Articles:

[Press Availability with Secretary of Defense Ash Carter, Japanese Foreign Minister Fumio Kishida, and Japanese Defense Minister Gen Nakatani](#)

[U.S., Japanese Officials Announce New Defense Guidelines](#)

[Revised Strategic Guidelines Key to Stability, Japan's Defense Minister Says](#)

2. Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference (04-27-2015)

Remarks by John Kerry, Secretary of State, New York City, NY

SECRETARY KERRY: Good afternoon, everybody. Let me start by thanking Ambassador Ferouki and Director General Amano for their leadership and for the deep commitment to the principles and the goals that are embodied by the NPT.

I want to begin by reading a portion of the message that President Obama has sent for this occasion. He says: "For over 45 years, the NPT has embodied our shared vision of a world without nuclear weapons... There are no shortcuts in this endeavor, and each step must be carefully taken to ensure that the security of all is increased along the way. We have not yet achieved the ultimate goals enshrined in the treaty – on this, we all agree – but it is only by seeking common ground and reinforcing shared interests that we will succeed in realizing a world free of nuclear dangers. Over the next few weeks and beyond the time of this conference, let us come together in a spirit of partnership to stop the spread of nuclear weapons." For succeeding generation – of each succeeding generation – I misread – "advance the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and continue our journey on the path to peace and security."

President Obama's message, in its entirety, follows:

I send greetings to all gathered in New York at the 2015 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference.

For over 45 years, the NPT has embodied our shared vision of a world without nuclear weapons. Thanks to collective international efforts and commitment, the NPT is now the cornerstone of the nuclear nonproliferation regime, and those that predicted at the time of the Treaty's signing that dozens of countries would soon possess nuclear weapons have thankfully been proven wrong.

While the NPT has demonstrated its worth, we know we have more to do. As I said in Berlin in 2013, we may no longer live in fear of global annihilation, but so long as nuclear weapons exist, we are not truly safe. The United States remains committed to all three pillars of the NPT—disarmament, nonproliferation, and encouragement of peaceful uses of the atom—and we are prepared to go further in meeting our obligations under the Treaty. We continue to lead efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and reduce the role and number of our own, and we are

dedicated to global efforts preventing proliferation. There are no shortcuts in this endeavor, and each step must be carefully taken to ensure that the security of all is increased along the way.

We have not yet achieved the ultimate goals enshrined in the Treaty—on this, we all agree—but it is only by seeking common ground and reinforcing shared interests that we will succeed in realizing a world free of nuclear dangers. Over the next few weeks and beyond the time of this conference, let us come together in a spirit of partnership to stop the spread of nuclear weapons, advance the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and continue our journey on the path to peace and security.

So, ladies and gentlemen, I am pleased to stand here today representing a President and an Administration that is committed to the vision of a world without nuclear weapons and to taking the prudent actions that are necessary to one day make that possible.

Now, as most of you know, this summer the world marks 70 years since representatives from dozens of countries came together in San Francisco to sign the United Nations Charter. In doing so, they pledged to save humankind from the scourge of war and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom. That pledge and that commitment have become the responsibility of each succeeding generation, and they are at the heart of our deliberations here today, because few things are more threatening to the ideals of the UN and to peace and security on our planet than the spread of nuclear weapons.

When I was a young man, fresh out of college and newly minted in the Navy, I was sent to train at the Nuclear Chemical Biological warfare school. And I learned in graphic detail about what nuclear war would look like, about the damage that weapons of mass destruction can inflict. I learned about throw weights and circles of probable damage. And I learned about radiation – not just the immediate harm, but the long-term trauma that it can cause. And when I considered the huge number of nuclear weapons that we were living with back then – late 1960s – I was left with only one conclusion: This defies all reason.

Thankfully, I was and am today far from alone in that assessment. The vast majority of the world has come to the conclusion – united around the belief that nuclear weapons should one day be eliminated – that as President Obama said in Prague, moral leadership is more powerful than any weapon. And today the race to nuclear arms that once sparked the fear of imminent Armageddon in billions of human beings and hearts, that has been supplanted in a wary but steady march in the direction of reason towards the promise of peace.

Can we really create a future in which nuclear weapons exist only within the pages of history books? The answer is yes. But I know – because I went through the same exercise myself – that based on years of thinking about deterrents and the nature of warfare and the nature of human beings – hard for people to believe that automatically. But when you stop and take into consideration the theories of those who have been involved for years in the national defense of their countries who have come to this conclusion, you realize that it embraces a notion of change in how we resolve conflicts, in how we think, in how we conduct our daily global affairs.

So the answer is yes, but the journey will be a long one. And it will take patience, cooperation, and persistence to complete.

But have no doubt: Every step you take that gets closer to it or that works to get closer to it, in fact, makes our planet safer. And one day when we finally approach the finish line, when we have conditions that allow us to go from a hundred warheads to zero, we will already be living in a world that is transformed, and transformed for the better.

For the past 45 years, the guiding light on these issues has been the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. It's a pretty straightforward arrangement, nothing complicated. Countries without nuclear weapons will not obtain them; countries with nuclear weapons will move towards disarmament; and all countries will have access to peaceful nuclear energy.

But it's critical to remember that each one of those components – nonproliferation, disarmament, and the peaceful use of the atom – is an essential ingredient to the full embodiment of the NPT. The NPT cannot stand unless all three of those pillars are sturdy enough to support it.

And for this treaty to remain upright we need to ensure its words have weight, that its rules are binding, and that its parties are compliant. And that means that the world has to remain united in rejecting the proliferation of nuclear weapons anywhere.

So today there is the potential for historic progress towards that end. The United States and our P5+1 partners have come together with Iran around a series of parameters that, if finalized and implemented, will close off all of Iran's possible pathways to the nuclear material required for a nuclear weapon, and give the international community the confidence that it needs to know that Iran's nuclear program is indeed exclusively peaceful.

I want you to know the hard work is far from over and some key issues remain unresolved. But we are, in fact, closer than ever to the good comprehensive deal that we have been seeking. And if we can get there, the entire world will be safer.

Now it's important to remember that the NPT has always been at the heart of these negotiations. From day one we have been focused on bringing Iran back into compliance with its obligations under the treaty. And if ultimately the talks are successful, it will once again prove the power of diplomacy over conflict and reinforce the rule of law.

Now we have said from the beginning that any deal with Iran will rely not on promises, not on words, but on proof. It will arrive – rely on verification, which is really at the center of the NPT and the entire IAEA process. Obviously verification is at the heart of the NPT, and one of the most important things that we can do to support our nonproliferation goals is to strengthen the IAEA safeguards in order to ensure that the agency has exactly what it needs in order to be able to verify safeguard agreements. That's why the United States is working to bring the Additional Protocol into force globally and to make it the standard, the global standard for safeguards compliance.

Verifying nations' compliance with the NPT is critical, but it's not good enough if we don't also hold parties accountable to their violations. And North Korea is the most glaring example. As we all know, the DPRK continues to ignore its obligations, to undermine the nuclear nonproliferation regime, and threaten international security and peace.

So we have to be crystal clear: North Korea must abandon all its nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs, return to the IAEA safeguards, and come into full compliance with the duties that it accepted when it first became part of the NPT. The Obama Administration continues to work with its regional allies and partners to set the stage for credible, renewed negotiations, but the onus remains on the DPRK to show that it is actually serious about addressing global concerns. Until that happens, it will only become more isolated from the rest of the world.

My friends, nonproliferation must be non-negotiable. There is no room under the NPT for a country to negotiate its way into becoming a nuclear-armed state. But we are mindful that in return for a commitment to refrain from pursuing nuclear weapons, nations around the world expect the existing nuclear powers to in their turn steadily disarm and fulfil their part of the bargain.

April 28, 2015

The United States is unequivocally committed to doing just that. We have and we will continue to scale down our arsenal, and to continue to move, step by step, toward nuclear disarmament. And I would say to you that our progress is indisputable. As of September 2014, the number of nuclear weapons in our stockpile has fallen to 4,717, or 85 percent below the Cold War peak. And yes, still way too many. Over the last 20 years alone, we have dismantled 10,251 warheads, with another approximately 2,500 warheads retired and in the queue for elimination. Now, this is complex and costly work, but we are committed to reducing this backlog. And I am pleased to announce today that President Obama has decided that the United States will seek to accelerate the dismantlement of retired nuclear warheads by 20 percent.

Our commitment to disarmament is clear in other areas as well. We have pledged not to pursue new nuclear warheads or support new military missions or military capabilities for the weapons that we do have, and we haven't tested a nuclear weapon in 23 years. We have clearly demonstrated our commitment to abide by the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. We have reduced the role that nuclear weapons play in our national security strategy. And the primary purpose today is simply to deter nuclear threats from others. We have reduced the alert status of our nuclear arsenal, and we have taken every reasonable step to ensure its safety, security, and strict control.

But as someone who has spent three decades focused on these issues, I know as well as anyone that we have a long way to go. And I share President Obama's belief that the same countries that ushered in the era of nuclear arms have a special responsibility to guide the world beyond it.

Despite significant reductions, the United States and Russia still possess more than 90 percent of the world's nuclear weapons. The New START Treaty – which I am proud to say was ratified when I was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee – has put both the United States and Russia on track to reduce our nuclear stockpiles to the lowest levels since the era of Eisenhower and Khrushchev. Implementation is going well and it remains on track, and it will reduce our current stockpile of weapons significantly. But we know that we can cut back even further, and President Obama has made clear our willingness, readiness, now, to engage and negotiate further reductions of deployed strategic nuclear weapons by up to one-third below the level set by New START. Let me underscore: That offer remains on the table, and we urge the Russians to take us up on it.

On that note, I want to emphasize our deep concerns regarding Russia's clear violation of its obligations under the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. We are urging Russia to return to compliance. For decades, that treaty has contributed to the peace and the security in Europe and Asia. And there is no reason – no reason – to create new dangers by undermining it now.

As we build for the future, there are further steps that we can take. It begins with agreement now to start to negotiate a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty. It involves initiatives to prepare for future arms control agreements, as we have started to do with a new International Partnership on Nuclear Disarmament Verification. It also includes legal assurances against the use of nuclear weapons against states that meet their obligations, as allowed under the protocols in regional nuclear-weapons-free zone treaties. And I am pleased to tell you today that the United States submitted the Protocol to the Central Asia Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty to the U.S. Senate for its advice and consent to ratification.

So let me briefly underscore one point here: In 1994, under the Budapest Memorandum, the United States, Russia and the United Kingdom extended similar assurances to Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus as they sent back to Russia the Soviet-era nuclear weapons that remained on their territory. This was an incredible act of leadership for the nonproliferation regime, which is why Russia's current approach to the Budapest Memorandum – disregarding it – is extraordinary.

We also remain firmly committed to holding the proposed conference on a regional zone in the Middle East, free of all weapons of mass destruction. And this zone is a hugely ambitious goal and fraught with challenges, but ambitious goals are always the ones worth pursuing. We support the regional efforts underway to reach agreement on terms for a conference, and those terms must be shared by all – there is no prospect for engagement or agreement absent the consent of the states involved. And this principle needs to be observed and respected if a process is really to start. And if that's the case, I guarantee you the effort will have the full support of the United States.

The third pillar of the NPT is to expand the peaceful uses of the atom. Here, too, the United States is proud to play a strong and supportive role.

The United States is pleased that we are, by far and away, the largest donor to the IAEA. Since the last Review Conference, we have provided close to \$200 million to promote peaceful nuclear applications, and today I'm happy to announce another \$50 million contribution to the agency's Peaceful Uses Initiative. These resources will further expand global access to the peaceful atom, putting it to use for sustainable economic development.

The fact is that nuclear energy can be an incredible resource, with a stunning range of applications.

Through the IAEA's Peaceful Uses Initiative, we are promoting food security by improving the detection of animal diseases in Africa and expanding food safety measures in Latin America. We are advancing human health by advancing early detection capabilities for Ebola in Africa and strengthening the capacity to detect and treat cancer around the world. And we are protecting the future of our planet by tracing pollution in marine waters, documenting the impacts of climate change, and reducing our climate emissions.

What's important here is that all of this work underscores the fact that our march towards peace is not only marked by the steps that we take to dismantle and to disarm. It's also about the steps that we take to develop, the steps we take to innovate, the steps that we take to build a more peaceful world, where the atom is not used or thought about being used to level cities, but to lift whole communities. That's our destination, and that's where we believe this march will take us.

No one in this chamber thinks that this is going to be easy. We're talking about weapons that have been a hugely important factor in the global system of defense and deterrence for decades, and to eliminate them completely will require a new way of thinking. But we know it's possible to think that way. We know it's possible to act that way. And when major figures in multiple countries have come together to suggest that we can think about this differently, then we need to think about this differently, and we have a clear responsibility to pursue this goal.

It will take intensive diplomacy on all sides – long days, late nights, many years, probably. And there are any number of skeptics who can doubt the international community's ability – let alone our will – to address a challenge of this magnitude.

But I will tell you that the United States is serious. We are committed to working with you to prove the skeptics wrong over time; to work through the challenges facing the NPT; and to carry on the treaty's essential work; and most of all, to leave the race for nuclear arms in the past, and continue instead on a march towards peace and stability and prosperity. Thank you.

Related Sites:

[LiveAtState: Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference](#) (04-22-2015)

[Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty](#)

3. DoD Sends Aircraft to Support Disaster-Assistance Operations in Nepal (04-26-2015)

DoD News, Defense Media Activity

WASHINGTON, April 26, 2015 – The United States has sent an Air Force aircraft to Nepal to deliver personnel and cargo in support of disaster-relief operations, according to Pentagon spokesman Army Col. Steve Warren.

A 7.9-magnitude earthquake hit the country yesterday, reportedly leaving almost 2,500 dead, about 6,000 injured and thousands more still missing. In addition, thousands of people are currently reported to be without food, water or shelter.

"This morning at approximately 11:18 a.m., a U.S. Military C-17 Globemaster departed from Dover Air Force Base bound for Nepal," Warren said in a statement released today. "The aircraft is transporting nearly 70 personnel, including a USAID Disaster Assistance Response Team, the Fairfax County Urban Search and Rescue team and several journalists, along with 45 square tons of cargo."

The flight is expected to arrive at Tribhuvan International Airport in Kathmandu, Nepal, on April 27, according to Warren.

The initial estimated cost for the U.S. Defense Department's support is approximately \$700,000, and there are currently no additional requests for DoD support, officials said on background.

There are 26 DoD personnel and one US C-130 In Nepal who were there to conduct a previously scheduled training exercise. All DoD personnel in Nepal are accounted for, officials said.

Related Sites:

[CIA World Factbook: Nepal](#)

[Dover Air Force Base in Delaware](#)

4. Carter Visits Silicon Valley Companies to Enhance DoD Technology Innovation (04-25-2015)

By Claudette Roulo

DoD News, Defense Media Activity

WASHINGTON, April 25, 2015 – Defense Secretary Ash Carter yesterday wrapped up a two-day trip to California's Silicon Valley, where he focused on renewing the longstanding relationship between the Defense Department and the wellspring of technology innovation found in that part of the nation.

"Across the board, ... there's a lot going on out there," he said, "in energy, in social media and talent management and lots of fields that matter across our technology base."

Carter met with senior executives at Facebook to discuss the potential for social media to connect commanders, troops and family members not only during deployments, but to also create "communities of interest."

He also met with Facebook employees who are also veterans to discuss "creating a two-way street between innovative talent in the private sector, and our need for innovative talent in the Department of Defense, not just the military, but the civilian part as well."

DoD's personnel system doesn't favor the kind of career flexibility preferred by people entering today's workforce, the defense secretary said.

"They like choice. They like openness. They like to move around. And therefore the ability to come in and come out, particularly in these highly technical areas, is really important," Carter said.

He said the department is working to create "tunnels" between DoD and industry to encourage innovative people to try out government service.

"We're going to see how it works and then scale it up if it does work," the defense secretary said. "And I'm just determined that we drill the holes in the walls that have developed between our two domains."

"I find people out there very eager to contribute," he said. "They care about national security, but they have their own style of operating in it ... We need to be compatible with that."

In addition to a mutual desire to attract talented and creative employees, the Defense Department and technology companies have something else in common, Carter said. Technology management - ensuring research and development are both valued and productive -- is an issue in both the private and public sector, he said.

"It's an everyday problem for the tech industry, where ideas are one thing; commercialization is another. So, we have a common set of issues in that regard," the defense secretary said.

Carter also met with the heads of Andreessen Horowitz, a venture capital firm, to discuss their efforts to build bridges between Silicon Valley and Washington.

The future of the finest fighting force in the world will depend upon the Defense Department's ability to attract talented people and build the best defense technology, he said.

"So I'm sure there'll be more trips and more innovation by us," the defense secretary said.

"We have to do things differently, but we can continue to be as effective, and I'm determined that we'll do that," Carter said.

In addition to visiting innovative technology firms, Carter delivered a lecture at Stanford University on April 23, in which unveiled the Defense Department's new cyber strategy to guide the development of DoD's cyber forces and to strengthen its cyber defenses and its posture on cyber deterrence.

Biographies:

[Ash Carter](#)

Related Sites:

[Special Report: The DoD Cyber Strategy](#)

[Special Report: Travels With Carter - April 2015](#)

Related Articles:

[Carter Unveils New DoD Cyber Strategy in Silicon Valley](#)

[Carter Seeks Tech-Sector Partnerships for Innovation](#)

[Carter's Silicon Valley Trip to Boost DoD Innovation](#)

5. Renewing U.S. Leadership Through Economic Strength (04-23-2015)

Remarks by John Kerry, Secretary of State at the Atlantic Council's Conference on Trade and National Security: Renewing U.S. Leadership Through Economic Strength

General Jones, thank you very much for a very, very generous introduction. More importantly, thank you for your absolutely extraordinary years of service to our country. You've held so many important positions and working your way up from a young lieutenant in Vietnam all the way to the National Security Advisor and many, many places in between. We admire – I admire and I think the world appreciates the extraordinary contribution to our country's security, and I mean it. Thank you very, very much. (Applause.)

The only thing I worry about is this notion of a terrible toll on my health. I feel great, folks. (Laughter.) I haven't noticed it. (Laughter.) I thought you were going to say a terrible toll on my family and their life, but – (laughter.)

Messrs, ambassadors, madam, thank you so much for being here today. It is an important statement about the importance of this topic that so many ambassadors are here reflecting their interests in this issue of trade.

And I'm really delighted to be here with all of you fellow Atlanticists. It's good to be here. I'm going to surprise you a little bit because I'm going to talk both about the Atlantic and the Pacific today. I'm going to talk about security and trade, which is a very timely topic and almost a guaranteed way to get into a pretty good argument within or without – outside the Beltway.

But that's exactly why we're here. The Atlantic Council has certainly never shied away from controversy. And for more than half a century, this product, the council of the greatest generation, has been an extraordinarily important bulwark of support for NATO, for close economic ties between the United States, Canada, and Europe. And in that time, the council has had a lot of superb leaders, beginning with Christian Herter, coincidentally a former U.S. secretary of state from Massachusetts. Fred Kempe also belongs to that good tradition of visionaries and internationalists, and I appreciate his invitation to be here. But I also appreciate his leadership, and I think all of you do too, what he's doing with the Atlantic Council.

The introduction of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act is, in fact, very good news. Why? Because it reflects exactly what our nation needs – a bridge over three divides: the Executive and Legislative; between the Senate and the House; and between the two major political parties. So I want to commend the Senate Finance Chair Orrin Hatch, the panel's Ranking Member Ron Wyden, and House Ways and Means Committee Chair Paul Ryan. I commend them for providing a framework for moving forward on a pair of the most significant trade negotiations in our history – the Trans-Pacific and the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnerships. Those of you fond of acronyms, TPP and TTIP.

Now, if enacted, the new bipartisan bill will fully respect and preserve the rights of Congress. But it will also give the President of the United States the flexibility that he has to have to negotiate credibly and effectively on our nation's behalf. And make no mistake: The question of whether a President should have Trade Promotion Authority in the end really does come down to whether the United States should even pursue significant free trade agreements. That's what's at stake.

During my 28-plus years of service in the United States Senate, I had a lot of conversations on this subject with factory workers, union representatives, businesspeople, and other professionals. And often, these discussions were heated, emotional, challenging, because men and women are understandably upset if they see a company close down, jobs lost, and they deem the causation to be directly responsible for a particular trade undertaking. It's only natural that people are going to look around, and in their distress they're going to find someone or something to be able to blame. And it's sometimes easy.

As a Democrat, as somebody who won the nomination of my party for the presidency, I understand those tensions as well as anybody. But I voted for the trade agreements, including NAFTA, when they came to the United States Senate.

I had a lot of other conversations, too, on the other side of that coin, with entrepreneurs and innovators – people who were eager to take advantage of new opportunities and whose ingenuity helped to create jobs, move our country forward, change our economy, open up new opportunities, reinvent the mix of our economic base in cities like Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, elsewhere.

And whether we like it or not, my friends, what is new, particularly in business – not in everything, but particularly in business – ultimately catches up with and ultimately overtakes the old practice. That's the reality. You can trace that from the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. It's what we've always called progress. And yes, with unevenness sometimes in the social fabric, it has more generally than not brought you that progress. But the resulting gains, it is fair to say, don't come often without some element of loss at some point. And that's why we've put in place trade adjustment assistance; that's why we've done a lot of other things in order to respond. It's always created somewhat of a dilemma for policymakers. But should we try to stop change, as inevitable as it is? Is that even realistic? Should we fight as hard as we can to maximize the benefits and minimize the dislocation that sometimes accompanies that change?

My own convictions are twofold. First, in the modern world, we simply cannot expect our economies to grow and generate new jobs if all we do is buy and sell to ourselves – ain't gonna work. Trade is a job creator, period. And the record of the past five years, the past 20 years, the past 100 years or more bears that out. As I speak, exports support about 11.7 million American jobs – exports. And that number is only going to go up. Why? It's pretty simple math: 95 percent of the world's consumers live beyond our borders. If for some reason we decide not to do business with them, our economy absolutely will gradually wither and shrink, and we will see boarded-up windows and “going out of business” signs from one side of America to another. Embracing globalization is not easy. I understand that. In fact, it can be hard. But trying to pretend that it doesn't exist would be catastrophic.

My second conviction is that we – and by that I mean the United States – should be deeply engaged in helping to write the rules for trade. Once again, common sense. Why would you sit on a sideline and let other people do that? You think they're going to go for our high standard automatically? You can measure what happens to companies all across the world in the application of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. How many countries try to ask their companies to operate by that standard?

Failure to do this would be a felony against the future of our own economy. We have to be engaged, because if we don't protect our interests, no one else is going to, and because we've learned from past experience to insist on tightly written and enforceable standards on the issues that we care about the most. That is why it is so important that these lessons are the very center of the bipartisan bill that is now being considered by the Congress and of the high-standard trade negotiations that are currently underway.

Let me look at that for a minute. The proposal now on Capitol Hill goes well beyond any previous measure of its type. Rather than settling for the status quo, it is designed to raise the bar on issue after issue. It says to our trading partners that if they want to take part in this global market then it's important for them to comply with the core international labor and environmental standards. They have to fight trade-related bribery and corruption; they have to color within the lines on intellectual property rights; they have to enable legitimate digital trade; and they have to accept effective dispute settlement mechanisms in order to ensure that promises made are promises kept.

Now all of this, all of those things I just listed that have to happen that are in the context of this agreement, they are the direct product of the lessons that we have learned and of the listening that we have been doing over the course of these last years. It adds up to a policy that pursues trade not just for the sake of trade, but to ensure that our workers and our businesses are, in fact, going to be guaranteed that they have a fair chance to compete.

Now remember when President Obama took office, we were in a recession. In fact, we were facing the greatest financial crisis of this country since the Great Depression. And we were looking at the prospect of even entering a great depression. The entire financial structure of the country was on the brink and ready to collapse. And I'm not saying that. That's what a Republican secretary of the treasury said to me and to my colleagues in the United States Senate on an afternoon when he came up to literally implore us to engage in a bailout of that system. Unemployment was approaching 10 percent. The housing market was in shambles. Today nobody's claiming victory, but since 2010, U.S. businesses have added over 12 million new jobs. We've put more people back to work than all the other advanced economies combined. And the single biggest cause of this success is that our exports have reached a record level. And that's more than a statistic, folks; that's a policy. Because when we increase the sale of U.S. goods and services, our payrolls get bigger and American paychecks get fatter. On the average, export-supported jobs pay significantly more than other jobs. And all of this matters enormously because, as President Obama has often observed, America's capacity to lead globally begins with our economic vitality here at home.

Now if we're all satisfied with our progress, perhaps we could sit back, forget about trade agreements and about the chance to further pry open international markets, where 19 out of 20 of the world's consumers live. But we're not satisfied, nor should we be. Because we know that if we attempt to stand still, we're going to get blown away economically. We've got to keep generating new jobs. And we've got to ensure that American workers, farmers, ranchers, and businesses receive equitable treatment. You can't do that by sitting on the side of the road, folks, while other countries write the rules of the road for world trade, which is where the future is going to be defined.

Most Americans understand that. A recent Gallup poll shows that almost 60 percent of our citizens view foreign trade as an opportunity, not a threat. And here's the reason: The U.S. market is one of the most open markets in the world, and our environmental and labor standards are among the highest in the world. That's why we actually have so much to gain and nothing to lose by reaching deals that lower barriers and raise the norms of business behavior so that our businesses can actually wind up selling more in other places.

Now consider that small and medium-sized businesses – which are the backbone of the American economy, by the way – they face a unique set of challenges when they're trying to increase exports. For example, Health Enterprises in North Attleboro, Massachusetts ships consumer health care items to more than 60 countries but is hurt by bureaucratic issues such as costly re-registration process in the EU. The Seattle-based Cascade Designs Company exports outdoor equipment – recreation equipment – but it faces high tariffs in TPP countries. An agreement would change that, enabling both exports and payrolls to grow. Concord Supply in San Antonio, Texas is a seller of industrial materials and it depends on patent enforcement in order to keep its innovative products from being ripped off. More generally, the United States is the world leader in many service industries, and therefore stands to gain significantly from greater openness in that sector.

The list goes on – long list. Our companies need agreements that will reduce both tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade, thereby enabling them to participate more fully in the new global supply chains that are creating unprecedented opportunities to establish winning connections around the world. In fact, the economic case for TPP and TTIP is actually overwhelming, and I've argued a lot of cases over the course of my public career.

However, as Secretary of State, I'd like to offer just a little bit of additional food for thought here – wearing the Secretary of State hat, not the business or trade hat. It is no secret that we have reached a very fluid stage in global affairs where people are wondering all around the world, frankly, how the world will look a couple of decades from now. This turbulence that we are witnessing comes from a combination of factors, but it comes significantly from technology, changing economic and political relationships. It comes from the fact that even as the world grows closer, there are powerful forces driving us apart. These include terrorism, but also extreme nationalism, conflicts over resources, the imbalance between the number of people coming of age in many regions, and a dangerous shortfall in economic and social opportunity.

We also know that everybody in the world is in touch with everybody in the world all the time every day. And believe me, that changes aspirations and it changes politics. It changes possibilities. It makes it harder to build consensus, harder to govern.

And when we add all of this up, we are confronted by a couple of very basic questions: Are we going to look backward and decide that the best way to prepare for the future is to try and recapture the past? Are we going to fear change and give up even attempting to negotiate a trade agreement that will spur sustained growth and address precisely the labor and environmental concerns about which critics have previously complained?

I sure hope not.

Because the fact is that we could try to build a wall around our economy as big as Fenway Park's Green Monster, maybe bigger; it would be a lot more harmful than it would be helpful, my friends. Instead of walls, what we ought to be building are alliances and partnerships and understanding and rules of the road by which we can all act with certainty, rather than hunkering down and just thinking somehow the storm's going to pass over you and you're going to be okay. We should be and we are – believe me – using all the diplomatic tools at our disposal to generate shared prosperity, so that we and our partners can move forward together. And we need to make certain that everybody up and down that food chain – the economic food chain – shares in the benefits of this much more effectively than have at some times in the past.

Now the good news is that our engagement has been welcomed across every ocean not because we always agree with all of our friends on every part of this or all of the impacts, but because we know that our markets and indeed our very futures – all of us – are linked. And that when the chips are really down our partners will be able to count on us, and just as we know, in fact, that we can count on them. That's what will give the world greater strength and, frankly, greater stability in this extraordinary moment of challenge on a global basis. The right kind of trade agreements are actually critical because they create habits of cooperation that help us not only economically but in everything else that we are not only determined to do but that we need to do in order to reduce the instability and address the challenges of the future.

The United States and Europe are bound together – as Shakespeare put it “by hoops of iron.” TTIP will enable us to take further advantage of our combined economic muscle. A few years ago when it was first talked about, I remember in the middle of the economic crisis, people said wow, this is going to be able to really help us get out of this crisis, lift up, create the jobs we need. That hasn't changed, that need. There's still crisis in a number of countries in Europe. And as we look at Greece struggling with the Euro and other challenges, TTIP has the opportunity to be able to provide the economic kick that people need and want, and thereby serve as a strategic pillar of the transatlantic community; it will underscore the democratic solidarity that has defined us and united us since the Berlin Wall was pulled down by the indomitable courage of people on both sides of that barrier. And looking ahead, TTIP will reinforce our common effort to counter violent extremism, support the sovereignty of Ukraine, build energy security and independence for many nations in Europe that currently have to rely on one source – Russia, and also it will help us address such global problems, such as nuclear proliferation and climate change. That's what comes out of this kind of cooperative effort and the growth that it will spur.

Of course, the Asia Pacific is also a major focus of our international economic policy and our diplomacy. The markets there are huge and they are growing very rapidly. And expanding right along with them is the range of American economic, political, and security interests. Seven Asian countries are among our negotiating partners on the TPP. These include Japan, whose prime minister will be in Washington next week for a state dinner and to address a joint session of Congress. The transformation of the United States and Japan from enemies to allies over the past seven decades is truly one of the most magnificent achievements of all history for both countries – an example of a remarkable turnaround of reconciliation and of possibilities. The TPP is one way to guarantee that our bilateral ties already strong grow even stronger, while serving to reassure all of our allies that America's commitment to the region is both deeply rooted and long-term.

And because the Asia Pacific matters so much, President Obama announced early in his presidency a plan for a rebalance in our foreign policy. But that rebalance is grounded as well in the need for regional partners to perceive a level playing field within Asia so that the geopolitical clout is not overly concentrated in any one country, including us. We're not seeking that. We want to see it spread and shared and understood and engaged in by all countries rather than a great game, as we have known it in too many places through all of the last few centuries. That equilibrium is crucial because the economic models and trade standards that hold sway in the Asia Pacific will have a decisive impact on the norms elsewhere. It's in America's interests, in our allies' interests, that these standards be as high as we can make them, because when the competition is fair those countries that practice by those standards are the most productive in the world, and I'm glad to say the United States is among them.

The bottom line is this: 2015 is simply not the time for us to decide that trade negotiations are too hard, or to somehow vacate the field and let 70 years of lessons from the Great Depression and World War II get tossed aside. It's not the time for us to sit back and allow the principles of free and

open trade to be supplanted by the barren twins of protectionism and mercantilism. Why on Earth would we ever think that to do so would be in America's best interests or the interests of the world? But that's what's being offered by others, opponents. Why would you even consider that?

If there is any message being sent by – to governments by the young people in the world today – which really was at the heart of the Arab Spring; at the heart of the revolution that was attempted in Syria; at the heart of Tahrir Square; at the heart of that terrible incident of one person, a fruit vendor, burning himself to death in Tunisia, igniting the rest of the aspirations of people to overflow in those squares and hope for jobs and opportunity and education and a future – if we don't meet the needs of those young people today in their demand for openness and freedom, the desire to give nature and the environment the same protections that we pursue for commercial contracts and property, these young people insist that we live by the rule of law so that the corrupt are held accountable, and it's possible to achieve prosperity without being either a giant corporation or born rich.

As Americans, these aren't the kind of demands that should worry us. These aren't aspirations we should be scared of. We should welcome them, because we've encouraged them all over the world for decades. They are, on the contrary, the hopes and expectations that the United States should embrace. They reflect principles that can help us modernize and strengthen our partnerships across both oceans. They can elevate the way the whole world does business. And the road to their realization begins with the approval of trade promotion authority for the President, followed by the completion of these two agreements, each of which represents an agreement with 40 percent individually of the GDP of the world.

Ultimately, my friends, trade issues cannot be separated from larger questions about America's global leadership or about the choices yet to be made by our generation. If we retreat on trade, our influence on the global economy will diminish. And if our economic stature is in doubt, our ability to deliver on defense and political challenges will be increasingly questioned. In our era, the economic and security realms are absolutely integrated; we simply can't pull back from one without diminishing our role on the other. We have to be fully engaged in each.

More than 50 years ago, when Christian Herter led this council, American exports were worth only about one-twentieth of their value today. In the decades since, our commercial relationships have been utterly transformed, our leading manufacturers have changed, our trade in services has exploded, and technology has made what was once barely imaginable now the new normal. We are living in a wholly different world, except for one thing: the need for American leadership. Like the greatest generation, we face the tests that we cannot allow partisanship or any other source of internal division to prevent us from meeting. We have an opportunity before us to shape and to elevate the global rules of trade for decades to come. On these rules will be written the economic history of this century.

In Congress, prominent leaders from both parties are poised to open that door. It is absolutely vital, my friends at the Atlantic Council, that you and we all together do everything possible to make sure we walk through that door together, and that we get this job done. Thank you very much.
(Applause.)

Related Articles:

[DipNote](#)

6. Amb. Baer's Response to Russia at OSCE on Training in Ukraine (04-23-2015)

*As delivered by Ambassador Daniel B. Baer to the Permanent Council, Vienna
Response to the Russian Federation regarding military training by US troops in Ukraine*

To respond to our Russian colleague's questions and points:

First let me say that I think the fact that our Russian colleague could neither confirm nor deny the presence of Russian air defenses or Russian participation in the training in Eastern Ukraine is progress: because neither confirming nor denying is at least not outright denying – so we've taken a half-step forward.

On the question of air defenses and why there would be air defense systems deployed, I think that's really more of a question for the Russian Ambassador's own government, and for his colleagues in the military, and the military leadership, as to what their rationale is. I am admittedly not a military expert, but my understanding is that, in general, often air defenses are deployed in order to provide cover for planned ground attacks. I just offer that general observation, but I think those best positioned to answer the question of the Russian Ambassador as to why his country's air defenses are deployed near the front lines, deep inside of Ukraine, are the military leaders' in Russia. In any case, no matter why they are deployed, they are clearly in violation of both the letter and the spirit of what the Russian government signed up to--several times now--in Minsk. So, whatever the rationale, the way forward would be for Russia to withdraw those, as well as its other military personnel and equipment.

In terms of the issue raised with training: the Russian Ambassador highlighted what has been a transparent agreed training program invited by the sovereign government of Ukraine. The United States had previously announced this – that we are, through our Global Security Contingency Fund, initiating training. There are approximately 290 US troops participating with various select units of the National Guard to help strengthen Ukraine's abilities with respect to internal security and territorial defense.

The Russian ambassador's question "what would you have us do? will Washington decide?" I think that goes to the heart of the matter: what makes this different from what Russia is doing is that, first of all, it's transparent. The Russian Ambassador himself was able to get plenty of information from US government websites. And secondly, and this is really important, that it is invited by the government of Ukraine and done with the government of Ukraine, on the territory of Ukraine. The training is happening in the far west, near to the Polish border. If colleagues would like more information on this – and it is publicly available: this is part of a long-standing engagement that we've had with Ukraine, as part of NATO's Partnership for Peace program.

I'm glad that the Russian ambassador raised this because it is really important to draw a distinction between the kinds of training that goes on government-to-government, that are invited by the host government, and the activities that the Russian Federation is carrying out in continuing to fuel a conflict in a neighboring country.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Related Articles:

[Amb. Baer's Response to Chief OSCE Monitor in Ukraine](#)

[Amb. Baer at OSCE on Illegal Custody of Ukrainian Hostages](#)

7. Work Praises U.S., Australia, New Zealand Partnership (04-22-2015)

By Terri Moon Cronk
DoD News, Defense Media Activity

WASHINGTON, April 22, 2015 – Thousands of miles from home, the Australian and New Zealand Army Corps fought for something larger than themselves: their national identity and ensuring the world was safer and better, Deputy Defense Secretary Bob Work said today during a ribbon-cutting ceremony of the enhanced exhibit in the Australia, New Zealand and United States Corridor at the Pentagon today.

The exhibit in the ANZUS Corridor marks the 100th-year anniversary, coming up April 25, of Australian and New Zealand Army Corps Day -- also known as ANZAC Day -- when troops from both countries landed at Gallipoli in Turkey's Dardanelles strait and met with fierce Ottoman Turkish defenders.

"It is a sacred day ... throughout Australia and New Zealand that honors the bravery, service and sacrifices made by the Australians and New Zealanders, not just on the shores of Gallipoli," Work said, "but in every major conflict since."

Quoting the words of Australian Ambassador Kim Beazley, who opened the ceremony, "Although Gallipoli was a failure in the operational sense, it is a story of just incredible bravery, courage and sacrifice," the deputy defense secretary said.

ANZAC Fought Bravely

Despite the difficult odds the Australians and New Zealanders faced on the beach and in that area, Work added, they fought bravely for many months and endured hardships almost impossible to imagine.

The ANZAC troops charged the Turks, who were entrenched with machine guns and rifles with bayonets, Work said.

"Over 10,000 brave soldiers from Australia and New Zealand lost their lives in those months," the deputy defense secretary said. "It's almost impossible for us to imagine that scale of loss today, but as Beazley said, that campaign was not even the bloodiest of World War I."

For more than 60 years since that time, the United States, Australia and New Zealand have served far from home together, risking their lives to ensure the safety and security of their countries, Work said.

U.S., Australia, New Zealand Fight Together

"The three nations worked to advance peace and stability throughout our world," he added. "The partnership between our three countries has led to rapid responses to the world's worst threats, no matter where they erupt."

And because of the ANZAC troops' tenacity, bravery and courage at Gallipoli, their later partnership with the United States has served as a model for nations, "galvanizing them, we believe, to participate in struggles around the world for freedom," Work noted.

The partnership has covered the globe. In Afghanistan, all three of militaries worked side by side for more than a decade, and in West Africa, they worked to battle Ebola, the deputy defense secretary said.

Working to Defeat ISIL

“And now in Iraq, the Australian and New Zealand troops have become invaluable partners in the international coalition against the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant -- proving that yet again, although we are separated by a broad ocean -- we are very close and not bound by any particular geography or conflict or adversary,” Work said.

The acute sense of global responsibility that the three countries have reflected well upon all of them and their fighting men and women in all of our services, he added.

“We’re all grateful for the continued leadership and partnership that we have with Australia and New Zealand,” Work said.

Biographies:

[Bob Work](#)

Related Sites:

[State Department Fact Sheet on Australia](#)

[State Department Fact Sheet on New Zealand](#)

8. Meeting With Former Lebanese Prime Minister Hariri (04-22-2015)

Remarks With Former Lebanese Prime Minister Saad Hariri

SECRETARY KERRY: Well, good morning, everybody. It’s my pleasure to welcome to Washington and to the State Department the former prime minister of Lebanon and a good friend personally. Each time that I have gone to Beirut, almost every time, I’ve had occasion to be able to visit with Saad Hariri. And he has worked for moderation and for thoughtful political compromise to try to move this country forward. He’s worked through very difficult challenges, obviously.

And we’re particularly, here in the United States, committed to Lebanon’s stability and security. We’re anxious to see the presidency ultimately filled and to try to see the effects of Daesh and Nusrah and Syria moved away from Lebanon so that Lebanon can really have its sovereignty respected and its future protected and guaranteed.

So we have a lot to talk about, because right now, there are some 1.2 million refugees who have spilled over from Syria into Lebanon that destabilizes the country. We are very opposed to entities like Hizballah and others using locations and places in Lebanon and nearby as pawns in this struggle. And we call on Iran and the Assad regime and others to respect the integrity of Lebanon, and permit it and its people to be able to find the peace and the stability that they have longed for so long.

So we have a lot to talk about, and I’m very, very happy to welcome the former prime minister here. I know he remains very active and is very important to the politics of his country. And we will continue to support the Lebanese Armed Forces and the forces of moderation and those who want to work together peacefully to provide the future that the people of Lebanon deserve.

Welcome.

MR. HARIRI: Thank you. I want to thank you, Mr. Secretary, for having me here. Yes, we do have a lot to talk about. Lebanon is living a very difficult time. The region also is in a very, very dangerous time also, I would say. The involvement of certain factions like Hizballah in Iran also – and in Lebanon or in Syria or in Iraq or in Yemen has grown to a point that is extremely dangerous. We believe that Iran has a good – a country that we all need to deal with, and we believe that interfering into Lebanon is not something that we would like as Lebanese people.

I would like to thank you for the support of the Lebanese army. This is something that we try to always help, because this is the basic of our security. We're facing Daesh; we're facing Nusrah; we're facing al-Qaida on our borders. We have 1.2 million refugees, like you said, and we need to elect a president. So hopefully, we'll have some good talks. Thank you.

SECRETARY KERRY: Look forward to it. Thank you. Welcome. Thank you very much, folks. Thank you.
