

**NOMINATIONS OF THE 113TH
CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION**

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

—————
MAY 7 THROUGH DECEMBER 17, 2013
—————

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>

**NOMINATIONS OF THE 113TH
CONGRESS—FIRST SESSION**

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE**

ONE HUNDRED THIRTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

MAY 7 THROUGH DECEMBER 17, 2013

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Relations



Available via the World Wide Web: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

88-305 PDF

WASHINGTON : 2014

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

NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA POWER

WEDNESDAY, JULY 17, 2013

Samantha Power, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations, and to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:18 a.m., in room SD-419, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Robert Menendez (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Senators Menendez, Cardin, Shaheen, Udall, Murphy, Kaine, Corker, Risch, Rubio, Johnson, Flake, McCain, Barrasso, and Paul.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning. This hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will come to order.

Good morning, Ms. Power. Welcome to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Your nomination as Ambassador to the United Nations has come with much fanfare and with some criticism which, at the end of the day, means you must be doing something right. But without fanfare or criticism, I do not believe anyone can question your credentials. Nor can anyone question your service.

And certainly no one can question your willingness to speak your mind, often forcefully, always passionately, and usually without hesitation, and I commend you for your willingness to speak out, particularly on human rights issues around the world, whether as a war correspondent in Bosnia, in the former Yugoslavia, in Rwanda and Sudan where, as you said in your Pulitzer Prize winning book on genocide, you witnessed "evil at its worst."

You have been an unrelenting, principled voice when it comes to human rights and crimes against humanity, and I know that voice will be heard around the world, should you be confirmed.

Personally, I am incredibly appreciative of the principled position you have taken, on many of these issues, but particularly on the

Armenian genocide. In 2007, you wrote in Time Magazine, “a stable, fruitful 21st century relationship,” in referring to Turkey, “cannot be built on a lie.” And I completely agree.

Your belief that we should use the lessons of what clearly was an atrocity of historic proportions to prevent future crimes against humanity is a view consistent with my own and many others on this committee and which is supported by your role on the President’s Atrocities Prevention Board.

I agree that we must acknowledge and study the past, understand how and why atrocities happen, to put into practice and give meaning to the phrase “never again.”

As the son of immigrants from Cuba, one whose family and friends bore witness to, suffered, and continue to suffer under the Castro regime’s oppression, I personally appreciate your commitment to exposing the Castro dictatorship’s total disregard for human and civil rights and for not idealizing the harsh realities of communism in Cuba. I know from the conversation we had in my office that you appreciate the suffering of the Cuban people, the torture, abuse, detention, and abridgment of the civil and human rights of those who voice their dissent.

I also welcomed your commitment to reach out to Rosa Maria Paya, a daughter of the longtime dissident and Cuban activist, Oswaldo Paya, who died under mysterious circumstances last year in Cuba. Ms. Paya is in Washington this week accepting a posthumous award from the National Endowment for Democracy on behalf of another young activist from Cuba who died alongside Oswaldo Paya, making your commitment to reach out to her that much more timely.

And yesterday’s news of the discovery of illegal arms shipments from Cuba to North Korea reinforces in my view the necessity of the United States keeping Cuba on the list of countries who are the sponsors of terrorism.

I share your view that we should not lose sight of these moral issues even as we are addressing the pressing economic and security issues that confront our Nation.

It is fitting that you will be at the United Nations, which was created after a period of atrocity and conflict with the goal of bringing nations together to achieve peace and stability.

In the words of the U.N. preamble that was created, quote, “to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women of nations large and small.”

If confirmed, your focus on the United Nations will, no doubt, be on the crisis du jour, the Middle East, Syria, Iran, North Korea, Afghanistan, Pakistan, increasingly North Africa, and the nature of nations that emerge from the Arab Spring. But I would encourage you to also keep your focus and task your staff to not forget what is happening off the front page as well as on it: What may be happening on freedom of expression in Latin America; fighting HIV/AIDS, malaria, and polio in Africa; on the status of talks to resolve the 66-year-long question of Cyprus; on women’s rights in Pakistan; labor rights in Bangladesh; and human rights in Sri Lanka.

The United Nations, for all its faults, has a great ability to serve as an arbitrator and neutral fact-finder and overseer of peace. I

urge you to harness its strengths in the interests of our Nation and not coincidentally in the interest of fulfilling the stated purpose of the United Nations, which is to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security.

We will address these issues, among many others, in our questioning, but let me take this opportunity again to welcome you to the committee and to say that we look forward to a full and frank dialogue on the issues you will face, should you be confirmed.

Let me also say for the record if there are additional questions for the record of this nominee, they should be submitted by 5 p.m. today.

With that, let me turn to the distinguished ranking member of the committee, Senator Corker, for his opening statement.

**STATEMENT OF HON. BOB CORKER,
U.S. SENATOR FROM TENNESSEE**

Senator CORKER. Mr. Chairman, thank you for having this hearing.

And I want to welcome the nominee. We had a very good meeting.

I will be brief.

I know you are going to be received very well here in spite of the two introducers that you have beside you.

But I do appreciate the time and the candor in our office. I want to thank you for being willing to serve in this way, and I think you know our Ambassador to the United Nations is one of the most important diplomatic posts that we have. You have daily contact with leaders from all around the world and, therefore, are maybe out there amongst people around the world more than anybody else, and it can be a critical component of our diplomatic efforts.

We are the largest contributor to the United Nations. I think you know that. And I hope that one of the things you are going to pursue—I know you are very policy-oriented, and I appreciate that, but I hope you are also going to pursue reforms at the United Nations to cause it to function in a much better way for not only U.S. taxpayers but for the world. All too often—I think you know this—the United Nations acts as a place where bad actors deflect criticism. And I hope that you will—I think you will actually—but I hope you will follow the footsteps of predecessors like Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Jeane Kilpatrick who basically got out there and championed our national interests at the United Nations even when it was unpopular.

So, again, I thank you for coming before us today. I look forward to your service. I know there will be a number of questions today that I know you will answer well. And, again, thank you for your willingness to serve.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to hearing from our extra-distinguished guests today that I know are looking at their watch wanting to go to the next hearing, even though they are glad to be here I know.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Corker.

We are pleased to have our distinguished colleagues from Georgia with us to introduce Ms. Power to the committee. So I will first

recognize the senior member from Georgia, Senator Chambliss, followed then by Senator Isakson.

**STATEMENT OF HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS,
U.S. SENATOR FROM GEORGIA**

Senator CHAMBLISS. Well, thank you very much, Chairman Menendez and Senator Corker, for allowing Johnny and me to come today to introduce Samantha Power to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Samantha is already well known by this committee, but suffice it to say she is an Irish-born American who matriculated to Atlanta to become educated in high school to prepare herself not just for this job but to go to Yale and go to Harvard Law School. Pretty good credentials coming out of Lakeside High School in Atlanta.

She has a passion for human rights, as you stated, Mr. Chairman, and she takes her passion very seriously. She is a prolific writer who believes in what she is writing about to the extent that she gets into the fray as she did in Yugoslavia by dodging bullets to report on the war in Yugoslavia.

She is a Pulitzer Prize winning author.

She has extensive foreign policy experience as a staffer, as well as a member of the President's national security team.

You know, the job that she has been nominated by the President to assume is a very difficult job. It is one that requires charisma and at the same time toughness. Now, I am told by her friends that Samantha can be kind and gentle, but she is one more smart, tough lady who can express herself in very strong terms when she needs to. And she is going to need that ability.

I look forward to seeing her as an adversary to some of the tougher leaders around the world that she will be dealing with at the United Nations because I am confident that the same passion she has for human rights she has for this country, and she will express that passion in no uncertain terms.

She is going to be a great representative of the United States as Ambassador to the United Nations. I commend her to you highly, and I look forward to seeing her confirmed in short order.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Isakson.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOHNNY ISAKSON,
U.S. SENATOR FROM GEORGIA**

Senator ISAKSON. Thank you, Chairman Menendez, Senator Corker. It is an honor to be here to introduce a woman with Georgia roots.

At the age of 9, Samantha's parents brought her from Ireland to the United States and she ended up at Lakeside High School in DeKalb County, Georgia, where she graduated.

I did some research to find out what others said about her when she was in Georgia, and a good friend of mine, Jeff Hullinger, who is the sports director for WSB in Atlanta, had her as one of his interns in 1989. And I want to quote directly from what he said about Samantha. He said "she seemed to be a fish out of water in the sports department. Oh, my God, was she bright, acerbic, light-

ning-witted, and the depth of the Mariana Trench." So I do not know if you have got a better introduction or a better compliment than that, but Jeff said she is one of the brightest people that he has ever known.

I appreciate her asking me to introduce her today, and I will just share a few thoughts additional to those Senator Chambliss said.

As you know, I have traveled to Sudan. I have traveled to Rwanda. I have been to some of the places Samantha has written about and been an activist about. In fact, in her book about Rwanda, "A Problem from Hell," which was a great book, she wrote that she could not believe that during the 3 months of the slaughter of over a million Rwandans, there was not even a high-level meeting at the White House. That, I am sure, was part of the motivation for her to create the Atrocities Prevention Board in the White House and for her to be a part of it.

Rich Williamson, who was the Special Envoy for President Bush to the Sudan, who I met with in Darfur—Senator Corker traveled with me to Darfur—gives her high marks.

My dear friend, Senator Bob Dole, sent me an e-mail after her nomination and said this is one woman who is most appropriate for the position to which she has been nominated.

Last, I am the Republican designee from the United States Senate to the United Nations for this session of Congress. Senator Leahy is the Democrat. I have traveled to the U.N. Security Council and watched the challenges that Senator Corker referred to in dealing with those 13 members. I have no reservation or doubt whatsoever that Samantha Power will be just what her name implies, a powerful representative of the United States of America in a very powerful body, the Security Council of the United Nations.

It is a pleasure and a privilege for me to introduce her and I wish her the best of luck in her confirmation.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, we thank both of our colleagues for coming and joining our work.

We welcome Senator Isakson back to the committee. Senator Isakson was a distinguished member of the committee. We miss him on the committee, and we hope that in some point he will return in the future.

And I know you have busy schedules. So when you feel it appropriate, please feel free to leave as you need to.

With that great set of introductions, Ms. Power, you are welcome to start your testimony. If you have family or friends here, please feel free to introduce them. We understand this is a commitment not only of yourself but family, and we appreciate that.

Your full statement will be entered into the record, without objection. And the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF SAMANTHA POWER, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, AND TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir, and thank you, Ranking Member Corker and distinguished members of this committee.

It is a great honor to appear before you as President Obama's nominee to serve as the U.S. Permanent Representative to the United Nations. Representing the United States would be the privilege of a lifetime. I am grateful to the President for placing his trust in me.

I would like to thank my friends and my remarkable family. My parents, who brought me here from Ireland, Vera Delaney and Edmund Bourke; my husband Cass Sunstein; and our children, 4-year-old Declan and 1-year-old Rian, who has already proven less interested in this hearing than others here today. [Laughter.]

I would also like to thank Senator Chambliss and Senator Isakson for their generous, remarkable introductions. Growing up as an Irish immigrant in Atlanta, GA, I cannot say that the United Nations was a popular topic with my classmates at Lakeside High School. But it was in Georgia, while working at the same local television station, that I witnessed footage of the massacre in Tiananmen Square and resolved then that I would do what I could for the rest of my life to stand up for American values and to stand up for freedom. My Georgia friends supported me every step of the way, and I am so proud now to count these two great public servants, Senator Isakson and Senator Chambliss, among them.

When I first came to this country, I viewed the United Nations as a place where people assembled to resolve their differences. It was the stage, as Senator Corker said, on which iconic Americans like Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Jeane Kirkpatrick stood up for what was right.

Unfortunately, when I traveled to the Balkans in 1993, I saw a different side to the United Nations. U.N. peacekeepers had been sent to protect civilians, but in the town of Srebrenica, more than 8,000 Muslim men and boys were executed in cold blood as the peacekeepers stood idly by.

The United Nations is, of course, multifaceted and its record mixed. It was with the support of the United Nations that I traveled in 2004 to Darfur where I discovered a mass grave and many charred villages, hallmarks of the genocide being carried out by the Sudanese Government. Today it is the World Health Organization that is helping to provide polio vaccinations, even as terrorists wage an assassination campaign against doctors.

And last Friday, it was the United Nations that provided a stage for Malala, the brave, young Pakistani girl who was shot last year by the Taliban on her way home from school. Together, she and the United Nations will inspire millions to stand up for girls' education.

Yet alongside all of this within the United Nations, an organization built in part to apply the lessons of the Holocaust, we also see unacceptable attacks against the State of Israel. We see the absurdity of Iran chairing the U.N. Conference on Disarmament. We see the failure of the U.N. Security Council to respond to the slaughter in Syria, a disgrace that history will judge harshly.

What is also clear, 68 years after the United Nations was founded in San Francisco, is that an effective United Nations depends on effective American leadership. The war in Bosnia did not end because the United Nations acted. It ended because President Clinton, backed by a bipartisan coalition in Congress, including Senator McCain, took robust action. It is now possible to imagine an AIDS-free generation in Africa not merely because of the essential work of UNAIDS, but because President George W. Bush decided to provide lifesaving drugs on a massive scale.

I believe that America cannot—indeed, I know that America should not—police every crisis or shelter every refugee. While our good will knows no bounds, our resources are, of course, finite, strained by pressing needs at home, and we are not the world's policeman. We must make choices based on the best interests of the American people, and other countries must share the costs and burdens of addressing global problems.

There are challenges that cross borders that the United States alone cannot meet. There are cases, as with sanctions against Iran and North Korea, where U.S. efforts pack far more punch when we are joined by others. There are occasions, as in Mali today, when the United Nations has to step up to prevent state failure which abets terrorism.

An effective United Nations is critical to a range of U.S. interests.

Let me highlight quickly three key priorities that I would take up, if confirmed by the Senate.

First, the United Nations must be fair. The United States has no greater friend in the world than the State of Israel. We share security interests. We share core values, and we have a special relationship with Israel. And yet, the General Assembly and Human Rights Council continue to pass one-sided resolutions condemning Israel. Israel, not Iran, not Sudan, not North Korea, is the one country with a fixed place on the Human Rights Council's agenda. Israel's legitimacy should be beyond dispute and its security must be beyond doubt. And just as I have done as President Obama's U.N. advisor at the White House, I will stand up for Israel and work tirelessly to defend it.

Second, the United Nations must become more efficient and effective. In these difficult budget times, when the American people are cutting back, the United Nations must do the same. This means eliminating waste, strengthening whistleblower protections, ending any tolerance for corruption, and getting other countries to pay their fair share. It means closing down those missions and programs that no longer make sense. The United States has the right and the duty to insist on reform, and if confirmed, I will aggressively pursue this cause.

Third, the United Nations must stand up for human rights and human dignity, which are American values and universal values.

Today, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights is widely hailed and yet only selectively heeded.

Taking up the cause of freedom is not just the right thing to do, it is, of course, the smart thing to do. Countries that violate the rights of women and girls will never approach their full potential. Countries that do not protect religious freedom create cleavages that destabilize whole regions. If I am given the honor of sitting behind the sign that says "United States," I will do what America does best: stand up against repressive regimes and promote human rights. I will also do everything in my power to get others to do the same.

This means contesting the crackdown on civil society being carried out in countries like Cuba, Iran, Russia, and Venezuela. It means calling on the world to unite against human trafficking and against the grotesque atrocities being carried out by the Assad regime. And it means uniting peoples who long to live free of fear in the cause of fighting terrorism.

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, and other distinguished members of the committee, the late ambassador, my friend, Richard Holbrooke, told this committee that Congress should be in on the take-offs, not just the landings. I appear before you today not just to seek your support, but to ask to join you in a conversation about how to strengthen what is right and fix what is wrong at the UN. If I am confirmed, I will continue this dialogue directly and personally. And if the prospect of visiting the UN does not immediately entice you, my son Declan has resolved to become a tour guide like no other.

If I am given the privilege of sitting behind America's placard, behind the "United States of America," you will be able to count on me. I will fight fiercely every day for what is in the best interests of the United States and of the American people. I will be a blunt, outspoken champion of American values and human rights. I will be accessible and forthright in my dialogue with you, and above all, I will serve as a proud American, amazed that yet again this country has provided an immigrant with such an opportunity, here the ultimate privilege of representing the United States and fighting for American values at the United Nations.

Thank you, and I look forward to answering your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Power follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT SAMANTHA POWER

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, and distinguished members of the committee.

It is a great honor to appear before you as President Obama's nominee to serve as the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations. Representing the United States of America would be the privilege of a lifetime. I am grateful to the President for placing his trust in me.

I would like to thank my friends and my remarkable family who are here with me today—my parents, who brought me here from Ireland, Vera Delaney and Edmund Bourke; my husband, Cass Sunstein; and our children, 4-year-old Declan and 1-year-old Rian, who may prove less interested in this hearing than others here today.

I would also like to thank Senator Chambliss and Senator Isakson for their generous introductions. Growing up as an Irish immigrant in Atlanta, GA, I cannot say that the United Nations was a popular topic with my classmates at Lakeside High School. But it was in Georgia, while working at a local television station, that I witnessed footage of the horrible massacres in Tiananmen Square and resolved that I

would do what I could the rest of my life to stand up for American values and to stand up for freedom. My Georgia friends supported me every step of the way, and I am now very proud to count these two great public servants among them.

When I first came to this country, I viewed the United Nations as a place where people assembled to resolve their differences and prevent hunger and disease. It was the stage on which iconic Americans like Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Jeane Kirkpatrick stood up for what was right.

Unfortunately, when I traveled to the Balkans in 1993, I saw a different side to the U.N. The U.N. Security Council had sent peacekeepers to Bosnia to protect civilians. But in the town of Srebrenica, those Bosnians who sought the protection of the blue helmets were handed over to those who wished them harm. More than 8,000 Muslim men and boys were executed in cold blood, as the peacekeepers stood idly by.

A decade later, I traveled across the Chadian border into Darfur to document the genocide being carried out by the Sudanese Government. After discovering a mass grave and many charred villages, I brought out some of the burnt remnants of those villages, which were exhibited at the U.S. Holocaust Museum. It was U.N. humanitarian workers who steered me to living witnesses, so eager were they to expose the regime-sponsored horror. I should note that, as the crisis in Darfur once again intensifies, U.N. peacekeepers on Saturday suffered a horrific ambush that killed 7 soldiers and wounded 17 others—a reminder of the risks that U.N. personnel face every day.

Elsewhere, today, we see physicians from the World Health Organization working with governments and local volunteers to provide polio vaccinations in Nigeria and Pakistan—determined to heal even as terrorists wage a campaign of assassinations against them. Just last Friday, the U.N. provided a platform for Malala Yousafzai—the brave young Pakistani girl who was shot in the head last year by Taliban gunmen on her way home from school—to inspire millions to stand up for girls' education.

Yet within this organization built in the wake of the Holocaust—built in part in order to apply the lessons of the Holocaust—we also see unacceptable bias and attacks against the State of Israel. We see the absurdity of Iran chairing the U.N. Conference on Disarmament, despite the fact that its continued pursuit of nuclear weapons is a grave threat to international peace and security. We see the failure of the U.N. Security Council to respond to the slaughter in Syria—a disgrace that history will judge harshly.

The U.N. is multifaceted, and its record mixed. But 68 years after the United Nations was founded in San Francisco, one fact is as true today as it was then: an effective U.N. depends on effective American leadership. The war in Bosnia didn't end because the U.N. was shamed by the massacres in Srebrenica. It ended because President Clinton, backed by a bipartisan coalition in Congress, decided that American values and interests were imperiled and acted to end the war. It is now possible to imagine an AIDS-free generation in Africa not merely because of the essential work of UNAIDS, but because President George W. Bush decided to provide life-saving drugs on a massive scale.

I believe that America cannot—indeed, I know that America should not—police every crisis or shelter every refugee. While our good will knows no bounds, our resources are finite, strained by pressing needs at home. And we are not the world's policeman. We must make choices based on the best interests of the American people. And other countries must share the costs and burdens of fighting injustice and preventing conflict.

That is where the U.N. can be very important. There are challenges that cross borders that the United States alone cannot meet—terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and pandemics. There are cases—as with sanctions against Iran and North Korea—where U.S. efforts pack a far greater punch when we are joined by others. There are occasions—as in Mali today—when the U.N. has to step up to prevent state failure, which abets terrorism and regional instability.

An effective U.N. is thus critical to a range of U.S. interests, and strong American leadership at the U.N. is indispensable to advancing those interests. Under the leadership of President Obama, the U.N. supported action to save countless lives in Libya; assisted a peaceful referendum giving birth to an independent South Sudan; and established a new agency dedicated to the empowerment of women worldwide.

If I am confirmed by the Senate, I will remain clear-eyed about the U.N.'s flaws as well as its promise, and I will fight fiercely every day for what is in the best interests of the United States and the American people. The list of our challenges in New York is of course long, but let me highlight three key priorities.

First, the U.N. must be fair. The U.N. cannot focus disproportionate attention on a few, while giving a pass to others flouting their international obligations. There

cannot be one standard for one country and another standard for all others. The United States has no greater friend in the world than the State of Israel. Israel is a country with whom we share security interests and, even more fundamentally, with whom we share core values—the values of democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. America has a special relationship with Israel. And yet the General Assembly and Human Rights Council continue to pass one-sided resolutions condemning Israel above all others. Israel—not Iran, not Sudan, not North Korea—is the one country with a fixed place on the Human Rights Council's agenda. Israel's legitimacy should be beyond dispute, and its security must be beyond doubt. Just as I have done the last 4 years as President Obama's U.N. adviser at the White House, I will stand up for Israel and work tirelessly to defend it.

Second, the U.N. must become more efficient and effective. In these difficult budget times, when the American people are facing tough cuts and scrutinizing every expense, the U.N. must do the same. This means eliminating waste and improving accounting and internal management. This means strengthening whistleblower protections and ending any tolerance for corruption. It means getting other countries to pay their fair share. And it means closing down those missions and programs that no longer make sense. As both the U.N.'s principal founding member and its largest contributor, the United States has the right and the duty to insist on reform. I will aggressively pursue this cause.

Third, the U.N. must stand up for human rights and human dignity, which are American and universal values. The U.N. Charter calls for all countries "to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights and the dignity and worth of the human person." But fewer than half of the countries in the world are fully free. The Universal Declaration on Human Rights is universally hailed and yet only selectively heeded.

Taking up the cause of freedom is not just the right thing to do, nor is it simply the American thing to do; it is the smart thing to do. Countries that abuse their own people are unstable. Countries that violate the rights of women and girls will never approach their full potential. Countries that allow people to be trafficked provide safe haven to dangerous transnational criminal organizations. Countries that do not protect religious freedom create cleavages and extremism that cross borders and destabilize whole regions. Countries that fail to invest in the health and education of their citizens undermine our shared efforts to promote opportunity. Countries that are corrupt trample upon the dignity of their people, while scaring away investment. If I am given the honor of sitting behind the sign that says "United States," I will do what America does best: stand up against repressive regimes, fight corruption, and promote human rights and human dignity. I will also do everything in my power to get others to do the same.

This means pushing for democratic elections, but also pushing for the freedoms necessary for democracy to work—freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, independence of the judiciary, and civilian control over the military. It means contesting the crackdown on civil society being carried out in countries like Cuba, Iran, Russia, and Venezuela. It means calling on the countries of the world to unite against human trafficking and against grotesque atrocities of the kind being carried out by the Assad regime. It means ensuring that in places like the Democratic Republic of Congo, peacekeepers sent into harm's way have the resources and the will to protect civilians. It means bolstering U.N. mediation so that conflicts can be defused before they become costly, protracted wars. It means strengthening non-U.N. forums like the Community of Democracies and President Obama's flagship governance initiative, the Open Government Partnership. It means redoubling our efforts to end extreme poverty. And it means uniting peoples who long to live free of fear in the cause of fighting terrorism and terror of all kinds.

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Corker, and other distinguished members of the committee, let me stress before closing that this administration will most effectively confront our current challenges if we benefit from the counsel and collaboration of this essential committee, and if we can earn the bipartisan support of both Houses of Congress. I would like to echo the words of the late Ambassador, my friend Richard Holbrooke, who told this committee that "Congress should be in on the takeoffs, not just the landings." So I appear before you not just to seek your support, but to ask to join you in a conversation about how to strengthen what is right and fix what is wrong at the U.N. If I am confirmed, I will continue this dialogue directly and personally. If the prospect of visiting the U.N. does not immediately entice you, my son Declan has resolved to become a tour guide like no other.

In closing, please know that, if I am given the privilege of sitting behind America's placard, you will be able to count on me. I will tirelessly promote and defend U.S. interests. I will be a blunt, outspoken champion of American values and of human rights. I will be a straight-shooter, always accessible to you and forthright

in my dialogue with you and the American people. And above all, I will serve as a proud American, amazed that yet again this country has provided an immigrant with such opportunity—here, the ultimate privilege of representing the United States and fighting for American values at the United Nations.

Thank you. I look forward to answering your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you very much for your statement. We will start a round of questioning.

And I would just say that following Declan at the United Nations, I would not get lost because I would see that red hair no matter what. [Laughter.]

And he is being very well behaved despite that this is boring. [Laughter.]

Ms. POWER. The day is young. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. We have got a lot of rooms here.

Let me start off. I appreciate your statement on Israel, and I agree with you wholeheartedly.

You know, above and beyond fighting battles against those who seek to delegitimize Israel, the United States has been very helpful in promoting Israel's position at the United Nations. As you know, Israel is seeking to represent The Western Europe and Others Group on the Security Council in 2018, representing the first time that Israel would serve at the pinnacle of the U.N. system.

Do you know if we are working to promote Israel for the Security Council, and how can we work in that regard? As well as the other injustice that Israel faces in the U.N. system is that in Geneva, unlike in New York, Israel is not part of any regional grouping. So would you commit to the committee that you will make efforts, should you be confirmed, to have Israel among the family of nations have an opportunity just like any other country would?

Ms. POWER. Absolutely, sir. I did speak in my opening remarks about fighting delegitimation, but what is a critical complement to that is legitimation. We have had modest success I think working with our Israeli friends to secure leadership positions across the U.N. system such as the vice-presidency of the General Assembly several years back, some leadership roles in U.N. Habitat and other organizations, membership in WEOG and participation in WEOG in New York.

But you are right. The Security Council seat is one that has eluded Israel despite its many contributions across the years. And I commit to you wholeheartedly to go on offense, as well as playing defense, on the legitimation of Israel and will make every effort to secure greater integration of Israeli public servants in the U.N. system.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, this committee has had a great deal of focus and the chair has had a great deal of focus on the question of Iran and sanctions. You mentioned it in your remarks about we are stronger when we can multilateralize those sanctions and I agree with you, although often we take the lead and we get others to then join us in a multilateral effort. So sometimes leadership is important in order to bring others to a point where they may not be, but for American leadership.

As Iran continues, despite our best efforts, to march toward nuclear weapons capability, clearly the Senate does not always express itself unanimously. It has on this issue to continue our efforts to prevent Iran from becoming the next nuclear state.

How do you plan to use your position at the United Nations to build consensus for additional measures against Iran and how do you see bringing that continuing multilateral effort to the next stage? The clock is ticking. The centrifuges are spinning, and the window is increasingly closing for us.

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator, and thank you for all of your leadership on that issue.

Let me start by saying that the last 4 years have entailed a ramp-up of very significant pressure on Iran, including of the multilateral kind. And you are absolutely right that the foundation for our leadership is the domestic measures that we have put in place, which other countries have also replicated with their own national measures.

The Security Council passed a crippling resolution back in 2011 that I think has had a great effect. They are some of the most stringent sanctions that we have ever seen put in place in the multilateral system. And I was very much a part of that effort by virtue of my position as the President's U.N. advisor working with the team in New York.

I think there are a couple things that we need to think about going forward. First of all, given that we need to increase the pressure until Iran is willing to give up its nuclear weapons program, we should always be prepared to look at new measures and see whether further action of the Security Council is required.

In addition, the Panel of Experts, which is a very useful way of holding countries accountable—it is a body that holds countries accountable for their compliance with the sanctions regimen that exists already—has pointed out I think in its most recent report that there are a fair number of evasive tactics that are being used not only by Iran but by other members of the United Nations. So one of the things that we need to move forward on with haste—and again, the team in New York is already seeking to do this—is the Panel of Experts' recommendations as to how those loopholes can be closed and how those countries that are in deviance of sanctions can be called out and held accountable and, indeed, how those practices can stop.

The other thing I would draw attention to, of course, is the human rights situation in Iran. Again, over the last 4 years, we have had some success. The margin now in which the General Assembly Iran human rights resolution passes is larger than it ever has been I believe. We have also created the first-ever country-specific human rights rapporteur at the Human rights Council and that is for Iran. And that individual—I talked to Senator Kirk about this earlier this week—deserves our full support as the crisis that the Iranians are facing inside the country is extremely grave.

So what I can commit to you, sir, is to be maximally consultative with you and to hear any ideas you have about things that we could be doing within the U.N. system that we are not doing, ways we can shore up the sanctions regime that already exists, and any other additional measures we should be contemplating to try to increase the pressure on Iran because I agree wholeheartedly with your premise which is that there is a window, but the window will not stay open forever.

The CHAIRMAN. Finally, this committee acted in a bipartisan manner as it relates to Syria, and the conflict in Syria has killed over 100,000 Syrians, created 1.7 million refugees, millions more displaced inside of the country, a continuing, in my mind, tragedy of enormous proportions, probably one of the largest ones in the world right now if not the largest one in the world.

But we have seen Russia and China continue to obstruct action by the Security Council, so much so that your predecessor, Ambassador Rice, said that the council's inaction on Syria is a moral and strategic disgrace that history will judge harshly.

I assume you agree with that characterization, and how do you work to move the Security Council to a more vigorous role on Syria?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator. I agree with you. It is one of the most critical issues facing us today, one of the most devastating cases of mass atrocity that I have ever seen. I do not know that I can recall a leader who has in a way written a new playbook for brutality in terms of the range of grotesque tactics that the Assad regime has employed in response to a democratic uprising.

What I will say is that the situation on the Security Council is incredibly frustrating. I described it as a disgrace that history would judge harshly in my opening statement, and I certainly agree with Ambassador Rice's claim that this is a moral and strategic disgrace in both respects.

What we have sought to do, as you know, is not simply rely on the Security Council, but to proceed with a multifaceted approach aimed at isolating the regime, bringing about the end of the regime, strengthening the opposition, et cetera.

We have worked through the General Assembly to signal just how isolated Syria is even as the Security Council remains paralyzed.

We have worked on the Human Rights Council to create a commission of inquiry to investigate the abuses because when the Assad regime falls—and it will fall—the individuals responsible for these atrocities will need to be held accountable and the evidentiary base needs to be built now.

And we have gone outside the United Nations, of course, to the Friends of Syrian People to coordinate the efforts of the likeminded.

I think we have to be clear-eyed about our prospects for bringing in the Russians, in particular, on board at the Security Council. I am not overly optimistic. By the same token, their interests also are imperiled with the rise of terrorism in the region with the use of chemical weapons. And we will continue forcefully, repeatedly, to make that argument to Russian officials and to engage them given the urgency and, again, the devastating human consequences of allowing this crisis to persist.

The CHAIRMAN. And one final point before I turn to Senator Corker.

Am I correct in that right now it is the turn of the United States to chair the Security Council?

Ms. POWER. We have the presidency of the Security Council in the month of July, which happens once every 15 months, yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. So right now, that presidency—the person who is sitting there is in an acting position.

Ms. POWER. It is a wonderful Foreign Service officer named Rosemary DiCarlo.

The CHAIRMAN. And I am sure she is wonderful, but it would be great to have the United States Ambassador to the United Nations sitting in that chair.

Senator Corker.

Senator CORKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you again for being willing to serve. I enjoyed our meeting and our discussion about what a liberal interventionist is. I certainly, though, would like to drill down a little bit on the responsibility to protect.

First of all, you know, in following up on the Security Council discussion that just was had, do you believe that for us to take unilateral military action, that we need a U.N. Security Council approval to do so?

Ms. POWER. Sir, I believe the President always should act in the interests of the American people when U.S. national security is threatened and the Security Council is unwilling to authorize the use of force but the President believes that it is judicious to do so. Of course, that is something that he should be free to do.

Senator CORKER. That was brief. [Laughter.]

What exactly does the responsibility to protect mean to you?

Ms. POWER. Well, sir, as I mentioned in my opening statement, some of the foundational events in my life were—

Senator CORKER. I should not say “to you.” What does that mean to us? Knowing that you are going to be at the United Nations, you no doubt are going to be a force. I think anybody who has met you knows that that is going to be the case. But how will that affect our efforts? When is it that we should respond to atrocities? And what are the guidelines as to whether we do that unilaterally?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir.

I believe that the way the President has articulated this is very important, which is that the United States has a national interest, national security interest, and a moral responsibility to respond to cases of mass atrocity, when civilians are being murdered by their governments. That does not mean the United States should intervene militarily every time there is an injustice in the world. What the President has asked us to do and what I strongly support doing and am eager to do again, if confirmed by you, is to look at the tools in the toolbox, diplomatic, economic, arms embargos, radio jamming, expelling diplomats from various institutions, creating commissions of inquiry, et cetera, and maybe deploying peacekeepers, providing different forms of assistance. There are so many tools in the toolbox.

So I think the concept of the responsibility to protect, which is less important I think than U.S. practice and U.S. policy, which is that when civilians are being murdered by their governments or by nonstate actors, it is incumbent on us to look to see if there is something we might do in order to ameliorate the situation. And there is no one-size-fits-all solution. There is no algorithm, nor should there be. If I am confirmed to this position, I will act in the

interests of the American people and in accordance with our values. That is the formula.

Senator CORKER. And that action might take place under a U.N. resolution or it might take place unilaterally. Is that what you are saying?

Ms. POWER. If you are referring to the use of military force, the President needs to make judgments about when to use military force on the basis of U.S. national interests.

I think what we have found in history is that there are times where we have to work outside the Security Council because the Security Council does not come along, although Presidents have believed that it is in our national interest to act.

There are times when we find it beneficial, of course, to have Security Council authorization because then we tend to be able to get some buy-in on the back end, maybe get some assistance with peacekeeping or reconstruction assistance and so forth. There is no question that internationally a Security Council authorization is helpful, but from the standpoint of American interests, it is U.S. national security interests and the needs of the American people that are paramount.

Senator CORKER. Thank you so much.

We may have a scare about just the overall growth of the United Nations. I know that just in 2000, there was a \$2.5 billion budget. It is now up to \$5.4 billion. Some people have advocated a zero growth policy. I would like for you to speak to that and just whether you believe there are many, many duplicative programs there that are wasteful and should be looked at and streamlined.

Ms. POWER. Well, thank you, Senator. Again, as I said in my opening remarks, I completely share the spirit of your question. These are such tough times for so many people here at home that we have to be zealous in our scrutiny of every program and every initiative that the American people are helping to support through their generosity.

We have had, I think, significant success over the last 4 years on a U.N. reform agenda, building on some of the work done by our predecessors. We have found in the peacekeeping budget \$560 million to cut, and that is a very substantial amount when, as you say, the U.S. share of that budget is significant.

The cuts can come when we have found, in the case of peacekeeping, duplications where a peacekeeping mission in one place is staffed or serviced logistically by one base and in another mission there is another base supporting that peacekeeping mission. Those have now been consolidated, and that is where some of those savings have come.

The Security Council has closed down two peacekeeping missions over the course of the last 4 years, and that is a very important cost savings, again looking at the situation on the ground and making sure that closing down a mission is something that will not squander the gains that have already been made, but very cognizant of the tough budget times that we operate in.

We actually brought about the first budget reduction, I believe, in 50 years in the history of the United Nations. It is very important that we keep that sensitivity that I think we have inculcated in New York going forward.

And as you and I discussed, I believe, in your office, there are always countries who want to throw new programs onto the table. But what I will commit to you, as I said in my opening statement, is when I sit down, if confirmed, in New York with the team and to go over the landscape and be as aggressive as possible in seeking to deliver again on the generosity of the American people.

Senator CORKER. And that includes looking at other longstanding peacekeeping missions that may or may not be necessary.

Ms. POWER. Indeed. I think we already, looking out on the horizon, can see some that can be reduced in size and will be reduced in size, which should bring about some savings.

Senator CORKER. Richard Holbrooke was able to negotiate our share back in 2000, I think it was, at being 25 percent, and it got down to just a little under 26 percent I think in 2009. It is back up today to 28.4 percent. And I am just interested in your thoughts there and whether you would be willing to try to—I know there are lots of Holbrooke doctrines, but if this is one you would try to adopt.

Ms. POWER. Certainly, sir, I commit to you that I will do everything in my power to reduce the U.S. share of the peacekeeping budget. There are complicated formulas that are involved in that that we have inherited from our predecessors, but I will do everything in my power to address that.

I will say also again that the absolute size of the peacekeeping pie is critical to this as well. So in addition to dealing with our share, we have to bring down, if we can, the overall cost, and that becomes evermore challenging with al-Qaeda and other terrorist actors out there on the scene targeting the United Nations as they are because the cost of peacekeeping missions has gone up in light of the threat posed to U.N. workers, which we have seen cause very tragic consequences in recent years.

Senator CORKER. And briefly—I know we have to move on, but your view of expanding permanent seats on the Security Council—I know there has been some discussion there.

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir.

The effectiveness of the Security Council is very important for U.S. interests, as I have described in my opening statement. I think any expansion of the membership of the United Nations Security Council should be one that both increases the representativeness of the council, which is what a lot of aspirants have emphasized, but also ensures the effectiveness of the council. And so it is not enough just to look to representativeness. We need to look at the degree to which the Security Council is going to maintain international peace and security. We do oppose, of course, giving up the veto.

Senator CORKER. Well, we have lots of people who come before us, some of which are more interesting than others. I have a feeling that you certainly are going to carve a path at the United Nations. I look forward to watching that. And I do appreciate the conversations we have had privately. I look forward to you carrying out in the same way that we have discussed things. I thank you for your willingness, and I certainly look forward to your service. OK?

Ms. POWER. Thank you so much, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Shaheen.

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

Ms. Power, thank you so much for being here today and for your willingness to take on this very important role. I certainly intend to support your confirmation, and I hope the entire Senate does as well.

You had an interesting exchange with Chair Menendez about Iran sanctions. Obviously, one of the things that has changed recently in Iran is the election of their new President, Mr. Rohani. And I wonder if you think that offers an opening. He has indicated that it is his intention to improve relations with the United States. Do you think there is an opening there with the new President-elect? And how can we pursue that? And does the United Nations have a role in trying to move Mr. Rohani and Iran to resume negotiations with the P5+1?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator, so much for raising that issue.

I would say first that whatever the public statements out of Iran, we have to remember the conditions that gave rise to that election or the conditions surrounding that election, which were the furthest thing from free, the furthest thing from fair. And I do not think anybody can say that the election in Iran represented the will of the Iranian people. I think we saw the will of the Iranian people reflected in the previous election and the democratic will of those people crushed. So that is point one.

Second, I would say that our policy, the administration's policy since I am not currently in the administration, is I think very much reflective of the views of people here in this body as well, which is verify, then trust, deeds not words. And again, we have a negotiation track. It is something that we want very much to succeed, and we recognize that we need to increase the pressure in order to increase its chances for success. And so we call upon the Iranians to engage that process substantively in a way that has not happened to date.

Senator SHAHEEN. And is there further action that could be taken at the United Nations that might help move the discussion in a positive way?

Ms. POWER. Again, to my exchange with Senator Menendez, I think we have to look at everything. This is so critical. This is so urgent. The clock is ticking. If there are steps that we can take in the Security Council, we should take them. And again, this is atop the list of urgent priorities in New York. But beyond that, I think it is probably best to get into the specifics in the event I am confirmed and can look at what is possible.

Senator SHAHEEN. You mentioned in your opening statement and you have written very eloquently about the tragedy in Bosnia. And we have seen, since those days, that Croatia has achieved EU membership. We are seeing some breakthroughs with Serbia and Kosovo. But Bosnia really seems to be stalled. And in talking to some of the folks who have been involved with efforts in Bosnia for a very long time, they have suggested that the structure that was set up as the result of the Dayton Accords has made things more difficult there to really achieve long-term resolution in the country for some of their challenges.

Can you speak to that and to what more we might be able to do to support efforts in Bosnia to move them toward EU integration and further into the West?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator.

And as you know, yes, Bosnia is a country very close to my heart.

I think what I would say is that, first, it is important to put today's challenges in some context. The country is at peace, at relative peace. It is an inspiring tribute, I think, to American leadership when you travel to the country and see the cafes open and see the hills no longer a source of target practice for nationalists and extremists, but instead a source of beauty. And it is a remarkable country and it is a remarkably resilient people. So I think the United States can—especially, again, the Americans who supported U.S. leadership can feel some sense of satisfaction at what the United States and our allies have done in preventing what was one of the most horrific crises of the last half century.

Second, though, in terms of ethnic polarization, I agree completely with your characterization. I think it is extremely problematic when you go to central Bosnia and you see entrances for Croatian students on one side of the building and for Bosniac or Muslim students on the other side. I mean, how is that possible in 2013 in Europe?

With regard, I think, to the degree to which the Dayton structure is to blame versus the absence of political will in the leadership across Bosnia, I have not worked on that issue very much over the last 4 years. It is something I certainly would be eager to look at if I return to the administration. But I think starting with popular will, popular culture, doing away with the polarization as a matter of social norms is also something that needs to be done. And again, there are real efforts, an amazing set of contributions by the international community, and amazing leadership at the civil society level in Bosnia. But of the leadership, we just have not seen that commitment to multiethnicity that we need.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Finally, there is a relatively new office at the United Nations that deals with women and empowering women around the world. I think one of the things that we have realized more in the last several decades is how important empowering women is to the success of communities and countries, and that when women have human rights and the opportunity to participate fully in a society, that communities and countries do better.

So I wonder if you will commit to doing everything you can to ensure that that office continues to operate in a way that continues to support women around the world and recognize the importance of the future legacy for that office.

Ms. POWER. Absolutely, Senator. I think President Bachelet did a remarkable job. As you know, we worked behind the scenes with the Secretary General in order to try to bring about that consolidation of all the efforts on women and girls across the U.N. system. We are very encouraged with its launch, but needless to say the stakes and the urgent needs in the real world are very high. So the more support we can give, the better. And I think U.N. Women is operating very well in tandem with some of our bilateral programming on these issues as well.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Rubio.

Senator RUBIO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, Ms. Power. Congratulations on your nomination. I know your family is proud of you.

As you recall from our meeting—and I highlighted this at the time and I am sure you are aware of it—one of the parts of any nomination is a nominee will be asked questions about previous statements that they have made and asked to clarify those. So I wanted to give you an opportunity to do that here this morning. I am not sure that time will permit to go through all of them, but I did want to go through a few. And I am sure you are familiar with them. You have been asked about them before.

So let me start by a 2002 interview where you advocated the use of a, “mammoth protection force,” to impose a solution to the Israel-Arab conflict saying external intervention was needed. Do you still hold that view and how would you place that in the context of today?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator, and thanks for giving me an occasion to clarify in a very public setting my actual views.

I have disassociated myself from those comments many times. I gave a long, rambling, and very remarkably incoherent response to a hypothetical question that I should never have answered.

What I believe in terms of Middle East peace is I think what is obvious to all of us here which is peace can only come about through a negotiated solution. There is no shortcut. That is why Palestinian efforts at statehood—by the way, my daughter does not like that quote either, just for the record. [Laughter.]

Senator RUBIO. We have all been heckled.

The CHAIRMAN. And we have all answered hypothetical questions.

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir.

Palestinian unilateral statehood efforts within the U.N. system—shortcuts of that nature just will not work. A negotiated settlement is the only course.

Senator RUBIO. OK.

Then in 2003 in an article, you recommended, “a historical reckoning with crimes committed, sponsored, or permitted by the United States.” Which crimes were you referring to, and which decisions taken by the current administration would you recommend for such a reckoning?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator. And again, thank you for giving me occasion to respond to that.

I, as an immigrant to this country, think that this country is the greatest country on earth, as I know do you. I would never apologize for America. America is the light to the world. We have freedoms and opportunities here that people dream about abroad. I certainly did.

And with regard to that quote, one of the things that had moved me I had, as some have mentioned, written very critically—I guess Senator Isakson mentioned—written very critically about the Clinton administration’s response to the Rwanda genocide back in 1994, written in great detail about that. And President Clinton

himself, as you know, had come forward and expressed his regret that the United States did not do more in the face of the genocide.

When I traveled to Rwanda, however, having been very, very critical, I was stunned to see the degree to which Clinton's visit to Rwanda, his apology for not having done more, how it had resonated with Rwandans, how it had impacted their sense of the United States and the kind of regard the United States had for them. And it moved me and I probably very much overstated the case in that article.

But the point, I think, that I was trying to make is that sometimes we, as imperfect human beings, do things that we wish we had done a little bit differently, and sometimes it can be productive to engage in foreign publics—excuse me—engage with foreign citizenry in a productive dialogue. And I think that is what President Clinton did in the wake of the Rwandan genocide. It had a great effect. It really meant a great deal. And that is really all I was meaning.

Senator RUBIO. So I would categorize the Rwanda situation as a crime, the words you used, permitted by the United States.

Which ones did the United States commit or sponsor that you were referring to?

Ms. POWER. Again, sir, I think is the greatest country on earth. We have nothing to apologize for.

Senator RUBIO. So you do not have any in mind now that we have committed or sponsored?

Ms. POWER. I will not apologize for America. I will stand very proudly, if confirmed, behind the U.S. placard.

Senator RUBIO. No, I understand. But do you believe the United States has committed or sponsored crimes?

Ms. POWER. I believe the United States is the greatest country on earth. I really do.

Senator RUBIO. So your answer to whether we have committed or sponsored crimes is that the United States is the greatest country on earth.

Ms. POWER. The United States is the leader in human rights. It is the leader in human dignity. As you know, one of the things that makes us so formidable as a leader on human rights is that when we make mistakes—and mistakes happen, for instance, in the case of Abu Ghraib in Iraq. Nobody is proud of that. Virtually every American soldier operating in the world is operating with profound honor and dignity. We hold people accountable. That is what we do because we believe in human rights. We believe in international humanitarian law and we observe those laws. We are, again unlike any other country, a country that stands by our principles.

Senator RUBIO. What is the reckoning you referred to? What would you consider reckoning for those instances that you have just highlighted for example?

Ms. POWER. I think when any of us who have the privilege of serving in public office deviate in any way, we have procedures in order to be held accountable—deviate any way from our own laws, regulations, standards.

Senator RUBIO. I understand, but that is true of the individuals that committed those acts. What about the country? Because your quote was about the United States committed or sponsored a crime.

What reckoning does the country have to face in response to acts committed by individuals of that nature? Because certainly that was not the command they had received.

Ms. POWER. Again, sir, I mean, I gave the Rwanda example. I think sometimes we see in the course of battle—unlike most militaries around the world, we put every target every choice through the most vigorous scrutiny, and occasionally there is collateral damage even after all of that energetic effort. And in those cases, we engage with foreign publics. That can be done at a national level. That can be done at a local level. I think there are various ways one can go about—

Senator RUBIO. My time is about to expire, so two very quick questions.

One is given an opportunity to restate what you wrote in that 2003 article, it sounds like you would state it differently.

Ms. POWER. Indeed, sir, I would absolutely—

Senator RUBIO. So let me bring you to a more recent one. In a 2008 op-ed, you described the Bush administration's concern about Iran as a, "imagined crisis." And you said that, "redundant reminders that military force is still on the table," strengthen the regime.

Do you still hold the views that you held in 2008 with regard to Iran? Is it still an imagined crisis? And do you believe that reminders that military force is still on the table strengthen the Iranian regime?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir. I have never referred to Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon as an imagined crisis. Ever. What I have long argued is that it is important both to have a pressure track and a negotiation track. And as we have discussed here today, it is essential to kick up the pressure, to tighten the vice. That is what the sanctions that I worked on over the course of the last 4 years have done. That is what we need to do in terms of, again, closing loopholes that have been established by the Iranian regime. So, of course, part of pressure is making very clear that military force is on the table.

With respect to that article, I was stressing the importance of also having a negotiation track so that if the pressure could be intensified, there was an off-ramp so that Iran could, in fact, give up its nuclear weapon, if they ever chose to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator Murphy.

Senator MURPHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome, Ms. Power.

The cold war is over and yet we have seen specifically most recently with respect to our deliberations internationally over Syria, that the juxtaposition between the United States and Russia can effectively cripple deliberations of the United Nations. Our relationship with them is obviously incredibly complex. Lots of good news in the last decade: cooperation on arms control, cooperation on antiterrorism efforts, willingness to work together on Afghanistan that was maybe unexpected at the beginning of that conflict. And yet, during that time, we have seen a very rapid downward slide in terms of the status of civil society in Russia.

And so without asking you to explain how you are going to essentially negotiate every different political issue with Russia, I would

love for you to talk for a minute about what the role of the Permanent Representative is to continue to raise these issues of civil society and issues of human rights abuses in Russia knowing, as we heard at a hearing not long ago, that the State Department is preparing, as they told us, to send forward another set of names to be added to the Magnitsky Act which is going to further complicate relationships with Russia but also give us a renewed platform to raise some of these issues.

So the administration is always in a difficult position because there are all sorts of important proactive work to do, which sometimes makes it difficult for them to try to raise issues of human rights. You will be in the same position whereby you will be trying to get them to the table on things that we care about, which may potentially compromise your ability to call them to the table on the way in which they are treating political opposition there.

So talk to me about how you strike that balance.

Ms. POWER. Senator, thank you so much. It is, of course, one of the most important relationships that has to be managed in New York, and we have a whole range of interests, as you have indicated, that flow through Moscow.

I think the challenge is to maintain—to stand up for U.S. interests and to stand up for U.S. values. I mean, it is a sort of simple formula. Sometimes our interests, of course, necessitate cooperation, as you have again alluded to, supplying our troops in Afghanistan, the North Korean and Iran sanctions regimes where Russia has stepped up and supported multilateral sanctions that are critical in our larger effort. These are examples where we have found a way to work with Russia.

But we can never be silent in the face of a crackdown on civil society, something I mentioned in my opening remarks today. We can never be silent—to get to an exchange I know Senator McCain had earlier in the week or last week, we can never be silent when the Russian Government sentences Sergei Magnitsky or convicts him of a crime rather than looking into those who are responsible for his death. I mean, we have to use the pulpit. We have to use the platform. We have to recognize that when the placard says “The United States,” people around the world, including across Russian civil society, are looking to the United States for leadership.

And I do think we can do both at once. I think it is extremely challenging, and there is no question that threading that needle and making sure that you do not sort of silence yourself and silence the values of your nation in the service of your short-term needs—it is a big challenge. Every diplomat has, I think, faced it. But I think our greatest ambassadors in New York are remembered for how they stood up for our values.

Senator MURPHY. I do not want to steal Senator McCain’s thunder on this issue. He has been a hero. But we are at a fulcrum point, and the problem is not only the very quick downward slide in Russia. It is that their neighbors are watching them and we are confronting many of the same issues, whether it be in the Ukraine, Belarus, Azerbaijan. And when the United States does not stand up at the United Nations to Russia, then that is a signal to them

that we may allow for them to engage in that same kind of behavior.

Quickly to turn to the issue of climate change, a really wonderful new initiative at the United Nations surrounding the issue of short-lived climate pollutants and fast-acting climate pollutants, specifically working with other nations to try to engage in best practices for the capture of methane coming out of landfills to work, as the United Nations has been doing for years, on building a new type of cook stove to downgrade the amount of black carbon escaping into the atmosphere—there is technology and best practices out there today with respect to noncarbon dioxide emissions. We are going to have a big fight over a new international global warming treaty, but there are some relatively simple things that you can do when it comes to just managing landfills better or trying to get \$15 cook stoves into the hands of more Indians and Chinese.

I think the answer to my question as to whether you are going to continue to help lead on this issue is probably self-evident, but this potentially allows for some of the quickest gains in the interim between now and when we ultimately get an operative global warming agreement in 2020. And you can play an incredibly important role in trying to move forward the work of the United Nations to engage in voluntary measures with member countries to try to engage in best practices as to decreasing the release of short-lived common pollutants, and we would love to see your leadership on that.

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir. You will have it.

Senator MURPHY. Thank you.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator JOHNSON.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Power, welcome. Like Senator Corker, I certainly enjoyed our conversation. It was very interesting. I think you will be a force.

I also want to thank you for your willingness to serve. You have got a young family. It will be a sacrifice. So we truly do appreciate it.

I also recognize you are a pretty prolific writer. I did compare notes. I actually had another 2003 article which I found very interesting. There are a number of interesting comments you make in that. And I do have to ask you some questions. And I realize your thoughts can certainly change over time, but there are certainly some quotes here that do disturb me.

Kind of going back to what we talked about in our office, I was very disappointed in President Obama early in his term going around the country on, you know, basically what has been called as an apology tour. I do not believe that is helpful. You are saying you will never apologize for America now. That is good.

But back in this article, this was full force in the New Republic, March 3, 2003. You said a country has to look back before it can move forward. Instituting a doctrine of *mea culpa* would enhance our credibility by showing that American decisionmakers do not endorse the sins of the predecessors.

Kind of going back to what Senator Rubio was talking about, which sins are you talking about there? And do you think President Obama's apology tour was well advised? Did that work very well?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator. I do not know if it is good news, but the quote that Senator Rubio was referring to is the same quote as this. So my response is similar.

But let me start just by saying what I should have said perhaps at the beginning before, which is I have written probably 2 million words in my career, a million, 2 million. I have certainly lost track. Only my husband, Cass Sunstein, has—well, there are others perhaps who have written more, but Cass has left most of humanity in the dust in terms of prolificness.

There are things that I have written that I would write very differently today, and that is one of them, particularly having served in the executive branch—

Senator JOHNSON. Move forward in terms of President Obama's apology tour, the reset with Russia. I mean, has that worked? Was that a good strategy for us to go across the world and actually provide that mea culpa? Do you think that was good or bad? Did it work or did not work?

Ms. POWER. I am not sure exactly to what you are—are you talking about the reset?

Senator JOHNSON. We can talk about reset, sure.

Ms. POWER. So the reset, again, is I think something that has yielded a very complex set of consequences. In some respects such as Syria, the reset has not produced the kind of dividend that we seek in New York and with devastating consequences again for the people of Syria.

On shipping supplies and reinforcing our troops in Afghanistan, the fact that we have a channel of dialogue and cooperation with Russia has produced results.

Honestly, the sanctions imposed against Iran back in 2011, the sanctions resolutions we have imposed even recently on North Korea—they come about in part because the bilateral relationship is strong, at least strong enough to allow us to agree on issues of shared interests.

There is also a lot, which I did not mention in response to Senator Murphy, that goes unseen. And again, none of this takes away from the crackdown on civil society, takes away from Snowden and his presence in Moscow, takes away from Magnitsky, takes away again from Syria. But there are things that happen on the Security Council, for instance, Russian support for robust peacekeeping action in Ivory Coast, Russian support for the South Sudan referendum going off on time, which was a major mass atrocity averted. So we work with them where we can get them to see that their interests align with ours and that their interests align with maintaining international peace and security.

Senator JOHNSON. You had mentioned earlier that Assad will fall. I think we have heard that in the past where it is not a matter of "if" but "when." It seems like he is getting more entrenched, and I am not quite so sure. Do you believe there was a point in time, had we shown leadership, that we could have tipped the scales and

he could have already fallen by now? Have we missed opportunities?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir.

Look, I think the situation on the ground right now is very worrying for a whole host of reasons. First, the military gains that the Assad regime has made lately; second, the fact of chemical weapons use in recent months; third, something you and I talked about I believe, the growth of the extremist presence within the opposition, et cetera. So I think nobody is satisfied with where we are today. I know the President is not. And the administration is constantly examining and reexamining how it can heighten the pressure on Assad so as to hasten that day that he departs.

I guess to come back to my comment where, given some of the facts on the ground right now, how I could say something of that nature, just again I think history shows that regimes that brutalize their own people in that manner, that totally forfeit their legitimacy, that do not abide by even basic norms of human decency—they just do not have the support to sustain themselves. So the day of reckoning will come. I agree certainly, wholeheartedly with your concern that the day is not coming soon enough.

Senator JOHNSON. Obviously he is going to fall because we are all mortal.

Getting back to that article, the final concluding paragraph, embedding U.S. power in an international system and demonstrating humility would be painful, unnatural steps for any empire, never mind the most important empire in the history of mankind, but more pain now will mean far less pain later.

Do you believe America is an empire?

Ms. POWER. I believe that we are a great and strong and powerful country and the most powerful country in the history of the world, also the most inspirational. Again, that is probably not a word choice that I would use today having served—

Senator JOHNSON. Fair enough.

Besides giving up a pinch of sovereignty will not deprive the United States of the tremendous military and economic leverage it has at its disposal in the last resort. So you are basically recommending that we give up a pinch of sovereignty. Is that still your view?

Ms. POWER. One of the things that I would do every day, if confirmed for this position, is defend U.S. sovereignty. I think nothing that I have supported the last 4 years would ever have that effect of giving up U.S. sovereignty. It is nonnegotiable.

Senator JOHNSON. So your thinking has changed on that then.

Ms. POWER. Again, serving in the executive branch is very different than sounding off from an academic perch. Yes.

Senator JOHNSON. Good. I appreciate your answers. Thank you.

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Kaine.

Senator KAINE. Welcome, Ms. Power, and congratulations. I look forward to working together. You have the ideal intellectual and values credentials for this position. When I heard of the appointment, though, my first reaction was, wow, she is pretty blunt and outspoken. I do not think blunt and outspoken is actually usually a great qualification for a diplomatic post, but actually for this one,

it is because my experience with the United Nations is it is vague and amorphous, and then you translate vague and amorphous into six languages. [Laughter.]

And I think the United Nations could use a lot more blunt and outspoken, and I think that is part of the reason why you are going to do a very good job in that position.

I visited the United Nations recently and spent a day with Ambassador Rice, and I would encourage any Member of the Senate to do it. To go to a Security Council meeting even on a topic that may not be the one that you are most passionate about is instructive, and you immediately sense some of the dynamics, some of the good, some of the bad.

One of the things that I really came away with from that visit, even seeing good and bad, was a real pride, a pride in this country for having been such a key part in creating the institution. You know, it was an American President who had the visionary idea in the aftermath of World War I to try to create something like it in the League of Nations, and neither the American public nor Congress or really the world embraced the idea.

But America would not let the dream die. And in the closing days of World War II, President Roosevelt and his advisors planned it. President Roosevelt did not get to see it. He died before the San Francisco conference.

President Truman had two decisions to make in his first two days in office, first, whether to keep the Roosevelt Cabinet—and he decided to do it—and second, when he was asked if we should cancel or postpone the San Francisco meeting that was going to happen within weeks of President Roosevelt's death, he decided that we needed to carry it forward.

And so for all the frustrations of the United Nations—and there are many, and I am going to ask you about my chief one in a second. But for all the frustrations, it was the United States that would not let the dream of an international institution of this type die. It was birthed here. We have nursed it along. We have funded it. We have kept it going. We have hoped for its improvement. We battled for its improvement. And of the many things to be proud about about this country, the United Nations I think is one. And yet, there are a lot of frustrations.

I was in Israel in April 2009. I was at Yad Vashem, at Yom HaShoah, as a guest of Prime Minister Netanyahu. And at the very moment we were there, the United Nations had convened an antiracism conference, Durban II, in Geneva, and it invited President Ahmadinejad to be one of the keynote speakers. Now, the United States, this administration boycotted that conference in Geneva, encouraged other nations to boycott it as well. Many other nations did. Some others attended and then walked out during Ahmadinejad's speech.

But I think one of the things that we wrestle with here and I think the American public wrestles with, too, is the psychology within an institution that was so critical to the formation of the State of Israel, to the beginning of the State of Israel. Explain, because you have been involved with the institution, the psychology that puts Israel on the permanent agenda to talk about human rights when North Korea is not, when so many other nations are

not. Israel is not perfect, but neither is the United States and neither is any of the member nations of the United Nations. You can be frustrated about the lack of pace toward a two-state solution, but we can think of frustrations about any nation that is a member of the United Nations.

I think the single thing that is the hardest for American citizens to grapple with is the continual drumbeat out of the United Nations that is hostile to the nation of Israel and it seems to hold Israel to a standard that is different than other nations that ought to also have their time under the microscope in terms of the analysis of their flaws and the recommendations for improving those flaws.

So with your experience in the institution and in working in these areas, I would love for you just to explain to us what is it about the psychology of the body that makes Israel the perennial punching bag at the United Nations.

Ms. POWER. Thank you so much, Senator.

The constant delegitimation of Israel across the U.N. system, as I indicated in my opening remarks, is a source of almost indescribable concern to me and to this administration. As the President's U.N. advisor the last 4 years, working with the team in New York, our team in Geneva and elsewhere, we pushed day in/day out to contest this kind of delegitimation.

In terms of the psychology, what I will say is that fewer than half of the countries within the United Nations are democratic. When you are not democratic, it helps to have a diversion. It helps to scapegoat other countries. And I think that is part of the psychology, is just having sort of a reliable way of changing the subject, and that is what these countries have done over so many years.

We have contested this, again, day in/day out. I spearheaded the decision not to participate in Durban II, because it reaffirmed Durban I which was so problematic. We stood up against the Goldstone Report, against attempts to politicize and judge Israel over the flotilla incident in the Human Rights Council which, as you know, we have joined in part to be within that institution to stand up for Israel. We have succeeded in cutting down the number of special sessions, cutting down the number of country-specific resolutions. But given, again, what I said at the start, the fact that there is a standing agenda item for one country—and that is Israel—and not for Cuba and not for North Korea and not for Iran just reflects a lack of seriousness and just how political and politicized this has become and unfair this has become.

Senator Kaine. I do not have another question, but I will just conclude, Mr. Chair, by saying I think the blunt and outspoken part of you will really be pressed in the service in this job. And I think the best ambassadors that we have had have been willing to do that, and it is issues like this double standard with respect to Israel that really demand very blunt and outspoken American leadership. And I wish you well.

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Flake.

Senator FLAKE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for the answers so far. I appreciate you coming by my office and the discussion. It was nice to discover we have a mutual interest and time spent in Zimbabwe and writing on the subject too. And thanks for sending those articles.

With regard to the United Nations, our law requires that we compile a list, an analysis of who votes with us and who votes against us, and it is sometimes frustrating to see so many countries where we play a vital role, in terms of aid and development and in their economy and see them just continually go against us. It sometimes seems in the General Assembly, if it were not for Israel, Palau, and the Marshall Islands, we would not have any friends. But in fact, I think 131 countries in the United Nations vote against the U.S. position more than 50 percent of the time. In the 2012 General Assembly, there were about eight resolutions that went before the General Assembly that were deemed important by the State Department, and countries voting with us—just about 34 percent of them voted with our position.

How can we change that culture? What can we do to better that situation?

You and I have seen situations—just take the country of Namibia where the General Assembly had long declared just one of the parties as the sole and authentic representative of the Namibian people, which was highly detrimental I think for a number of years and forestalled negotiations that should have happened. But then the Security Council came in with a resolution that actually paved the way for Namibian independence and played a vital role and a good role. And so we see both within the same institution, just the difference between the General assembly and the Security Council.

How can we in the General Assembly have a better situation where countries recognize that we are friendlier than we seem I guess?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator.

This issue of voting divergence is critical. It has been acutely frustrating. I will say if you could look at the charts that show the trend lines, we are trending more positively than you would expect. I would say in the General assembly—

Senator FLAKE. It is a pretty low base, but yes.

Ms. POWER. It is a low base. It is. I very much agree with that.

I do not think the convergence rate is trending positively in the General Assembly on Israel, however. And again, that is something that we have to fight every day to try to change.

But with regard to other countries, it is acutely frustrating. I mean, some of it relates to my response to Senator Kaine's question, which is standing up to the United States can be a cheap and easy political win for a small country to show that they are not with us. But again and again, we see them voting against their interests. And in the case of those countries that are democratic, either fully free or partly free, we see them acting in defiance of the values that they are most proud of in their own countries. And that is the conversation I have certainly sought to have over the last 4 years with countries who vote en masse as part of regional groupings reflexively rather than thoughtfully. And again, we are nibbling away at it.

But it is an urgent priority for any incoming official in New York. And if I am confirmed, getting countries to vote their interests and their values, getting them to see the importance of maintaining international peace and security, doing that has huge consequences for the United States, but it has huge consequences for these countries as well. Taking advantage of the fact that a lot of countries, including several important African countries, are involved in U.N. peacekeeping, to get their countries engaged in the politics in the countries where their troops and their police are deployed—so there are just a lot of disconnects I think between at least what we would perceive as beneficial for those countries and, as you suggest, how they have performed on various votes. And we just have to keep fighting every day and be aggressive in our pursuit of convergence, not divergence.

Senator FLAKE. On that last point, with Zimbabwe, a country that we are both very interested in, elections are scheduled July 31, likely too soon to have any real prospect of free and fair elections or elections that mean anything. Can you foresee a role for the United Nations, a broader role than is currently planned, in that situation?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator.

I mean, that is certainly something we should look to. It has been very difficult for the United States, very difficult for United Nations programs that Zimbabwe most needs, for instance, a human rights office, development assistance that is spread equally across the country irrespective of the politics of the recipients, et cetera, the kinds of standards we would want to see as part of our assistance with the Mugabe regime, just almost impossible to operate in that environment.

And so I think the hope would be that in the wake of the election and certainly with the passage of authority to new leadership, that there is an opening to have a conversation about what an impactful U.N. presence would look like and how it could contribute to what has to happen in Zimbabwe, which is a meaningful transition to democracy.

And I would note—and I know you are more familiar with this than I am—but the civil society in Zimbabwe is unbelievable. I mean, just they keep slogging along and battling it out, going to court, getting released from court, going on hunger strike, going again and again back at the regime, refusing to accept that Zimbabwe cannot achieve its promise. And again, I think the United States has a critical role. They look to us for leadership. They have some friends in the U.N. system, but they are now outliers. You know, friends like Cuba and Iran, et cetera are not credible.

So given that there is a moment of opportunity potentially upon us, I think we have to look at what programming could be helpful.

Senator FLAKE. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Senator McCain.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Welcome and thank you for your continued service and advocacy on behalf of human rights. I am glad you are able to correct the

record on some of your past statements. Speaking for myself and my colleagues, I have never said anything that I later regretted or wanted to correct in the record. [Laughter.]

And I note your young son there. He has a future in the diplomatic corps if he has been able to sit quietly through this ordeal. I congratulate you on this. There he is.

In your testimony, you called the failure of the U.N. Security Council—failure to respond in Syria a disgrace that history will judge harshly. Do you think that the Security Council will ever authorize an international military intervention in Syria certainly in the foreseeable future?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator, and thank you for all that you have done for me and my family. Thank you for all you have done for Syria.

Right now, the fact that the Security Council has not managed even to pass a condemnatory resolution, never mind economic sanctions, to this point not even anything on chemical weapons use, I think we could start there in terms of where we would seek to move the Russians. The Russian position, as you know—

Senator MCCAIN. I got you. I have got about three or four questions.

Ms. POWER. Oh, please. Go ahead.

Senator MCCAIN. Go ahead. The answer is I think is not likely in the near future.

Ms. POWER. That is probably better put.

Senator MCCAIN. Is that correct?

I was struck by an article by Anne Marie Slaughter in a piece she published in the Financial Times that said that the article 52 of the U.N. Charter could serve as a basis for international action in Syria in the event that regional organizations like NATO and the Arab League notify the Security Council of their actions as required by article 54, but not necessarily seek approval. Do you believe that article 52 of the U.N. Charter could serve as a basis for international military intervention in Syria by regional organizations?

Ms. POWER. Well, Senator, as you know, the President's policy is to focus on all forms of assistance to the opposition to build up the opposition. In terms of the legal rationales, that is not something I feel equipped to weigh in on.

Senator MCCAIN. I hope you will look at that because that is specifically under your area, article 52 of the U.N. Charter, because I think with 100,000 people massacred, we are going to have to look at every option that we possibly can.

Senator Lindsey Graham, with the help of our chairman and ranking member, has passed a couple of authorizations concerning Iran. He has now authored, with a large number of us, a resolution by the Senate or Congress that would authorize the use of force on Iran if the Iranian nuclear progress reached a point that the President has described as unacceptable.

What do you think about that?

Ms. POWER. Well, sir, as somebody aspiring to go back into the executive branch, it may not surprise you that I would want to ensure that the President had the flexibility that he needed to make a judgment that he thought best on behalf of the American people.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, it authorizes him to use force. In fact, it gives him flexibility.

Ms. POWER. Having not studied the authorization, I probably should not comment.

Senator MCCAIN. I think it is very important because I do not think there is anyone who would argue that the Iranians have proceeded undeterred from their pursuit of the ability to acquire and use nuclear weapons. I think you would agree with that. Which means that matters are probably going to come to a head, at least in the view of some experts, within 6 months to a year. You would agree.

Ms. POWER. That is certainly what our assessments have shown.

Senator MCCAIN. Everybody has for you the cheapest commodity in this town, and that is advice. So I will not exempt myself from that privilege.

I have known and admired many men and women who have served as our Ambassador to the United Nations, and I agree that it is a very important position. The one I admire most is a woman named Jeane Kirkpatrick. I hope you will look at her record of service in the United Nations. She spoke truth to power. She took on the vested interests. She argued for budgetary restraint. She spoke up for the United States of America in a way that I think still many of us admire her and we revere her memory. So when you look at the record of your predecessors, as I have looked at my predecessors in the United States Senate, I hope you will be instructed to some degree by her performance which I think made all Americans who had a very poor opinion of the United Nations very proud of the role she played speaking for them in the United Nations.

Ms. POWER. Absolutely, sir. I actually got to know her a little bit as an intern in this town in the early 1990s when she was a forceful advocate on Bosnia long after her service in New York and absolutely will study her legacy.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, I hope you will continue the work you have done in speaking up for human rights. We are about to see a Middle East that is already imploding. You may be faced with issues before the United Nations and the Security Council, the likes of which we have not seen. So I know that you will preserve your fundamental beliefs in the supremacy of the role of the United States in the world and our advocacy for the freedoms that are so important to all of us. So I look forward to having you go to work as soon as possible.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Risch.

Senator RISCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Power, first of all, your work in Idaho has not gone unnoticed, and we thank you for that. It is greatly appreciated.

Thank you for coming to see me, and you and I talked about a number of things. One of the things I am concerned about is one of the matters that Senator Corker raised, and that is reform at the United Nations.

People in America are not happy with the growth and particularly with what seems to be this expanding reach. The United Nations plays an important role when it comes to peacekeeping, when

it comes to nations being able to sit down and resolve their differences. But this continued growth and this continued reach in the areas that really are the sovereign concern of an individual nation bothers me and I think it bothers a lot of Americans.

What are your thoughts on that?

Ms. POWER. May I ask you to be more specific? If not peacekeeping, what do you have in mind in terms of—

Senator RISCH. Well, I am talking about just the continued growth of the size of it and its reach into areas. I have one particular item in mind but I am not going to raise it as it would probably divide the panel as we talk here. But this continual arena in the matters that are sovereign concerns of individual nations is concerning.

Ms. POWER. OK. Well, let me, if I could, address maybe two dimensions of that, one, the growth, and then second, maybe U.N. treaties which tend to raise sovereignty concerns—

Senator RISCH. Always.

Ms. POWER [continuing]. Particularly in this body, yes.

So in terms of the size, you mentioned peacekeeping, and I appreciate your recognition and we discussed this in our meeting as well that peacekeeping can perform an important service. Mali is a great example today of a mission that 3 years ago, if you had said in 2013, are we going to have a peacekeeping mission in Mali, we would have said Mali—why peacekeeping there at that time? And yet, in the wake of the French intervention, we cannot afford to squander the gains that have been made and to allow al-Qaeda to regain a foothold in that country. And again, the peacekeepers are not going to be challenging al-Qaeda but they are going to be strengthening the Malian Armed Forces who, hopefully, then will have occasion or will be in a strong position to hold off any further resurgence. So that is just one example of something that sort of comes onto our plate because the world demands it.

The Iraq and Afghanistan missions are much bigger now than they were 5 years ago—the U.N. missions, that is, political missions. And of course, it is in our interest to see those missions do important work particularly in the wake of our withdrawal from Iraq and as we draw down from Afghanistan. The last thing we want to see after all of the sacrifices that Americans have made is those gains in terms of political reforms and political transition and the road to democracy—those gains squandered.

So, you know, that is the good side of the growth.

Senator RISCH. Let me ask a little more—

Ms. POWER. Pardon me. Okay.

Senator RISCH. Have you been an advocate for any areas for the United Nations to expand into that they are not already into? I do not mean geographical areas. I mean just issue concerns. Is their reach broad enough, I guess, is what I am asking.

Ms. POWER. There are two issues. One is are there places the United Nations should go where they have not gone. Nothing is coming to mind.

Senator RISCH. I am not talking about places.

Ms. POWER. No, no, no. Sorry. I meant thematic areas.

The United Nations touches so many social and economic developments, peace, and security issues, but there is plenty. And I

would cite corruption as one where there is a U.N. Convention on Corruption, but the modalities of actually tackling corruption in countries around the world are not as strong as I think they could be. And so there is an example where there is reach, but not necessarily substance or sufficient substance. And so those are the kinds of gaps.

So there are two forms of cuts that one would seek. One is, is there just extraneous stuff being done that was started 50 years ago for one reason and persists today for no good reason? That, of course, we would need to—or even if it started 10 years ago or 5 years ago. And that is where we draw down peacekeeping missions when the original motivation for those peacekeeping missions has gone away or has been addressed. And then beyond shrinkage are the things the United Nations is doing that it should be doing but that it is not doing well, where we increase effectiveness and not just efficiencies. And so I think both have to be an area of emphasis.

But my message to you, you know, which I hope I have expressed forcefully, is that the American people are making cuts. This Congress and this President are negotiating how to get our fiscal house in order. It is not tenable for the United Nations to exist immune from that conversation. I do not think it has in the sense that I think the administration has really pushed it to tighten its belt, and I think that is where we found more than half a billion dollars in savings in peacekeeping just in the last year.

Senator RISCH. Let me touch on just a couple other things.

Ms. POWER. Please.

Senator RISCH. Because my time is running out here.

First of all, as Senator McCain said, advice is rampant in this town, and I want to give you mine. I hope, as you go to the United Nations, you will take the view that America is unique and exceptional, and we are a unique and exceptional people. We need to hold our heads high. We need to be proud. We need to not apologize for things that we do. We are leaders in this world. We need to be leaders in this world, and I certainly hope that when you go to the United Nations, you will convey that to them that we are a proud people and we do good things. And if you look around the world, the world would not be what it is today without the leadership of America when it comes to quality of life or anything else.

Finally, let me say one of my concerns, as we talked about, is Israel. There is a lot of us. In fact, Senator Rubio yesterday or today dropped a bill on the United Nations Transparency, Accountability, and Reform Act. I do not know if you are familiar with that or not. A number of us are cosponsors of that bill. And it has some really good reform provisions in it, and particularly one of the several provisions has to do with withholding the United States contributions to any U.N. entity that grants full membership to the Palestinian Authority. As you know, there has been a push to do that in some of the operations of the United Nations to include the Palestinian Authority in the absence of a negotiated peace settlement with Israel. We want to see that. I am sure you want to see that. Everyone wants to see that. One of the ways I think we need to do that is to insist that the United States withhold contributions

to any U.N. entity that would grant full membership to the Palestinian Authority.

Do you have any thoughts on that?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir.

First, on your first point on advice, I have spent my whole career standing up for American values.

Senator RISCH. Thank you.

Ms. POWER. And I will not apologize for America. American leadership is the light to the world. I could not agree more.

Second, we need to deter the Palestinians in any way we can, and we need to get their attention. They have held off but, as you know, they have made clear their previous intention to join various U.N. agencies in the wake of the General Assembly vote last fall.

The one caution I would issue—and again, we are completely aligned on preventing the Palestinians from seeking unilateral actions at the United Nations. The one caution is that when we are out of U.N. agencies, which would be the consequence ultimately of defunding U.N. agencies, we cannot stand up for Israel, we cannot stand up for American values, we are not there leading on a range of other U.S. interests. And so I just think we have to find the right balance.

Senator RISCH. That is the decision the agency has got to make if it goes ahead with that kind of proposal. And I think we ought to put them in that position where if they are going to make that judgment, they are going to live with the consequences of it.

So thank you for your thoughts on that. Thank you for your candor on that.

My time is up. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Barrasso.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to follow up a little bit of what Senator Risch has talked about.

First, congratulations to you and to your family, and I appreciate you coming by to visit on issues.

I want to talk about the U.S. Arms Trade Treaty. When Secretary Kerry came before this committee in January of this year, I asked him during his confirmation process if he would support any treaty that allows the United Nations to establish and maintain a gun registry on law-abiding U.S. gunowners. He stated in writing that we will not support a treaty that impacts domestic arms transfers or creates a U.N. gun registry.

I have that U.N. Arms Trade Treaty here, and article 12 is called "Recordkeeping." It encourages countries to maintain records on the importation of conventional arms, including small arms. It specifically requests that the states maintain records on the quantity, the value, the model, the type, and the end user. These records, it says, must be maintained for a minimum of 10 years.

Article 13, titled "Reporting"—that requires signatory states to issue annual reports to the United Nations on all imports and exports.

So the question I have is, Do you believe that this framework could lead to a U.N. gun registry?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator.

Let me start just by saying again that we in this administration and certainly I, if I have the privilege of going to New York, would never do anything that would infringe on U.S. sovereignty or that would interfere in any way with American law. Second Amendment rights are paramount. American law is paramount. The Constitution is paramount.

Again, in terms of what the U.N.'s designs are in taking that treaty forward, I am not myself familiar with those. I think what is important is that Secretary Kerry has given you the assurance that nothing the administration put forward with regard to that treaty would ever contemplate a gun registry in this country or our participation in a gun registry. So I think that the key point is, irrespective of the provisions that you have pointed to, the United States, in dealing with this body in any future engagement on the Arms Trade Treaty, would never, again, allow anything in that treaty to interfere with American law or American practice.

Senator BARRASSO. So the simple question would be, Do you support the United Nations in establishing and maintaining a gun registry on law-abiding U.S. gunowners?

Ms. POWER. No.

Senator BARRASSO. The answer is no. Thank you.

Following up on also what some other members have asked about in terms of U.N. budget, reporting to Congress, in 2009–2010, the Office of Management and Budget provided Congress with a list of total U.S. contributions to the United Nations from the State Department, as well as 18 other U.S. departments and agencies. And I believe this information is valuable for all citizens. I think it is important for everyone to understand how the United States is spending taxpayer money at the United Nations. I do not want to quiz you on the specifics of the budget, but I would ask, do you support transparency of U.S. funding?

Ms. POWER. I do, sir.

Senator BARRASSO. Support the Congress and the American people receiving a report from OMB on an annual basis on U.S. contributions provided to the United Nations?

Ms. POWER. Full transparency I think to sustain support for, again, the generous contributions that the American people make—you have to provide transparency.

Senator BARRASSO. The other question that you raised is the issue of sovereignty. Your position is very important. Can you just talk a little bit about how you plan on preserving and protecting American sovereignty within the United Nations?

Ms. POWER. Well, one starts, of course, sir, by asserting again and again the importance of American sovereignty. It also involves protecting the interests and projecting the values of the United States within the United Nations when countries seek to judge us and take steps, any steps, that would interfere, again, with domestic law or domestic practice, to stand up against that and to fight for our laws to be ascendant as they are within this country.

Senator BARRASSO. Can you talk a little about your commitment to challenging the actions of the United Nations that run contrary to our standards, our values, and our interests?

Ms. POWER. Well, I think there are at least two dimensions to that, one on the mismanagement side. That certainly runs contrary

to our aspirations for how we govern ourselves. And then again, on the values side, whether it is corruption or those countries that trample human dignity or that stand with human rights abusers, we have to use the bully pulpit and be forceful in contesting that wherever we can and also creatively thinking about what other tools we can do beyond speaking out, what tools we could put in place in order to halt those practices.

Senator BARRASSO. Can you talk a little bit about what measures you might use in assessing whether or not to veto a specific U.N. resolution, just how you would think about those things?

Ms. POWER. Obviously, any discussion or decision about using the veto would be something that one would have in the context of the interagency and so forth, but we will not allow anything to go through the Security Council that we deem a threat to U.S. national security interests. And that is, I think, a broad standard but a critical one.

Senator BARRASSO. I wanted to follow up a little bit with Senator Risch on the Palestinian Authority. I have a number of written questions that I will submit.

I am just wondering how you are going to make it clear to the Palestinians that their actions at the United Nations will have serious implications and consequences.

Ms. POWER. Well, I know from having worked this issue for the last 2 years that we make it clear in every bilateral encounter we have with the Palestinians that it will have serious consequences. Moreover, it will have serious consequences not just to the United States-Palestinian bilateral relationship but to the peace process which the Palestinians have invested in and which all of us have an interest in seeing bear fruit. I think there is legislation up here as well that would impose direct symbolic and financial consequences in terms of the Palestinian office and some of the funding, and the Palestinians have been made well aware of those consequences as well.

Senator BARRASSO. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Paul.

Senator PAUL. Congratulations on your nomination, and thanks for coming today.

Was the recent military takeover in Egypt a coup?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator.

As you know and as we discussed, I share the President's concern and your concern over the seizure of power from President Morsi, the suspension of the constitution, the arrests, et cetera.

On the legal matter and on the review that the administration is carrying out, I just do not feel equipped to comment not now serving in the administration, not having access to full facts and not being part of the review.

Senator PAUL. So for the record, you are unsure if it is a coup.

Ms. POWER. I do not feel equipped to comment.

Senator PAUL. Very politic of your answer.

You stated that whenever a government is killing its citizens, it is morally incumbent, I presume, for us to intervene. In Pakistan, they kill their citizens for certain types of speech. Does that mean we should intervene in Pakistan?

Ms. POWER. Thank you, Senator.

The quotation that you read surprises me because that is not language that I would normally use, but let me refine my own view, if I could.

“Intervene” is a word that can mean a range of things. When you speak out in a country to contest gross violations of human rights or mass atrocities, that is a form of intervention in the sense that you are, in a way, meddling in the internal affairs of a state on behalf of human rights. Economic sanctions are a form of response. I think in the face of gross violations of human rights, mass atrocity, genocide—and this is, again, something we discussed yesterday—we have a vast array of tools in the toolbox: assistance—

Senator PAUL. I guess my specific question then would be are you willing today to speak out against the practice of killing people for making religious statements that are objectionable to certain religions.

Ms. POWER. Absolutely, sir. I have spent my whole life speaking out about such.

Senator PAUL. Because I mean, that is part of it. I think we have become so timid with certain of these—you know, at the very least we can call them intolerances, but basically killing people for religious speech I think is something we should not be ashamed of speaking out about. I am not proposing we invade Pakistan to tell them how to lead their lives in their country, but I am saying that not only should we speak out about it, we should make our aid contingent upon it. Do you think any aid to these countries should be contingent behavior?

Ms. POWER. Well, sir, again as we discussed, I think every tool in the toolbox needs to be reviewed, and depending on the circumstances—it is a little hard to speak in the abstract, but we need to use the levers we have at our disposal, consistent with our other interests because we do retain other interests, of course, with these countries as well, but certainly examine anything we can do to deter such horrible practices.

Senator PAUL. When we intervene in countries, who gets to make that decision? The President or the Congress?

Ms. POWER. Thank you.

Well, let me just say—and I hope the last few weeks—that the past is prologue in a way. If I am confirmed, I would benefit enormously if I could maintain the relationships that I feel like I have begun to forge here these last weeks and continue these conversations.

So consultation is indispensable. I cannot do this job, even if confirmed without you.

Senator PAUL. Congress or the President decides whether we—

Ms. POWER. As you know, there is a longstanding debate between the executive and the legislature that has crossed Republican and Democratic administrations about authorizations for the use of force. And all I can say is that I promise to consult with you extensively at all times.

Senator PAUL. It sounds like a nonresponse response.

But, you know, the thing is that these are important questions. The vast majority of the public is not in favor of arming Islamic rebels who, in all likelihood, will be killing Christians in Syria. The

vast majority of the American public is not in favor of giving arms to people who are basically allied with al-Qaeda in Syria. The vast majority of the public does not believe that we are going to have a way of knowing who our friends and who our foes are. We cannot even tell who our friends are in the Afghan Army, which is a much more stable situation than Syria. So I find it incredible to think that we will.

But the thing is those can be honest disagreements among people who say, oh, absolutely we can say who the good people are and we are only going to give weapons to good people. I find it a ridiculous argument, but I think it is an argument that some could make.

But the thing is that I do not think there is a valid argument for fighting secret wars without the permission of Congress. And basically that is where we are right now.

I think it is also untenable to the American public for the administration to say, well, you know, we are going to go over there and we are going to arm them. We are not really going to try so much to win, but we really would like to get to stalemate so we could get the Russians to negotiate. And I think that is really not very tenable either and not too exciting for American GIs who might lose lives and limbs, should we be stuck in another war in the Middle East, to be too excited about this, that well, our goal is stalemate.

And I think you have noble purposes in wanting to eradicate human rights abuses around the world, but realize that war is a messy business and people do lose their lives, people you know. A young sergeant in the neighboring town to mine lost both legs and an arm in Iraq. And so these are not geopolitical games and they are not things that we can say we are going to make the world this great, groovy place where nobody has any human rights abuses, but we are going to do it through war.

And so my caution is to be careful about what we wish for and to be careful about the belief that even though we are a good people and we want good things—I think you are a good person and you want good things—that in all likelihood, as you do this, there are unintended consequences. And as we slip into this new war in Syria, if our trainers that are over there—I do not know how many there are, but the newspaper says several hundred trainers are over there that are Americans.

So I would just say that even though noble intentions, I think, are yours, be very wary of what intervention means when we intervene. And it is one thing to send bread, but it is another thing to send guns.

Thank you.

Ms. POWER. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator.

I just have some final questions and then we will, hopefully, let you go. You have been resilient here for 2 hours. And your son is doing exceptionally well. It is amazing what food can do. [Laughter.]

Let me ask you. First of all, when you get confirmed—and I believe you will be—I would like you to look at our charge and mandate at the United Nations on the question of Cyprus and the division of Cyprus and where we are at in that regard. I believe the

Cypriots have a new President and some new initiatives even in the midst of economic challenges, and I would like to see us be able to be more vigorous in our engagement through what is an ongoing U.N. effort to end the division of the country for quite some time. So I hope you will be able to do that.

Ms. POWER. Absolutely, sir. I take it that the Special Representative Downer is hoping to restart talks in October, and it feels like a ripe opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, these are two generic questions but they are important I think. Is genocide genocide only when it is convenient to call it so, or is genocide genocide when it violates the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide?

Ms. POWER. I have written, as you know, a great deal about this. I think the Genocide Convention is a worthy instrument. I would note that political groups are excluded from the convention as a potentially targeted group by virtue of the role of the Soviet Union in the drafting of the convention. So it is not a perfect instrument, but I think it is an agreed upon tenet of international law today.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, let us move the convention aside then for a moment. Is genocide genocide when all of the facts that we observe would lead to a conclusion that a genocide has taken place, or is that only when it is convenient to acknowledge it is genocide?

Ms. POWER. The former. The facts should drive the analysis.

The CHAIRMAN. And if the facts drive the analysis, then we should call that set of actions, whether historical in nature of present—God forbid—in reality a genocide.

Ms. POWER. I believe so, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is a violation of human rights a violation of human rights depending upon where it takes place, or is it universal?

Ms. POWER. Universal, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I think you understand why I asked you those questions. And I hope that your past history in this regard, even in the context of understanding the new role that you will play, will not diminish your fire for making the case internally why genocide should be called genocide when the historical facts attain themselves to that standard.

All right. With that, Senator Corker, any final remarks?

Senator CORKER. I do. I want thank you for having the hearing and I want to thank Ms. Power for coming before us. There are very few people nominated to positions like this that have so many people in advance giving strong opinions about your service, and as I mentioned on the front end, sometimes our nominees are more interesting than others. You, no doubt, are one of the interesting nominees.

And I very much appreciate the conversation that we had in the office. I think you have handled yourself exceptionally well today. You know, based on those conversations—I know nothing know about premeeting you a few weeks ago firsthand—I think you are going to be a significant and positive force at the United Nations, something that certainly our Nation and the world needs at this time from, as you mentioned, the world's greatest nation.

So I happen to be, based on the interaction and again the way you have answered questions today, exceptionally excited about the fact that you are going to be in this position, and I hope that you will continue in your service along the lines that the answers were today and certainly the meeting that we had in our office and I think you will.

So, look, we need very, very strong representation and leadership at the United Nations especially today. My sense is you are going to be, again, an exceptional advocate for our country and for causes around the world that we care about. And I am thankful that you are going to be in this position very soon.

And I thank your family. I have enjoyed getting to know them. I had a chance to spend a little extra time with your daughter in the back. [Laughter.]

Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. I would remind members that 5 o'clock today is the close for any questions submitted for the record. I would urge you to answer the questions as quickly as possible. It is the chair's intention to put your name on an executive calendar meeting for next Tuesday. That will depend upon answers to questions being submitted in a timely fashion, which I would expect you would do, so that we could get, hopefully, you seated while we are still the President of the Security Council and get you to work.

With the thanks of the committee, this hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:17 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

RESPONSES OF SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROBERT MENEDEZ

Question. U.S. engagement in the United Nations allows us to leverage both resources and influence with other like-minded nations toward common goals.

- Please give us examples of how, by working through the United Nations, we've been able to magnify our efforts. How does the United States work through the United Nations to better protect U.S. national interests? Do we do so effectively? What can we do better?

Answer. As I noted in my testimony, the U.N. has an important role in a wide range of U.S. national security issues, including efforts to combat terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and pandemics. The U.N. also plays an essential role in advancing American values around the world.

The United Nations is a primary partner in our efforts to maintain peace and security around the world. From Haiti to the Golan Heights to Cote d'Ivoire, U.N. peacekeeping operations are the lynchpin to maintaining peace, protecting civilians, and stabilizing fragile states. In 2011, the United States worked with our partners on the U.N. Security Council to prevent a massacre in Libya and help the Libyan people begin a transition to democracy after four decades of brutal dictatorship. In Mali, U.N. peacekeepers will be critical to our efforts to restore stability, which will help prevent the creation of an al-Qaeda safe haven in the Sahel region.

The United Nations also plays a critical role in U.S. and international efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons and fight terrorism. Working through the U.N. Security Council, we have helped facilitate the adoption of robust multilateral sanctions on Iran and North Korea that remain key tools in our efforts to convince these actors to change their behavior. Similarly, U.N. sanctions on al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups are a key tool in our efforts to eliminate the threat of terrorism.

The United States also relies on the U.N. system to help address humanitarian crises that require international response. The U.N. World Food Programme, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the U.N. Children's Fund (UNICEF) have the expertise, capacity, and networks to reach displaced persons

and victims of conflict even in highly insecure areas. For example, the United Nations has played a critical role in coordinating and delivering humanitarian assistance to nearly 7 million people affected by the violence in Syria, as well as nearly 1.8 million refugees from Syria who have fled to Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq, and Egypt. U.N. agencies such as the World Health Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization and the U.N. Development Program also play a critical role in U.S. and international efforts to strengthen global pandemic preparedness, fight infectious disease, improve food security, and promote development to alleviate poverty in the world's poorest regions.

Finally, U.S. engagement in the U.N. helps to advance American values such as freedom of speech and association, protection of minorities and the rights of women and children. Through the U.N. Human Rights Council, the United States has helped shine a spotlight on the worst human rights abusers, including North Korea, Syria, and Iran. We have also helped pass the U.N.'s first ever resolution on the human rights of LGBT persons and at a time of crackdown on civil society created a special rapporteur on freedom of association.

While the U.N. does much to advance U.S. interests around the world, it could do more. Under President Obama's leadership, the United States has worked to strengthen and improve the effectiveness of the U.N. system to carry out its many mandates. This administration has also worked with the U.N. to reduce waste and inefficiency, and to guarantee that the contributions of the United States and other member states are used as effectively and transparently as possible. If confirmed, I will continue our engagement with the U.N. in pursuit of U.S. interests, and our efforts to make the U.N. a stronger, more effective organization.

Question. Please explain the different elements of U.S. assessed contributions to the United Nations, how they are assessed, and how the United States provides for their payment. For example, there is the U.N. regular budget; there is the U.N. Capital Master Plan; and there are two U.N. War Crimes Tribunals.

- Are we assessed 22 percent for each of these? Do you think these assessment levels are appropriate? What is the success rate of the United States in keeping the rate of growth in the U.N. regular budget within certain limits?

Answer. The United States pays 22 percent of the U.N. regular budget. The 22 percent is the maximum (ceiling) rate under the regular budget scale of assessments. The costs of the U.N. Capital Master Plan were also assessed according to the regular budget scale. The United States paid 22 percent of that assessment over 5 years, from FY 2008 through FY 2012.

There is a separate scale of assessments for U.N. peacekeeping budgets. One half of the budgets for the U.N. War Crime Tribunals are assessed according to the peacekeeping scale of assessments, and one-half according to the regular budget scale of assessments. The United States is assessed 25.4 percent of the total U.N. peacekeeping budget under the peacekeeping scale and 22 percent of the amount assessed under the regular budget scale.

The United States and other major contributors to the United Nations have been working very hard to limit growth in the U.N. regular budget. The administration has been successful in keeping the 2012–2013 budget level below the level of the 2010–2011 budget, marking only the second time in 50 years that the U.N. regular budget decreased from the previous biennium.

Over the next 2 years, in advance of the General Assembly's next review of the scales of assessment in 2015, the administration will work to achieve reforms in the U.N. scales of assessment methodology to better reflect changes to the global economy. Although the latest scale of assessments included notable increases for several countries, including China and Russia, the methodology used to calculate each country's share needs to be streamlined and updated.

The administration will also work to address the scales in the context of a broader U.N. reform agenda, identifying alternative formulations for the scales of assessments that better reflect capacity to pay, and working closely with other major financial contributors to ensure their support for our efforts.

Question. What is the current status of U.S. arrears in its contributions to the U.N. regular budget, including the Capital Master Plan and the two war crimes tribunals? Please explain these arrears.

Answer. The United States has approximately \$529 million in arrears at the U.N., the vast majority of which date from prior to 2000. The unpaid amount consists of \$341 million for peacekeeping missions, \$176 million for the regular budget, and \$12 million for the U.N. war crimes tribunals for Rwanda and the former Yugoslavia.

In 2009, with the support of Congress, the administration cleared \$243 million in post-2000 arrears at the United Nations. This amount consisted of \$159 million for

peacekeeping missions and \$84 million for the U.N. regular budget. There are no arrears for the Capital Master Plan.

Question. The United Nations has a longstanding presence in Burma, focused largely on humanitarian and development issues. The United Nations has sent aid convoys—which frequently have been blocked—to aid civilians in areas of fighting between the army and Kachin rebels, assisted refugees in camps for the displaced along the country's borders, aided ethnic Rohingya minorities who are denied citizenship by the government, and carried out disaster risk reduction, health, environmental protection, and food security programs, among other activities.

- What positive roles do you think the United Nations can play in furthering Burma's tenuous transformation from military dictatorship to democracy?

Answer. As you noted, the U.N. has been working in Burma for many decades and has provided much-needed humanitarian assistance to the people of Burma. The Burmese Government has taken positive steps, including the release of hundreds of political prisoners and holding elections in which the democratic opposition participated as a legal political party and its leader Aung San Suu Kyi was elected into the Parliament. In response, the United Nations—with the support of the United States—has stepped up efforts to assist the transition and support long-term economic development.

Given its expertise and programming, as well as the experience that comes with a longstanding presence in Burma, the U.N. can provide valuable assistance to help the country transition to a prosperous democratic society. Many areas in which the U.N. can work—legal reforms regarding political participation, labor, human rights, media, and commerce, as well as providing health, education, and livelihood programs—can bring tangible benefits to the Burmese people and help consolidate political transition. The U.N. can complement U.S. efforts in these and other areas.

The administration supports efforts to resolve ethnic conflicts peacefully, and is working with the government, the U.N., and other international partners to help the parties reach political settlements that address longstanding grievances as well as to provide needed humanitarian and development assistance to affected populations.

Despite the positive efforts, the United States remains concerned about the severe limits on humanitarian access in certain parts of the country and also concerned about the protection of internally displaced persons, refugees, asylum seekers, and other vulnerable migrants. The U.N. can play an important role in both Burma and neighboring countries to help address these issues. In this regard, the administration supports the U.N.'s recent extension of the mandate for a special rapporteur on the human rights situation in Burma, paying particular attention to the plight of the Rohingya.

On the eve of President Obama's historic visit to Burma in November 2012, President Thein Sein publically committed to take concrete steps in 11 areas of human rights and humanitarian reforms, including to "extend an invitation to the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to establish an office in Myanmar." An OHCHR presence in country would provide an institution through which the government can seek technical assistance and human rights expertise to push to completion the ambitious democratic reform agenda it has set out to accomplish. During the visit, President Obama spoke at the University of Yangon and said, "No process of reform will succeed without national reconciliation. You now have a moment of remarkable opportunity to transform cease-fires into lasting settlements, and to pursue peace where conflicts still linger, including in Kachin State. Those efforts must lead to a more just and lasting peace, including humanitarian access to those in need, and a chance for the displaced to return home."

If confirmed, I will work to ensure that the commitment to open an OHCHR office in Burma is fulfilled. I will also work closely with senior U.N. management as well as like-minded countries to support the U.N.'s continued provision of assistance to support the country's transition.

Question. I remain deeply troubled by reports of systematic discrimination and organized violence targeting Burma's ethnic Muslim minorities. What can the United Nations do to deal with this situation? How will you use your position to advance these efforts rapidly?

Answer. As I said in my opening comments, if confirmed, standing up for human rights and human dignity will a priority for me as U.N. Ambassador.

The U.N. General Assembly (UNGA) and the Human Rights Council (HRC) each adopt an annual resolution on the human rights situation in Burma, which include expressions of concern regarding discrimination, human rights violations, and violence directed against persons belonging to ethnic, religious, or linguistic minorities in Burma. Recent resolutions have maintained scrutiny on Burma and urged contin-

ued reforms while recognizing the positive changes that the Government has made in the past year. The HRC's resolution also renews the mandate of the Special Rapporteur (SR) for the Human Rights Situation in Burma. The current SR for Burma is Tomas Quintana (Argentina), who conducts regular visits to Burma and reports to the HRC and UNGA on his findings concerning the situation in the country. If confirmed, I intend to continue to work closely with and support the important work of the Special Rapporteur.

During the June HRC session, the Council adopted a Presidential Statement (PRST) on the "Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar as Regards to Rohingya Muslims in Rakhine State and other Muslims" that the United States supported and joined consensus on alongside of the Organization for Islamic Cooperation (OIC) and other HRC members.

Despite the evolution in the UNGA and HRC resolutions on Burma and in the United States bilateral relationship with Burma, significant human rights concerns remain. There have been ongoing human rights violations against the Rohingya community in Rakhine State since an initial flareup in June 2012 and an increase in the expression of anti-Muslim sentiment across the country.

The United States also continues to engage with the Government of Burma and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) to press for the establishment of an OHCHR country office in Burma, a commitment that President Obama secured from the Burmese Government on his November trip. An OHCHR office could provide the Government of Burma with valuable training and other assistance to build Burma's capacity to protect human rights.

Question. A Commission of Inquiry to examine allegations of human rights abuses in North Korea set up by the United Nations Human Rights Council began work last week in response to long-expressed concerns by U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, Navi Pillay and several independent U.N. human rights experts that serious crimes, including crimes against humanity, have been prevalent in North Korea for decades. The Inquiry will examine claims of "systematic, widespread and grave violations of human rights" in North Korea.

- What is your sense of the current human rights situation in North Korea, and how do you think the United States can most effectively move the human rights agenda forward in tandem with our efforts to bring North Korea's nuclear and missile programs under control?

Answer. As I said in my opening comments, if confirmed, standing up for human rights and human dignity will be one of my priorities as Ambassador to the United Nations. The human rights situation in the DPRK remains deplorable. The DPRK is one of the world's most systematic abusers of human rights. The State Department's annual "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices" details the breadth and depth of the government's human rights abuses. The human rights situation in the DPRK is addressed every year at the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) and in the U.N. General Assembly Third Committee and U.S. officials use their voice in these venues and beyond to highlight the horrible conditions in the DPRK. The United States calls on the DPRK to close its gulags, and end systematic repression and the starvation of its population. At the March 2013 HRC session, the United States worked closely with Japan, the European Union, and the Republic of Korea (ROK), among others, to cosponsor a resolution that established a Commission of Inquiry (COI) to investigate the grave, widespread, and systematic human rights violations in North Korea. The resolution was adopted by consensus, illustrating the extent to which the international community shares the concerns voiced repeatedly by the United States and others on the Council. The COI, led by Michael Kirby (Australia), and including Sonja Biserko (Serbia) and Marzuki Darusman (Indonesia), began its work on July 1.

The COI will build on the important work by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the DPRK, Marzuki Darusman, who has provided insightful and detailed reporting on the human rights situation despite the DPRK Government's refusal to grant him access to the country. The Special Rapporteur, whose mandate the United States has consistently supported, has provided an important monitoring function, reporting to the U.N. Human Rights Council every March as well as to the U.N. General Assembly every fall. The United States takes the opportunity of the interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur to express our concerns about human rights in North Korea.

The United States will continue to work with partners at the Human Rights Council to support the COI in its important work, and looks forward to the COI's interim report to the Human Rights Council in September and its full report of its findings to the HRC in March 2014.

Ensuring the well-being of North Korean refugees and asylum seekers is also very important. If confirmed as Ambassador, I will ensure that we continue to work with other countries in the region and our international organizations, including the U.N. Human Rights Council and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, to raise attention to the deplorable human rights conditions in the DPRK and to cooperate in the protection of partners, especially South Korea, on the issue of North Korean refugees and asylum seekers. If confirmed, I would continue to urge all countries in the region to act in conformity with the 1951 U.N. Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1976 Protocol.

I would welcome any additional ideas you have on how we might raise the profile of the human rights crisis in the DPRK.

Question. I'm interested in your insight on where China is regarding North Korea, and how you intend to work with the Chinese Ambassador to the United Nations to continue to build on the close cooperation Ambassador Rice has established with her Chinese counterpart.

- Do you think China is prepared to be serious and implement and enforce sanctions this time? Do you think the PRC has leverage to play to change North Korea's behavior?
- If North Korea conducts an additional missile or nuclear test what do you think U.S. policy ought to be? Are there additional sanctions or action through the UNSC? Additional unilateral sanctions—along the lines of the Banco Delta Asia sanctions from 2005—that we ought to pursue? As you know, there is some consideration in Congress to creating new statutory authority for additional unilateral U.S. financial sanctions on North Korea. Do you think that that would be helpful?
- Cuba's recent shipment of weapons systems to North Korea clearly has serious implications for international security. Does this shipment amount to a violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions and sanctions on North Korea? Does the administration plan to submit this issue to the Security Council for review?

Answer. The administration has commended Panama for the recent actions it has taken to implement relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions with regard to the North Korean ship *Chong Chon Gang*. The United States will work closely with the Government of Panama, which has requested our assistance, and the administration intends to provide assistance as best we can.

Panama has informed the UNSC DPRK Sanctions Committee of the incident and has invited the Panel of Experts, which assists the United Nations Security Council North Korea Sanctions Committee, to conduct an investigation.

Panama's actions regarding the Sanctions Committee as well as requesting the involvement of the Panel of Experts will help clarify involvement of the Government of Cuba with this issue. We will look at all possibilities regarding appropriate actions once the Committee and Panel complete their work. The administration will keep your staff informed.

North Korea's nuclear, ballistic missile, and proliferation-related activities constitute a serious threat to international peace and security and undermine the global nonproliferation regime. Shipments of arms or related material to or from North Korea, and services related to such items, would violate U.N. Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874, as reaffirmed this year in Resolutions 2087 and 2094. These Security Council resolutions generally provide that all states shall prevent the direct or indirect transfer of weapons from their territory or by their nationals to North Korea and shall prohibit procurement of such weapons from North Korea. The administration hopes that the Sanctions Committee, with the support of the Panel of Experts, will investigate this case thoroughly, identify parties responsible and recommend actions to be taken in response. The administration notes that the Sanctions Committee has the ability to impose targeted sanctions (asset freeze/travel ban) on individuals and entities found to have contributed to prohibited activities or to evasion of the sanctions.

The United States also continues to work closely with China to deepen our dialogue on North Korea to achieve our shared goal of verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula in a peaceful manner. Through our discussions, the administration will continue to encourage China to leverage more effectively its unique relationship with the DPRK. Chinese officials have made clear their concerns about North Korea's destabilizing and provocative behavior and their commitment to the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

The administration worked closely with China in the adoption of U.N. Security Council Resolutions 2087 and 2094, the two 2013 resolutions that imposed new sanctions on North Korea. Chinese officials have stated publicly that China is com-

mitted to strict implementation of UNSC sanctions. It is a leading priority in the bilateral relationship for the administration to work with China on enforcement of all relevant DPRK-related UNSCRs and to address North Korea's threats to regional peace and security and the global nonproliferation regime.

The United States will continue to work closely with all U.N. member states to ensure the full and transparent implementation of U.N. Security Council resolutions concerning North Korea. This will make it harder for the DPRK to acquire the technology, know-how, and funds to develop its nuclear and ballistic missile programs, which the international community has repeatedly condemned. The administration will likewise continue to exercise our national authorities, where and when appropriate, to impede Pyongyang's nuclear, ballistic missile, and proliferation-related activities.

Question. In July 2012, the Azerbaijani State Civil Aviation Administration said in a statement that planned flights between Stepanakert and Yerevan would represent an invasion of Azeri airspace and "taking corresponding measures in connection with that is inevitable."

- What has the United States done to prevent Azerbaijan from committing provocative acts against civil aviation? What consequences would Azerbaijan face if they threatened a civilian aircraft? What role can the United Nations do to protect civil aviation in this situation?
- Members of the international community have repeatedly called for the withdrawal of snipers from the Armenian-Azerbaijani line of contact. What's the status of international efforts to accomplish this? Is it true that the Azeri Government has refused?

Answer. As a Cochair of the OSCE Minsk Group, the United States remains committed to helping the sides find a peaceful solution to the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict. Secretary Kerry has discussed the issue of civil flights to Nagorno-Karabakh with the governments of Armenia and Azerbaijan at the highest levels. The Cochairs of the Minsk Group (United States, Russia, and France) are working to help the sides find a means of resolving this issue diplomatically, and have received assurances that they will reject any threat or use of force against civil aircraft. We remain concerned about any action that could fuel tension in the region or threaten the peace process. We believe the Minsk Group remains the best mechanism to help the sides reach agreement.

The Cochairs of the OSCE Minsk Group are working to help reduce tension in the region. Over the years the Cochairs have proposed a number of confidence-building measures that would reduce violence and improve the climate for negotiations. The longstanding proposal from the Minsk Group to withdraw snipers is one such measure; they noted with regret in March 2011 that it had not been implemented, and they continue urging the sides to consider such ideas. In their June 2012 statement on the Nagorno-Karabakh conflict, the Presidents of the United States, the Russian Federation, and France reiterated the need for the sides to "respect the 1994 cease-fire agreement, and abstain from hostile rhetoric that increases tension." We remain committed to helping the sides find a peaceful resolution to this conflict. Member states of the U.N. should also reinforce these efforts.

Question. Alexander Downer has been the U.N. Secretary General's envoy to Cyprus since 2008. What has he been able to accomplish in his 5 years in the position? How often is he present on the island? What is your view of the role Turkey plays in the Cyprus issue and in its resolution?

Answer. The United States strongly supports the work of the U.N. Secretary General in Cyprus under the leadership of Special Advisor Alexander Downer. During his tenure, Downer has worked effectively with both sides to restart full-fledged negotiations. From 2008 to 2012, Downer and his team convened approximately 150 meetings of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leaders, in addition to hundreds of other meetings of the leaders' representatives and the bicomunal Technical Committees.

Following the election of President Anastasiades in February, Special Advisor Downer resumed regular visits to Cyprus to hold meetings with both leaders and to lay the groundwork on the way forward. The Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot leaders have confirmed their intention to resume the settlement process in October, and while Greece and Turkey have also expressed support for the settlement process. If confirmed, I would support the efforts of the United States to work closely with the United Nations, both Cypriot communities, Greece, and Turkey to encourage reconciliation and reunification. The administration is prepared to commit energy and resources toward the goal of finally achieving the fair and lasting settlement that has eluded the people of Cyprus for so long.

Question. Does the election of a new President of Cyprus present a new opportunity for peace efforts in Cyprus? What can and should the United Nations do to take advantage of any existing opportunities? Is the resolution of this 66 yearlong dispute a policy priority for the administration?

Answer. The United States applauds the commitment of the two leaders to resume the settlement process in October. President Anastasiades has taken promising steps in support of the Cyprus talks, including the July 16 appointment of a lead negotiator.

If confirmed, I would strongly support intensive U.N. engagement. The United States firmly believes that a mutually acceptable settlement is in the best interests of the people of Cyprus and will continue to support such a settlement. The United States will continue to urge the leaders of both communities to engage constructively in the settlement process as the best way to reach an agreement and will also engage with Turkey and Greece to encourage reconciliation and reunification. And we will consult with you and look to see if there are additional steps we should be taking to advance progress.

Question. For years MONUSCO has been criticized for failing to protect civilians. What are your views on this new intervention brigade? Tanzania, South Africa, and Malawi are expected to be the major troop contributors. Do you think they are they up to the task of rooting out armed groups in the DRC?

Answer. Rooting out armed groups in the DRC is something that has been attempted by many different groups over many years. Although it will prove a challenging task, it is significant that in March, the United States supported the Security Council's approval of an Intervention Brigade (IB) within MONUSCO. The South African and Tanzanian battalions now are in place, and Malawi is due to arrive in the coming weeks. The United States is in the process of providing training and limited equipment support to the deployment of the initial Malawian battalion and the follow-on Tanzanian battalion and is prepared to support South Africa should there be a request. It is in the U.S. interest for this force to succeed, and we are looking at the ways in which we can support its mission.

Through the IB, MONUSCO now has a more explicit mandate to conduct independent military operations to disarm and neutralize armed groups, which have long been a major source of instability and violence against civilians, including sexual and gender-based violence, in the DRC. Such security operations will be essential to create space in which the DRC Government can undertake security sector reform and deliver on all its commitments in the Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework (the Framework) in support of a lasting, regional peace.

The administration has given its full backing to the Secretary General's recent appointments of Martin Kobler as his Special Representative and Head of Mission, as well as of Carlos Alberto dos Santos Cruz as Force Commander. The United States has been assured in turn that MONUSCO stands ready to protect civilians and that it will defend Goma if faced with an M23 offensive. The administration continues to urge all troop-contributing countries of MONUSCO to remain committed to implementing the mission's robust mandate.

Even though the IB has not fully deployed, it is already having a positive effect on the ground. M23 defections have risen and morale is reportedly very low. MONUSCO and its IB will play an important part in confronting armed groups, but the peacekeeping mission alone cannot solve the problem. Signatories must abide by and demonstrate their commitments under the framework, the international community must stay engaged, and there must be an end to impunity for those who have committed abuses and violations of human rights or violations of international humanitarian law. There are no overnight solutions to the human rights and security challenges in the DRC, but the United States has demonstrated, with our recent appointment of former Senator Russ Feingold as Great Lakes Envoy and our significant investments in the humanitarian and security situation on the ground, how invested we are in trying to find ways to help stabilize and promote human rights in the region.

Question. The Security Council recently announced the U.N. Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) will be extended for another year. What other steps can the United States take through the United Nations in order to help the government better protect civilians?

Answer. I am deeply disturbed by mounting reports of abuse of civilians, including ongoing killings, beatings, and looting and destruction of homes and humanitarian facilities in Jonglei State. I am extremely concerned about the detrimental impact that these ongoing clashes have on the physical security and humanitarian situation of tens of thousands of affected South Sudanese. The rainy season, currently in

progress, makes travel difficult or impossible across vast swathes of South Sudan, and this—combined with SPLA restrictions on U.N. movement into active conflict areas—greatly complicates international efforts to gather information about the extent of the conflicts, deliver humanitarian assistance, or to respond to the violence that the United States believes to be underway.

The administration continues to strongly advocate for the U.N. Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), U.N. humanitarian agencies, and NGOs to have full, unfettered access to all areas in order to protect civilians. This access would allow UNMISS to conduct timely patrols and air reconnaissance and permit humanitarian workers and U.N. representatives to provide assistance and protection to all affected populations. The United States has also called on the Government of South Sudan to meet its obligations to ensure the safety and security of all civilians regardless of their background or ethnicity. The United States has reiterated that the Government is responsible for preventing SPLA attacks on UNMISS or humanitarian staff and assets. If confirmed, I will also continue to press the government to hold accountable those individuals who are responsible for the violence and who have committed abuses—including members of the security forces—through transparent judicial processes that respect the rule of law. I am also keenly aware of the mobility issues facing UNMISS, particularly restrictions affecting the use of helicopters, and will work vigorously with the U.N. and other stakeholders to fill these gaps. I am also interested in obtaining the views of Members of Congress and advocates with long histories of working on South Sudan as I think through what additional steps may be taken.

Question. In the last month, we've seen increasing violence in Sudan, particularly in Darfur, against U.N. peacekeepers and between ethnic groups. Earlier this month, the U.N. Representative to the Secretary General noted that "[t]he deterioration in the security situation in parts of South Sudan has been accompanied by human rights violations by both armed groups and national security institutions . . . [while] cases of arbitrary arrest, detention, abuse and incidences of killings by security forces, as well as the inability of the authorities to hold those responsible to account, are cause for deep concern." And just last week, 7 United Nations peacekeepers were killed and 17 were injured.

- What more can be done to better support the United Nations Mission in Darfur?

Answer. The United States is deeply concerned about increasing violence in Darfur and deteriorating humanitarian and human rights conditions. The administration has also condemned in the strongest possible terms the attack by unidentified assailants on an African Union—United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) patrol north of Nyala in South Darfur on July 13, which may constitute a war crime, and which constituted the largest single loss of life in the history of the UNAMID deployment. The United States deplores the persistent impunity for attacks on U.N. peacekeepers in Darfur and calls on the Government of Sudan to promptly conduct full and credible investigations into all attacks against UNAMID and to hold the perpetrators accountable.

The administration is pressing for a full investigation of this latest attack by the United Nations and the African Union. Once the perpetrators are identified, the United States will pursue targeted U.N. sanctions against those responsible for this attack and other attacks on peacekeepers.

The administration will continue to engage the African Union and troop contributing countries and work together to press the Government of Sudan and all parties to the conflict to cooperate fully with UNAMID and humanitarian organizations, to lift all bureaucratic and operational impediments to the mission's freedom of movement, and to allow the mission to implement its mandate without restriction. The administration will also emphasize to the U.N. and UNAMID leadership the importance of UNAMID's troops actually enforcing their Chapter VII mandate and the rules of engagement under which they operate.

The United States is providing predeployment training to contingents deploying to UNAMID and is engaging diplomatically with the governments of nations that provide troops and police contingents to UNAMID to encourage them to provide better trained and equipped personnel, and to protest the Government of Sudan's restrictions on UNAMID.

Obviously what is most needed, beyond better tactical civilian protection, is a meaningful political solution, which has long remained elusive. The administration will redouble its efforts to work with local parties and international stakeholders to resolve the crisis in a manner that addresses the root causes of the violence, holds perpetrators accountable, and addresses the longstanding grievances of the people of Darfur, who have suffered too long.

Question. The discovery of significant petrochemical resources in Cyprus' offshore economic exclusion zone (EEZ) may provide a new area for cooperation with the United States and with Israel. Prompt development of this resource could be a key driver of Cyprus's economic recovery and could potentially act as a stabilizing and unifying factor in the eastern Mediterranean. What can the United States do within the U.N. system to assist Cyprus in defending its right to operate in its exclusive economic zone?

Answer. The administration recognizes Cyprus' right to develop hydrocarbon resources in its EEZ. It does not believe that developing offshore energy resources need hinder the reunification talks. The administration continues to believe that, in the context of an overall settlement, the island's resources should be equitably shared between both communities. It fully supports the settlement process, under U.N. auspices, to reunify Cyprus as a bizonal, bicomunal federation. Such a settlement will help to strengthen regional stability as it would facilitate the normalization of relations between Cyprus and Turkey. If confirmed, as I stated during the hearing, I will support U.N. efforts to facilitate the settlement process. I will also support Cyprus' right to develop hydrocarbon resources in its EEZ, and urge U.N. member states to adopt a similar posture.

Question. In your book, "A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide," you described American inaction during the Armenian genocide. What is the obligation of the United States to condemn and commemorate past instances of genocide? What are the dangers of genocide denial?

Answer. With regard to your question about genocide, condemning and commemorating such crimes is extremely important. Doing so is a form of accountability, and it honors the memory of the victims and the survivors. It also reminds us that such horrors can be repeated unless we work to bring the promise of "never again" to life. As President Obama said at the launch of the Atrocities Prevention Board, "We must tell our children. But more than that, we must teach them. Because remembrance without resolve is a hollow gesture. Awareness without action changes nothing. In this sense, 'never again' is a challenge to us all—to pause and to look within." If confirmed, as I said in my hearing, I will stand up for human rights and stand up against atrocities and genocide.

On the first part of your question, the United States clearly acknowledges as historical fact and mourns the fact that 1.5 million Armenians were massacred or marched to their deaths in the final days of the Ottoman Empire. I will represent the United States Government and faithfully carry out the policy of the administration. As President Obama has said, a "full, frank, and just acknowledgement of the facts is in all of our interests."

RESPONSES OF SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BOB CORKER

Question. If confirmed, will you commit to making oversight a priority of your tenure as U.N. Ambassador? Do you consider the OIOS to be an independent inspector general and does the current Office of Internal Oversight (OIOS) have the tools and authority it needs to adequately perform an effective oversight role? If not, what recommendations would you make to further strengthen oversight and transparency?

Answer. As I noted in my opening testimony, making the United Nations more efficient and effective will be a priority, if I am confirmed as Ambassador to the United Nations. The United Nations Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), which was established in 1994 and uncovers numerous cases of mismanagement, fraud, and abuse each year, serves as the U.N.'s inspector general by fulfilling the Secretary General's internal oversight responsibilities. The General Assembly resolutions governing OIOS established operational independence for the Office in order for it to effectively deliver its mandates without interference. However, the United States continues to press for even greater operational independence for OIOS, including greater control over budget and personnel decisions.

If confirmed, I will support efforts to revitalize OIOS and further strengthen its core functions of audit, investigation, and evaluation. While I was an advisor at the White House, the United States worked tirelessly in the General Assembly to establish an Assistant Secretary General position to serve as OIOS Deputy to improve overall management. The United States also has strongly supported efforts of the current OIOS head, Ms. Carman Lapointe of Canada, to reduce vacancies across the Office, particularly in the Investigation Division where the vacancy rate was the highest. In addition, the United States supports the Secretariat's reaffirmation of

OIOS' jurisdiction over U.N. funds and programs, to enable OIOS to have full access to these entities and all parts of the U.N. system.

Question. The 2008 report of the cochair of the Mandate Review, which sought to identify and review the ongoing relevance of "all mandates older than five years originating from resolutions of the General Assembly and other organs," concluded that only 155 (56 percent) of the 279 mandates in the Humanitarian cluster were "current and relevant" and that only 18 (35 percent) of the 52 mandates in the African Development cluster were current and relevant.

- Which, if any, of these mandates have been eliminated? Do you intend to seek an update of the Mandate Registry or revive the Mandate Review?

Answer. As the United States faces difficult budgetary challenges, the United Nations also needs to closely scrutinize all its budgeted activities. The administration remains concerned about the size of the U.N. budget and the continuation of anachronistic mandates, policies, and programs. Even before joining the U.S. Government, I was outspoken about the need for far more rationalization of mandates and missions across the U.N.

The 2005 World Summit established a process to review U.N. mandates. That process effectively came to an end with UNGA Resolution 62/278 (2008). While there was some consensus reached in setting aside 74 completed mandates and identifying overlapping mandates during Phase I of the review, during Phase II of the review, there was limited progress in reviewing any significant number of mandates and no progress in eliminating or consolidating any mandates.

Overall, this attempt at a "mandate review" was highly contentious. Developing countries refused to engage in the process in a meaningful way because they viewed the exercise as an effort by the United States and others to cut the U.N. budget in areas that they most strongly support. As a result of the experience and the controversy, the term "mandate review" is now viewed negatively by many member states. Despite this, I firmly believe the problems this exercise was attempting to address are real and continue to deserve attention.

The administration continues to push for a more selective and strategic approach to improve problematic mandates or selective groups of related mandates such as in the area of development. In addition, the administration supports inclusion of sunset clauses in mandates. The administration continues to provide input and look for opportunities to evaluate mandates on a routine basis, for example through the application of results-based management. The Secretary General recently called for the need to seriously review mandates again, and I look forward to offering him the whole-hearted support of the United States as well as my personal support.

Question. Previous reform efforts have included strengthening protections for whistleblowers at the United Nations. What steps do you intend to take to further protect whistleblowers at the United Nations from retaliation, including best practices for protecting whistleblowers from retaliation? Would you support extending whistleblower protections beyond formal U.N. employees and staff members to others who report illegality, waste, mismanagement, abuse of authority, or acts that pose a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety?

Answer. This administration remains deeply committed to advancing oversight, ethics, and accountability reforms throughout the U.N. system. Through the United Nations Transparency and Accountability Initiative (UNTAI) and U.S. leadership in the General Assembly and relevant governing bodies, the United States has pressed U.N. leadership to robustly enforce U.N. policies on whistleblower protection.

The UNTAI benchmark for whistleblower protection is based on research of best practices, which includes policies on zero tolerance of retaliation and mandatory training. If confirmed, I would support continued consultations with U.N. system organizations on how they can build a culture of accountability and further effective whistleblower policies.

I agree that whistleblowers should be able to report fraud and corruption without fear of reprisal. The current U.N. whistleblower policy is tailored to protect U.N. personnel against retaliation. The policy includes measures to reverse administrative actions deemed to be retaliatory, which deems it largely inapplicable to individuals not employed by the United Nations. That said, I believe that it is important to consider measures for providing greater protection to individuals who report illegality, waste, mismanagement, abuse of authority, or acts that pose a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

At U.S. urging, U.N. member states made a formal request to the Secretary General this past spring to expedite the development of strengthened protections against whistleblower retaliation, and the U.N. Ethics Office is expected to present recommendations to the General Assembly this fall. The U.S. Mission to the U.N.

also remains committed to maintaining a hotline for waste, fraud, and abuse on its Web site where U.N. staff or other persons can report to the United States any abuse or retaliation at the United Nations.

Question. Considering the expense and difficulty of obtaining troop commitments for peacekeeping operations, especially those missions with a more robust mandate, and given the U.S. role as a permanent Security Council Member, if confirmed, will you commit to reviewing and reporting back to Congress on the ongoing necessity for longstanding peacekeeping missions?

Answer. The United States Government reviews individual peacekeeping missions annually, or more frequently in some cases. Especially in tough budget times, we need to make sure each mission is justified. If confirmed, I look forward to consulting with Congress throughout this process.

In addition, the Department briefs the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on U.N. peacekeeping on a monthly basis. The Department of State also provides an annual report to Congress on U.N. peacekeeping operations. The Department also notifies Congress when impending votes in the Security Council may modify the mandate of an individual mission or increase its size, as required by law.

Question. What steps has the United Nations undertaken since 2009 to address sexual exploitation, abuse and misconduct by U.N. peacekeepers and civilian personnel participating in those operations? What further steps will you pursue, if confirmed?

Answer. The United States remains a leader in international efforts to eliminate sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) by U.N. personnel, including by U.N. peacekeepers (whether international or local, civilian, military, or police). Predatory behavior by a few discredits the approximately 111,000 people serving with distinction in U.N. peacekeeping missions around the world, and undermines the trust that is essential to the success of each mission.

In late 2011, the United Nations launched an internal review to ensure that all peacekeeping missions are complying with the regulations and procedures recommended in the 2005 report by Prince Zeid of Jordan, the U.N. Secretary General's Adviser on SEA. As a result of this review, the U.N. has undertaken a program of action focusing on three aspects: (1) ensuring the credibility of the Organization's response through increased transparency and cooperation; (2) strengthening governance, oversight, and enforcement; and (3) enhanced awareness and advocacy for more responsive protection and assistance to victims of SEA. These efforts are coordinated by the Conduct and Discipline Unit (CDU) in the Department of Field Support.

Under this program of action, there have been a number of key developments over the last year. For example, beginning in September 2014, the United Nations will include in the annual report of the Secretary General on special measures for protection against sexual exploitation and sexual abuse, country-specific data on SEA allegations, including pending actions and any sanctions imposed. Field missions are currently reviewing a draft accountability framework for conduct and discipline. The U.N. has also taken steps to improve the Misconduct Tracking System (MTS), a database for tracking allegations of misconduct, including SEA. As part of a new human rights screening policy, issued in December 2012, MTS is now linked to the recruitment tool used by the Police Division in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, facilitating clearance of police personnel prior to deployment to the field. Work is also underway to establish a similar link with the recruitment system used by the Office of Military Affairs for military personnel. The enhanced reporting and improvements to MTS were undertaken in large part due to sustained engagement by the United States over the past few years.

Persons guilty of sexual misconduct must be held accountable. While the U.N. can conduct administrative procedures and waive immunity for its own civilian employees, many nations which host peacekeeping operations do not have sufficient capacity to provide for fair trials or acceptable standards of confinement, which makes local prosecution problematic. In addition, different procedures apply for military and police personnel, as often do the laws of the host country and the sending country. The U.N. can request a sending country to investigate and hold accountable its military personnel under their national laws, but the U.N.'s authority is limited to ordering repatriation of a soldier and requesting the troop contributing country report on actions taken to discipline its personnel. In 2011, in an important step forward, the General Assembly adopted a U.S. proposal to withhold reimbursement to troop-contributing countries for military contingent personnel repatriated for disciplinary reasons, including violation of the zero-tolerance policy for SEA.

If confirmed, I will continue to work with the United Nations and member states. I view pressing for ending impunity for U.N. officials as particularly important, as well as taking the steps needed to ensure that the U.N.'s database can effectively prevent previous offenders from serving again in the U.N. system, in any capacity.

Question. The United Nations Human Rights Council has the authority to establish mandates to monitor, advise, and report to the Council on human rights issues with respect to specifically identified countries. The Special Rapporteurs who govern these mandates are authorized to investigate and report to the UNHRC on alleged human rights violations or abuses. The United States has every reason to expect the Special Rapporteurs to carry out their functions in a professional and impartial manner. Yet the U.N. does not have a process or system to provide transparency and ensure accountability for these rapporteurs and other special mandate holders' poor performance, abuse of their position, or gross impartiality.

- If confirmed, would you support steps to bring greater transparency, accountability, and professionalism to the position of Special Rapporteur? For example, would it make sense to establish processes for dismissing Special Rapporteurs who repeatedly violate the code of conduct, engage in serious personal misconduct, or provide evidence that their impartiality is gravely compromised or otherwise seriously harms the trust they enjoy of all stakeholders?
- Would you support increased transparency on resources budgeted and expended in support of the mandate?
- Would you consider leading an effort to require Special Rapporteurs to disclose all sources of funding or other compensation received?

Answer. There are just under 50 different thematic and country specific U.N. Special Procedures, which include U.N. Special Rapporteurs, Independent Experts, Commissions of Inquiry, and Working Groups. While the effectiveness of these mandates depends greatly on the mandate holder, at their best these independent experts raise and maintain critical human rights issues on the international agenda, including gross violations of human rights by countries such as Syria and Iran, and often conduct important fact finding country visits.

While we do not always agree with specific Special Procedures, we greatly respect their independence and the overall importance of their work. It is essential that they maintain their independent voices, as some nations with poor human rights records regularly engage in attempts to undermine and weaken mandate holders, especially those who heavily scrutinize the records of human rights abusers. We work with mandate holders who are under attack from abusive states, such as the Iran Special Rapporteur, to ensure their ability to work independently.

The United States regularly consults with the special procedures mandate holders, and we scrutinize their work through their regular reports. We also take advantage of the regular interactive dialogues to press them on their methodology, operations, and the specific findings of their investigations; convey our views on those issues; and recommend topics for future inquiry.

I agree that Special Procedures are discredited and counterproductive when used for political purposes. One notorious and deeply disturbing example is the biased and discredited United Nations Special Rapporteur on "the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories," Richard Falk, who undermines the credibility of the Special Procedures and the Human Rights Council—thus hampering the promotion and protection of human rights. The United States has repeatedly condemned Falk for his despicable and offensive statements, as has U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-moon. Earlier this year, Falk sought to blame the terrorist bombings in Boston on U.S. foreign policy and on Israel. Falk also called for a watchdog NGO to be stripped of its U.N. observer status after the group rightly criticized Falk's repeated biased and anti-Israel remarks, including Falk's publishing of a clearly anti-Semitic cartoon on his blog and his repeated assertions of an equivalence between Israeli actions toward the Palestinians and the Holocaust.

That said, as a member of the Human Rights Council the United States is well placed to engage in efforts to strengthen the effectiveness of the Special Procedure mechanisms, and we will continue to work with other countries and the mandate holders themselves to do so. In 2014, more than one-third of all Special Procedures mandate holders (including the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the Palestinian territories) will reach their maximum term to serve and will need to be replaced. The United States will seize this opportunity to seek and support qualified candidates and will work with the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the HRC President to fill these positions.

Question. The Gingrich-Mitchell Task Force on U.N. Reform called for the U.N.'s hiring practices to increase the focus on competence over geographic considerations.

To what extent has this reform been implemented and, if confirmed, what steps will you take to ensure that competence is the first and foremost criteria in hiring decisions?

Answer. The United States is a strong proponent for reform of the U.N. Human Resources Management system. Over the past 8 years, the United States has advocated for reforms that facilitated recruiting highly skilled staff in a timely manner, while promoting top performers, getting rid of underperformers, encouraging mobility, and providing professional development to ensure continued excellence.

In 2010, the General Assembly adopted Resolution 65/247, which called for a comprehensive review of the entire recruitment process. Since then, the Office of Human Resources Management introduced the "Long List/Short List" approach that identifies candidates with the highest qualifications. They also developed a roster system that compiles the credentials of highly qualified, prescreened candidates to facilitate swift placement.

The United States has also been a strong advocate for the rigorous implementation of a comprehensive performance management system. The administration believes it is important that the U.N. strengthen the link between performance and career progression, in particular for those staff members in managerial positions.

Over the next few years, a large number of U.N. Secretariat staff members will retire. This turnover is an opportunity to reshape and streamline the U.N. by demanding a thorough review of staffing needs of the organization. The administration will support efforts to eliminate those positions that no longer contribute to the strategic objectives of the organization, as well as plans to combat "grade inflation" by ensuring the adequate classification of vacant positions.

This also is an opportunity to ensure that highly qualified Americans are employed in the United Nations. As part of the administration's strategic approach to fill key positions at the United Nations, the United States has taken a proactive approach by focusing on positions where the U.S. Government could make the strongest contributions and by conducting its own targeted recruitment of exceptionally qualified U.S. candidates.

Question. With respect to U.N. professional compensation, do you support the principle that U.N. compensation should not exceed equivalent U.S. civil service salaries? If so, what do you plan to do to ensure this principle is observed?

Answer. As the United States Government undertakes an austere fiscal diet, including staff furloughs and other cutbacks, it is important we send a message to the U.N. that salaries and other expenses must be controlled. This is key to ensuring that the overall U.N. budget is in line with the new realities.

The United Nations sets salaries for professional staff according to the Noblemaire Principle, which states that compensation should be set high enough to attract nationals from all member states, including those member states with the highest paid national civil service employees. Since its inception, the U.N. has based salaries for professional employees on the U.S. civil service scale. In 1985, the U.N. General Assembly decided, with agreement from the Reagan administration that average U.N. net salaries should fall within 110 to 120 percent of average U.S. civil service net salaries.

While the United States has joined consensus a number of times since 1985 on maintaining the current margin system, this administration has been vocal about the need for greater clarity in the methodology used by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC). The Department of State readily accepted the Government Accountability Office (GAO) recommendation in its recent report, "U.N. COMPENSATION: United Nations Should Clarify the Process and Assumptions Underlying Secretariat Professional Salaries," which requested that the U.S. Mission to the U.N. request that the ICSC clarify the methodology and assumptions used to calculate the margin between U.S. civil service and U.N. Secretariat staff salaries and to make this information available to member states.

The administration was pleased that GAO was conducting a follow-on study because, in actuality, the total U.N. compensation package includes salaries, locality pay, benefits, and allowances. It is important to determine whether the U.N.'s compensation package in its entirety is more generous than the U.S. civil service package. This study coincides with the administration's successful request for the ICSC to conduct its own comprehensive review of U.N. compensation and the methodology used. The administration will continue to push for the ongoing ICSC comprehensive review of U.N. compensation and use the findings of GAO as an opportunity to review the various components of the U.N. compensation package and to seek ways to streamline the current system.

Question. The international community, including the UNSC, has imposed broad and far-reaching sanctions on North Korea for its illicit nuclear, missile, and proliferation-related activities. Yet the record of member state implementation and enforcement of these sanctions remains mixed.

- If confirmed, what actions will you undertake to ensure effective implementation and enforcement of sanctions to prevent North Korea's continued illicit proliferation activities?
- If confirmed, will you support continued efforts by outside experts to document sanctions loopholes and expose member states' noncompliance with UNSC resolutions on North Korea?
- Do you believe universal implementation of UNSC requirements in the context of North Korea is achievable?
- Are there additional sanctions that the United States should pursue against third countries should they fail to fully implement and enforce United Nations Security Council resolutions?
- Chinese adherence to its commitments in UNSC resolutions is especially important. If confirmed, what actions will you undertake to specifically influence or pressure China to implement and enforce existing UNSC sanctions?

Answer. North Korea's nuclear, ballistic missile, and proliferation-related activities constitute a serious threat to international peace and security and undermine the global nonproliferation regime. Shipments of arms or related material to or from North Korea, and services related to such items, would violate U.N. Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874, as reaffirmed this year in resolutions 2087 and 2094. These Security Council resolutions generally provide that all states shall prevent the direct or indirect transfer of weapons from their territory or by their nationals to North Korea and shall prohibit procurement of such weapons from North Korea. The administration notes that the Sanctions Committee has the ability to impose targeted sanctions (asset freeze/travel ban) on individuals and entities found to have contributed to prohibited activities or to evasion of the sanctions.

The United States also continues to work closely with China to deepen our dialogue on North Korea to achieve our shared goal of verifiable denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula in a peaceful manner. Through our discussions, the administration will continue to encourage China to leverage more effectively its unique relationship with the DPRK. Chinese officials have made clear their concerns about North Korea's destabilizing and provocative behavior and their commitment to the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

The administration worked closely with China in the adoption of U.N. Security Council resolutions 2087 and 2094, which imposed strong new sanctions on North Korea. Chinese officials have stated publicly that China is committed to strict implementation of UNSC sanctions. It is a key priority in our bilateral relationship with China for the administration to work with China on enforcement of all relevant DPRK-related UNSCRs and to address North Korea's threats to regional peace and security and the global nonproliferation regime.

The United States will continue to work closely with all U.N. member states to ensure the full and transparent implementation of U.N. Security Council resolutions concerning North Korea. This will make it harder for the DPRK to acquire the technology, know-how, and funds to develop its nuclear and ballistic missile programs, which the international community has repeatedly condemned. The administration will likewise continue to exercise our national authorities, where and when appropriate, to impede Pyongyang's nuclear, ballistic missile, and proliferation-related activities.

Question. A United Nations Commission of Inquiry recently convened to investigate and document North Korea's "grave, systematic, and widespread" human rights abuses.

- If confirmed, will you commit the full resources of the U.S. mission to assist the efforts of the Commission? If confirmed, how will you use your position to highlight the deplorable human rights situation in North Korea? Can the United States do more to assist North Korean refugees, and if so, what?

Answer. As I said in my opening comments, if confirmed, standing up for human rights and human dignity will be one of my priorities as U.N. Ambassador. The human rights situation in the DPRK remains deplorable. The DPRK is one of the world's most systematic abusers of human rights. The State Department's annual "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices" details the breadth and depth of the government's human rights abuses. The human rights situation in the DPRK is addressed every year at the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) and in the U.N. General Assembly Third Committee and U.S. officials use their voice in these

venues and beyond to highlight the horrible conditions in the DPRK. At the March 2013 HRC session, the United States worked closely with Japan, the European Union, and the Republic of Korea (ROK), among others, to cosponsor a resolution that established a Commission of Inquiry (COI) to investigate the grave, widespread, and systematic human rights violations in North Korea. The resolution's adoption by consensus illustrated the extent to which the international community shares the concerns voiced repeatedly by the United States and others on the Council. The COI, led by Michael Kirby (Australia), and including Sonja Biserko (Serbia) and Marzuki Darusman (Indonesia), began its work on July 1.

The COI will build on the important work by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the DPRK, Marzuki Darusman, who has provided insightful and detailed reporting on the human rights situation despite the DPRK Government's refusal to grant him access to the country. The Special Rapporteur, whose mandate the United States has consistently supported, has provided an important monitoring function, reporting to the U.N. Human Rights Council every March as well as to the U.N. General Assembly every fall. The United States takes the opportunity of the interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur to express our concerns about human rights in the DPRK.

The United States will continue to work with partners at the Human Rights Council to support the COI in its important work, and looks forward to the COI's interim report to the Human Rights Council in September and its full report of its findings to the HRC in March 2014.

Ensuring the well-being of North Korean refugees and asylum seekers is also very important. If confirmed as Ambassador, I will ensure that we continue to work with other countries in the region and our international organizations, including the U.N. Human Rights Council and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, to raise attention to the deplorable human rights conditions in the DPRK and to cooperate in the protection of partners, especially South Korea, on the issue of North Korean refugees and asylum seekers. We will continue to urge all countries in the region to act in conformity with the 1951 U.N. Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1976 Protocol.

I would welcome any additional ideas you have on how we might raise the profile of the human rights crisis in the DPRK.

RESPONSES OF SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

Question. Thank you for your thoughtful answers to the many questions my colleagues and I have raised regarding Israel today and during our private meeting. As you know, U.S. support for Israel within the United Nations is critically important to our foreign policy and national security priorities. As I mentioned during our private meeting a few weeks ago, I greatly appreciate the constant efforts by you and the President to defend Israel at the United Nations and other international bodies. Yet I am discouraged that, as you noted during your testimony, Israel continues to be singled out at every opportunity by U.N. member states. As you stated, many close allies and aid recipients blindly support anti-Israel resolutions in the General Assembly and various U.N. bodies.

- If confirmed, how would you leverage our bilateral relationships with specific countries, particularly African and Asian partner countries and U.S. aid recipients, to reduce hostile activities aimed at delegitimizing Israel at the United Nations?
- In your opinion, how can the United States promote Israel's fair treatment with the professional staff of the U.N., the Secretary General and the heads of individual agencies? Do you believe such engagement is necessary?
- What can be done to more effectively push for structural changes to eliminate the institutional bias against Israel?

Answer. If confirmed, I will continue the administration's efforts to normalize Israel's status at the United Nations, including vigorously opposing one-sided, biased resolutions, fighting any efforts to delegitimize Israel, and supporting Israel's positive engagement with the United Nations.

In addition, I will make clear the administration's position that one-sided actions in international fora will not advance the aspirations of the Palestinian people. I believe that such actions at the U.N. will make it harder to achieve progress toward Middle East peace, possibly driving the parties further apart, heightening the risk of violence on the ground that could claim innocent lives on both sides, and risking hard-won progress in building Palestinian institutions.

U.S. officials meet regularly with host governments and U.N. officials to make known our opposition to unfair and biased resolutions that directly or indirectly target Israel. I will engage with my counterparts in New York from all regions, including Africa and Asia, and urge them to put a stop to efforts to delegitimize Israel in the U.N. system. The United States consistently opposes any texts or actions that criticize Israel unfairly in any U.N. body or specialized agency, and I will maintain that position.

If confirmed, I will also explore new opportunities for Israel to engage in the U.N., whether it is supporting the participation and selection of Israelis for leadership roles in U.N. programs and agencies, or backing Israeli initiatives at the General Assembly, like this year's entrepreneurship resolution. Israel was elected to the Executive Board of the U.N. Development Programme in 2012 and will serve on the board of UNICEF in 2013. The United States will continue to support efforts to expand Israel's participation in an important negotiating group in New York and Geneva (WEOG) to enhance Israeli participation in the U.N. system. Israel's candidacy for a seat on the U.N. Security Council for the 2019–2020 term—which the United States strongly supports—is based on its membership in WEOG.

Question. Maritime disputes in the East and South China Seas have caused increased tensions and considerable friction among East Asian countries. Secretaries Hagel and Kerry have both emphasized the need for bilateral and multilateral dialogue and peaceful dispute resolution mechanisms within ASEAN.

- If confirmed, would you be willing to facilitate a meeting of the relevant East Asian country representatives, and Members of Congress, in New York to discuss options for the peaceful resolution of maritime disputes in the East China Sea and South China Sea?

Answer. I agree that the peaceful resolution of maritime disputes in the East China Sea and South China Sea must be a priority. U.S. officials regularly discuss this issue with relevant countries, and if confirmed, I would support those efforts in my meetings with representatives from other diplomatic missions. I would also look forward to having Members of Congress visit the U.N. to participate in discussions on this topic or any other topic of interest and concern.

Question. During your long and distinguished career as a human rights champion, you served on the Board of the U.S. Committee for Human Rights in North Korea. The issue of North Korea's nuclear program is rightfully on the U.N. Security Council's agenda. The country's atrocious record of human rights abuse and crimes against humanity, however, are rarely addressed or invoked there.

- If confirmed, do you pledge to publicly raise the North Korean regime's human rights violations?
- Do you believe that in addition to demands on the nuclear program, the United States should routinely make demands to North Korea that it undertakes reform, close its gulags, and end the systematic repression and starvation of its population?

Answer. As I said in my opening comments, if confirmed, standing up for human rights and human dignity will be one of my priorities as Ambassador to the United Nations. The human rights situation in the DPRK remains deplorable. The DPRK is one of the world's most systematic abusers of human rights. The State Department's annual "Country Reports on Human Rights Practices" details the breadth and depth of the government's human rights abuses. The human rights situation in the DPRK is addressed every year at the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) and in the U.N. General Assembly Third Committee and U.S. officials use their voice in these venues and beyond to highlight the horrible conditions in the DPRK. The United States calls on the DPRK to close its gulags, and end systematic repression and the starvation of its population. At the March 2013 HRC session, the United States worked closely with Japan, the European Union, and the Republic of Korea (ROK), among others, to cosponsor a resolution that established a Commission of Inquiry (COI) to investigate the grave, widespread, and systematic human rights violations in North Korea. The resolution was adopted by consensus, illustrating the extent to which the international community shares the concerns voiced repeatedly by the United States and others on the Council. The COI, led by Michael Kirby (Australia), and including Sonja Biserko (Serbia) and Marzuki Darusman (Indonesia), began its work on July 1.

The COI will build on the important work by the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights in the DPRK, Marzuki Darusman, who has provided insightful and detailed reporting on the human rights situation despite the DPRK Government's refusal to grant him access to the country. The Special Rapporteur, whose mandate the United States has consistently supported, has provided an important

monitoring function, reporting to the U.N. Human Rights Council every March as well as to the U.N. General Assembly every fall. The United States takes the opportunity of the interactive dialogue with the Special Rapporteur to express our concerns about human rights in North Korea.

The United States will continue to work with partners at the Human Rights Council to support the COI in its important work, and looks forward to the COI's interim report to the Human Rights Council in September and its full report of its findings to the HRC in March 2014.

Ensuring the well-being of North Korean refugees and asylum seekers is also very important. If confirmed as Ambassador, I will ensure that we continue to work with other countries in the region and our international organizations, including the U.N. Human Rights Council and the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, to raise attention to the deplorable human rights conditions in the DPRK and to cooperate in the protection of partners, especially South Korea, on the issue of North Korean refugees and asylum seekers. If confirmed, I would continue to urge all countries in the region to act in conformity with the 1951 U.N. Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and its 1976 Protocol.

I would welcome any additional ideas you have on how we might raise the profile of the human rights crisis in the DPRK.

Question. In your last position, one of your main responsibilities was promoting human rights as part of U.S. foreign policy. Highlighting human rights issues in China is one of the most contentious parts of the United States-China relationship; many critics have said that the U.S. Government soft pedals on human rights in China at the expense of other political and economic concerns.

- If confirmed, how will you use your position to promote human rights in China? Will you ensure that China's human rights problems are not made secondary to other issues?
- How will you use China's candidacy to the U.N. Human Rights Council in Geneva—which requires a U.N. General Assembly vote—to highlight and raise international concerns with China's human rights record?

Answer. Promoting human rights—including the fundamental freedoms of religion, expression, assembly, and association—is a central objective of U.S. foreign policy around the world, including with China. In my opening statement, I highlighted standing up for human rights and human dignity as one my priorities, if I am confirmed as Ambassador to the United Nations. The United States has consistently pressed the Chinese Government in senior-level meetings and dialogues, including during the Human Rights Dialogue, to improve its human rights record. If confirmed, I will emphasize to the Chinese that the deterioration of the human rights situation in China inevitably affects the overall bilateral relationship and harms China's own pursuit of stability and prosperity I will raise publicly and privately human rights concerns, while pursuing practical engagement with China on a range of human rights-related issues, such as the benefits of legal reform and a more robust rule of law. I would welcome additional ideas from you as to how to advance the case of human rights in China.

The Obama administration has consistently urged the Chinese leadership to address the counterproductive policies that contribute to tensions and violence in Tibet and the Uighur areas, and pressed for a substantive dialogue with the Dalai Lama or his representatives, without preconditions.

In addition to high-level bilateral dialogues, the United States uses every appropriate opportunity to highlight China's human rights record in multilateral fora, including regularly raising China's human rights abuses during the Item 4 intervention the United States delivers at the Human Rights Council (HRC).

One useful vehicle for taking up this case is the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process of the Human Rights Council. In China's previous UPR in 2009, participants highlighted repression of religious and other minorities, harassment and detention of human rights defenders, and the use of "re-education through labor." As it does for all states undergoing review, the United States will make a statement highlighting key human rights concerns and recommendations for improvement during China's upcoming review in October, ahead of the elections for the Human Rights Council, expected in November.

RESPONSES OF SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR MARCO RUBIO

Question. On July 16, Panamanian authorities intercepted an illegal arms shipment from Cuba to North Korea. Cuba's actions violate at least three United Nations Security Resolutions.

- Given North Korea's record of proliferation of weapons technologies to other state sponsors of terrorism such as Syria and Iran, doesn't this latest case make clear once again that North Korea should be relisted as a state sponsor of terrorism?
- What actions will the United States take at the United Nations as a result of Cuba's violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions regarding trade of prohibited items with North Korea?

Answer. As a matter of law, in order for any country to be designated as a State Sponsor of Terrorism, the Secretary of State must determine that the government of that country has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism. The administration makes these designations after careful review of all available evidence to determine if a country meets the statutory criteria for designation.

Even without being designated as a state sponsor of terrorism, North Korea remains among the most heavily sanctioned of any country in the world based on its announced nuclear detonations, ballistic missile activity, proliferation activities, human rights violations, and status as a Communist state. North Korea has also been subject to sanctions under multiple U.N. Security Council resolutions for its ongoing nuclear and ballistic-missile related activities, which constitute a clear threat to international peace. In January 2013, the U.N. Security Council adopted UNSCR 2087 (2013), condemning North Korea's December 2012 satellite launch, which used prohibited ballistic missile technology, and on March 7, 2013, the U.N. Security Council unanimously adopted UNSCR 2094, condemning North Korea's February 12, 2013, nuclear test and imposing significant new sanctions under Chapter VII of the U.N. Charter.

The administration has commended Panama for the recent actions it has taken to implement relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions with regard to the North Korean ship *Chong Chon Gang*. The United States will work closely with the Government of Panama, which has requested our assistance and the administration intends to provide assistance as best it can.

North Korea's nuclear, ballistic missile, and proliferation-related activities constitute a serious threat to international peace and security and undermine the global nonproliferation regime. Shipments of arms or related material to or from North Korea, and services related to such items, would violate U.N. Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874, as reaffirmed this year in Resolutions 2087 and 2094. These Security Council resolutions generally provide that all states shall prevent the direct or indirect transfer of weapons from their territory or by their nationals to North Korea and shall prohibit procurement of such weapons from North Korea.

Panama has informed the U.N. Security Council DPRK Sanctions Committee of the incident and has invited the Panel of Experts, which assists the United Nations Security Council North Korea Sanctions Committee, to conduct an investigation.

Panama's actions regarding the Sanctions Committee as well as requesting the involvement of the Panel of Experts will help clarify the involvement of the Government of Cuba with this issue. The administration hopes that the Sanctions Committee, with the support of the Panel of Experts, will investigate this case thoroughly, identify parties responsible and recommend actions to be taken in response. The administration notes that the Sanctions Committee has the ability to impose targeted sanctions (asset freeze/travel ban) on individuals and entities found to have contributed to prohibited activities or to evasion of the sanctions. The administration will look at all possibilities regarding appropriate actions once the Committee and Panel complete their work. The administration will keep you and your staff informed of progress and would welcome your recommendations on next steps.

The United States will continue to work closely with all U.N. member states to ensure the full and transparent implementation of U.N. Security Council resolutions concerning North Korea. This will make it harder for DPRK to acquire the technology, know how, and funds to develop its nuclear and ballistic missile programs, which the international community has repeatedly condemned. The administration will likewise continue to exercise our national authorities, where and when appropriate, to impede Pyongyang's nuclear, ballistic missile, and proliferation-related activities.

Question. The National Security Staff at the White House is reportedly looking at ways to delist Cuba as a state sponsor of terrorism. Reports from July 16, 2013,

clearly show Cuba's collusion with North Korea on weapons transfers. Additionally we already know that Cuba continues to provide safe haven to terrorist groups such as ELN and the FARC.

- Do you agree that it only makes sense to retain Cuba on the list of state sponsors of terrorism?

Answer. The Reagan administration designated Cuba as a state sponsor of terrorism in 1982 due to its repeated provision of support for acts of international terrorism. After a designation is made, it remains in place until rescinded in accordance with the relevant statutes. The Department has no current plans to remove Cuba from the state sponsors of terrorism list. I support Department policy.

The administration has commended Panama for the recent actions it has taken to implement relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions with regard to the North Korean ship *Chong Chon Gang*. The United States will work closely with the Government of Panama, which has requested our assistance and the administration intends to provide assistance as best it can. Panama has informed the U.N. Security Council DPRK Sanctions Committee of the incident and has invited the Panel of Experts, which assists the United Nations Security Council North Korea Sanctions Committee, to conduct an investigation. Panama's actions regarding the Sanctions Committee as well as requesting the involvement of the Panel of Experts will help clarify the involvement of the Government of Cuba with this issue.

Question. I believe that we should immediately cease granting people-to-people licenses for travel to Cuba because of this latest evidence of collusion with North Korea. How can this administration advocate for relaxing policies with regard to the Cuban regime considering their support for illegal weapons transfers to North Korea? Is the President prepared to immediately halt all people-to-people programs to Cuba?

Answer. If confirmed as Ambassador to the United Nations, I will stand up for human rights and human dignity. As I indicated in my opening statement, I intend to draw attention to the crackdown on civil society in several countries, including Cuba.

The administration believes U.S. citizens are the best ambassadors of American values and that well-defined, purposeful travel that appropriately expands religious, cultural, and educational connections between Cubans and Americans allows Cubans to experience the freedom of association and expression they have too long been denied.

Regulations regarding such travel have been intentionally structured to maximize the benefits to, and contact with, the Cuban people.

Question. Will you support efforts to get the United Nations to increasingly rely on voluntary contributions to fund its regular budget?

Answer. In these tough times, when American taxpayers are scrutinizing their budgets, we need to do the same. I share your concern about the historical growth in the U.N. budget and increase in our share of the peacekeeping assessment. We have to be zealous in our scrutiny of every program and every initiative that the American people are helping to support through their generosity.

We have had significant success over the last 4 years on a U.N. reform agenda—building on some of the work done by our predecessors. We have sought reductions in the peacekeeping budget of over \$500 million.

The United States and other major contributors to the United Nations have been working very hard to limit growth in the U.N. regular budget. The administration has been successful in keeping the 2012–2013 budget level below the level of the 2010–2011 budget, marking only the second time in 50 years that the U.N. regular budget decreased from the previous biennium.

Assessed contributions ensure a shared financial responsibility among all U.N. member states and provide a stable and predictable funding source needed to enable the United Nations to address a wide array of global challenges.

A voluntary approach to funding would undercut U.S. arguments for burden-sharing in areas where the United States has strong national interests, such as peacekeeping and the special political missions in Iraq and Afghanistan. In addition to this, a voluntary approach would likely result in an overreliance on a handful of member states with the United States paying a greater share of the costs.

Question. Do you agree that the most effective tool we have in getting the United Nations to become more effective and transparent is to condition our financial contributions on specific reform metrics?

Answer. We must seek reforms across the U.N. system to guarantee our financial contributions are spent effectively. The best metric is a well-run cost-efficient

United Nations. By contrast, successive administrations—Republican and Democratic—have argued against conditioning U.S. contributions to the U.N., because the U.S. Government experience has been that the United States has diminished our leverage for reform when we are not inside. For example, when we were in arrears, even our closest allies were less willing to cooperate with us, including on reform issues. In 1996, our candidate to the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions (ACABQ)—an important body that scrubs U.N. budgets and advises on management issues—suffered an embarrassing defeat (receiving only 55 of 173 votes) in a rebuke over U.S. arrears.

By contrast, we have seen significant reforms achieved by robust, long-term, sustained engagement. These include: the establishment of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, the U.N. Independent Audit Advisory Committee, and the U.N. Ethics Office; advancement in U.N. transparency efforts by making the Office of Internal Oversight Services' internal audit reports publicly available; reforms to the current U.N. air travel policy that put in place common sense restrictions on use of business class travel and abolishment of several unnecessary and costly reimbursement practices; and improvements to U.N. human resources policies, including a pay freeze and right-sizing exercise pending the outcome of comprehensive reviews of staff needs and compensation and enhancements to performance management and management accountability.

Question. Given that several notorious human rights abusers (as is the case with Iran and Syria currently), perennially try to run for seats on the Council, do you agree that the United States should make its participation in the Council contingent upon certain standards for membership?

Answer. United States engagement in the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) has resulted in real progress in promoting and protecting human rights globally. U.S. reelection to the HRC last year—with the highest number of votes among its five Western competitors—was a clear indication that the rest of the world views U.S. leadership on the HRC as crucial. Though hard to measure, we also believe the good will generated by our principled engagements has enhanced U.S. standing as a human rights leader beyond the Council.

The United States remains concerned that countries with poor human rights records continue to be elected to seats on the HRC. The U.N. General Assembly, which elects members of the HRC by secret ballot, is supposed to elect only members that “uphold the highest standards in the promotion and protection of human rights.” The United States actively seeks to positively influence the elections both by encouraging countries with strong human rights records to seek seats and by encouraging competitive elections for the HRC.

The United States has also worked behind the scenes with other countries to oppose the election of some of the worst human rights violators to the Human Rights Council and other important global bodies and will continue to do so. As you may know, a relentless diplomatic campaign by the United States helped keep Syria, Iran, and Sudan from becoming members in the recent past.

We agree it should not take this kind of effort to keep countries in regional blocs from voting for bad actors. But we pledge to fight aggressively such disturbing campaigns which undermine the Council and the broader human rights agenda.

U.S. membership and leadership are critical to improving the Council's performance, and we recognize that a lot of hard work lies ahead.

Question. In the last session of the United Nations General Assembly, 131 countries—out of 193 member states—voted against the United States position on more than 50 percent of the rollcall votes. Among these 131 countries are several recipients of considerable amounts of U.S. foreign assistance.

- Do you agree that a country's voting pattern at the United Nations should be a factor in determining levels of U.S. foreign assistance?

Answer. A country's voting record at the United Nations is always relevant to its bilateral relationship with the United States. The administration references U.N. voting in our bilateral discussions at all levels, and we believe that member states should be held accountable for votes we deem problematic.

Obviously, there are a range of factors that go into our assessment of the bilateral relationship and divergent votes are just one dimension of a country's relations with the United States. We should consider the full range of economic, strategic, and political factors when considering how to utilize our foreign assistance.

Question. In late 2000, the U.N. agreed to lower the U.S. peacekeeping assessment to 25 percent of its total budget. However, in the most recent U.N. Budget (2013–2015) the U.S. share of the peacekeeping budget will rise to 28.4 percent.

- Do you agree that the United States should seek to reverse this trend and lower the U.S. share of the peacekeeping budget to 27 percent?
- What specific steps can you pledge to take to reverse this increase in the U.S. share of the U.N. peacekeeping budget?

Answer. The United States will work over the next 2 years to try to achieve reforms in the U.N. scales of assessment methodology to more equitably distribute the U.N. budget, in advance of the General Assembly's next review of the scales of assessment in 2015. The United States believes that emerging power—including China, India, Brazil, and Turkey—need to pay their fair share of the U.N. budget.

Although the latest scale of assessments included notable increases for several countries, including China and Russia, the methodology used to calculate each country's share needs to be streamlined and updated. If confirmed, I will work to address the scales in the context of a broader U.N. reform agenda, identify alternative methodologies for the scales of assessments that properly reflect capacity to pay, and work closely with other major financial contributors to ensure their support for our efforts.

Question. Do you support the creation of an inspector general to investigate and audit the use of U.S. contributions to the United Nations?

Answer. Strong oversight is important, which is why the United States has consistently pushed for credible external and internal audit functions at all U.N. organizations. The United States has great confidence in the quality and integrity of the National Audit Offices serving as the external auditors of U.N. organizations, which functions like a U.S. Government IG. The external auditors examine the financial statements and accounts of U.N. organizations. This arrangement avoids duplication of effort and assures that the external auditors are accountable to the entire membership.

If confirmed, I would support efforts to assure that U.N. internal auditors have adequate resources and independence to carry out their oversight responsibilities.

Question. Do you agree that the United States should condition its contributions to the United Nations on certification that no U.N. agency or affiliated agencies grants any official status, accreditation, or recognition to any organization which promotes or condones anti-Semitism?

Answer. Anti-Semitism is a scourge that cannot be tolerated. Our special envoy to combat anti-Semitism uses all means and venues to make sure it is stamped out. The United States is steadfast in combating all forms of anti-Semitism, and actively works to prevent the United Nations from being used as a platform for any hate speech. For example, the United States has continued its opposition to the Durban Declaration and Programme of Action (DDPA) in all U.N. venues given concern about anti-Israel references, as well as language that calls for undue restrictions on freedom of expression. Our diplomats have staged walkout during the presentations by Iranian President Ahmadinejad or other leaders who spew anti-Semitic hate. At the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC), the U.S. delegation calls points of order if any delegations use anti-Semitic language, including terms such as "blood libel." Senior government officials, including now-National Security Advisor Ambassador Susan E. Rice and Ambassador Eileen Donahoe (HRC) have stated publicly several times that Richard Falk is not fit to serve as a U.N. special rapporteur given his past anti-Semitic remarks.

If confirmed, I will join these public condemnations. If confirmed as Ambassador to the United Nations, I would continue to stand up to every effort that seeks to delegitimize Israel or undermine its security.

Question. Last year, 19 out of 78 rollcall votes at the General Assembly, involved the condemnation of Israel. Do you agree that this represents a disproportionate focus on Israel? If so, what practical measures would you, if confirmed, take to significantly reduce or end this practice?

Answer. I agree that the U.N. General Assembly disproportionately focuses on Israel. As I said in my testimony, "Israel's legitimacy should be beyond dispute, and its security must be beyond doubt. Just as I have done the last 4 years as President Obama's U.N. adviser at the White House, I will stand up for Israel and work tirelessly to defend it."

If confirmed, I will continue the administration's efforts to normalize Israel's status at the United Nations, including vigorously opposing one-sided, biased resolutions, fighting any efforts to delegitimize Israel, and supporting Israel's positive engagement with the United Nations.

U.S. officials meet regularly with host governments and U.N. officials to make known our opposition to unfair and biased resolutions that directly or indirectly

target Israel. We repeat this message in capitals and in Geneva. The United States consistently opposes any texts or actions that criticize Israel unfairly in any U.N. body or specialized agency, and I will maintain that position.

If confirmed, just as I did as President Obama's U.N. adviser, I would take every opportunity to make clear the administration's position that one-sided actions in international fora will not advance the aspirations of the Palestinian people. We make the costs of unilateral action clear to the Palestinians and to those who have supported counterproductive unilateral action in the United Nations. I believe that such actions at the U.N. will make it harder to achieve progress toward Middle East peace, possibly driving the parties further apart, heightening the risk of violence on the ground that could claim innocent lives on both sides, and risking hard-won progress in building Palestinian institutions.

U.S. officials meet regularly with host governments and U.N. officials to make known our opposition to unfair and biased resolutions that directly or indirectly target Israel. The United States consistently opposes any texts or actions that criticize Israel unfairly in any U.N. body or specialized agency, and I will maintain that position.

If confirmed, I will also explore new opportunities for Israel to engage in the United Nations, whether it is supporting the participation and selection of Israelis for leadership roles in U.N. programs and agencies, or backing Israeli initiatives at the General Assembly, like this year's entrepreneurship resolution. Israel was elected to the Executive Board of the U.N. Development Programme in 2012 and will serve on the board of UNICEF in 2013. The United States will continue to support efforts to expand Israel's participation in an important negotiating group in New York and Geneva (WEOG) to enhance Israeli participation in the U.N. system. Israel's candidacy for a seat on the U.N. Security Council for the 2019–2020 term—which the United States strongly supports—is based on its membership in WEOG.

Question. If confirmed, would you advocate for the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA) to harmonize its definition of "refugee" with that of the U.N. Refugee Agency (UNHCR)?

Answer. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) defines a refugee under the terms of the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees as a person who, "owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality, and is unable to or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country or return there because there is a fear of persecution"

The United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), which predates the creation of UNHCR, defines a refugee for purposes of its operation as any person whose "normal place of residence was Palestine during the period 1 June 1946 to 15 May 1948 and who lost both home and means of livelihood as a result of the 1948 conflict," and descendants of fathers fulfilling those criteria.

In protracted situations of displacement, groups experience natural population growth over time. UNHCR and UNRWA both generally recognize descendants of refugees as refugees for purposes of their operations; this approach is not unique to the Palestinian context. For example, UNHCR recognizes descendants of refugees as refugees in populations including, but not limited to, the Burmese refugee population in Thailand, the Bhutanese refugee population in Nepal, the Afghan population in Pakistan, and the Somali population seeking refuge in neighboring countries.

The United States acceptance of UNRWA's method of recognizing refugees is unrelated to the final status issue of Palestinian refugees, which can only be resolved in negotiations between the parties.

Question. July 22 will mark the first anniversary of the death of Oswaldo Paya Sardiñas in a car crash in Cuba. Mr. Paya was an internationally respected member of Cuba's beleaguered democracy movement, and newly available evidence by a survivor of the crash has raised questions about the possible involvement of the Cuban regime in the crash.

- If confirmed, what measures would you take to seek a credible U.N. investigation of the circumstances surrounding Mr. Paya's death?
- Would you commit to give Mr. Paya's surviving daughter (Rosa Maria Payá) a forum at the United Nations to ask for such investigation?

Answer. I understand and agree strongly with the call the Department of State has already made for an independent investigation, with independent, international observers, into the circumstances leading to the deaths of Oswaldo Payá and Harold

Cepero, and if confirmed I will continue to support such calls and encourage other U.N. delegations to do the same. Additionally, I understand the Department of State also called for an independent investigation at the June 2013 session of the U.N. Human Rights Council.

At both the U.N. General Assembly (UNGA) in New York and the U.N. Human Rights Council (HRC) in Geneva, civil society representatives play a crucial part in highlighting human rights issues of concern. In March 2013, Ms. Paya came before the HRC to call the Council's attention to her father's tragic and untimely death.

As you know, if I am confirmed as Permanent Representative to the United Nations, I have agreed to reach out to Rosa Maria Paya to speak with her directly. I would also reach out to Assistant Secretary General for Human Rights, Ivan Simonovic, to encourage the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to conduct a thorough investigation. I would like to explore any and all appropriate venues for raising the profile of this case and of the broader human rights plight of the Cuban people.

Question. If confirmed, what steps would you take to raise international attention about Cuba's poor human rights record at the General Assembly?

Answer. As I stated in my opening testimony, the United Nations must stand up for human rights and human dignity, which are American and universal values. I also spoke about the need to contest the crackdown on civil society being carried out in Cuba. If confirmed, I intend to continue to speak about this issue, including at the U.N. General Assembly and at any other appropriate venue that we identify. As it stands now, the United States uses every appropriate opportunity to highlight Cuba's human rights record in multilateral fora, including at the U.N. General Assembly. If confirmed, I will redouble these efforts. This will include diplomacy to strongly make the case to increase votes against the annual Cuban embargo resolution at the U.N. General Assembly. It will also include consulting with you, other interested Members of Congress, and Cuban advocates to come up with fresh venues and approaches to drawing attention to the dire human rights conditions inside Cuba.

Question. Has the United States response to events such as the 2009 protests in Iran after the fraudulent election of Mahmoud Ahmadinejad or to the revolutions of the Arab Spring been adequate and timely? Have we capitalized on the opportunity for fundamental change to occur in these countries that would advance U.S. interests in the long term?

Answer. The uprisings in the Arab Spring grew out of the deep longings of the people of the region for freedom, dignity, and opportunity, after decades of oppression and an illusory stability where citizen aspirations were suppressed but never addressed. Today we see many countries in the region struggling on the long, very bumpy road to democracy and stability, and the administration is deploying a range of diplomatic, economic, and other tools to support the peoples and governments of the region, as it is in the U.S. interest to see a more peaceful, democratic Middle East. Through this period the United States policy has been defined by support for three principles: nonviolence, respect for universal human rights, and meaningful political and economic reform on the road to democracy.

As you note, the first match was lit in Tehran in 2009, when millions rose up to demand democracy and protest Iran's stolen election. The United States stood with the Iranian people, voicing strong American support for those seeking to exercise their universal rights. However, the Iranian regime—terrified of the implications of a democratic movement within its borders—crushed that inspiring movement, arresting, beating, and killing peaceful oppositionists, political activists, and average Iranians who refused to have their voices ignored. This was an outrage, and the administration said so. On June 23, the President said, "The United States and the international community have been appalled and outraged by the threats, the beatings, and imprisonments of the last few days. I strongly condemn these unjust actions, and I join with the American people in mourning each and every innocent life that is lost." Over the past several years, the administration has worked in Geneva to establish and support the first-ever country-specific Special Rapporteur for Human Rights, for Iran; we have established ever-wider margins for the annual Iran human rights resolution in the General Assembly; and we continue to impose sanctions against human rights abusers, including those who use technology to commit human rights abuse. I would welcome the opportunity to consult about any additional steps we might take to support human rights in Iran.

In Libya President Obama mobilized broad international support and led a coalition to help the Libyan people rid their country of a tyrant who had made clear his intention to murder all those who opposed him and stood up for democracy. He was

also a dictator who had brought great harm to American and other innocent families. With Ghadafi gone, the Libyan people have the opportunity to chart a new direction for their country and build their democracy. They face significant challenges in light both of the evisceration of institutions under Ghadafi and the growth of militias and the vast quantities of arms in Libya. These challenges cannot be overstated. And it will surely take time—and support from the broader international community—for the Libyan people to build a peaceful democratic Libya, but U.S. leadership made it possible for the brave Libyan people to embark upon that journey. The United States now stands as a partner to Libyans who are investing their lives in building that future.

Egyptians, too, stand at another crossroads in their journey toward peace and democracy. There is a tremendous yearning for change and yet enormous challenges remain for the Egyptian people to move in an inclusive, rights-respecting fashion toward stability and justice. In response to the original uprising, President Obama made it clear to the Egyptian people that he respected their universal rights of protest; the administration worked behind the scenes through political and military channels to urge nonviolence against the protesters; and, with congressional support, the United States stepped in with a variety of forms of technical, democracy, and other assistance to help support Egypt as it planned and executed its first democratic elections. In a country of such strategic importance to the broader region, this support was important. Unfortunately, while the Muslim Brotherhood won Egypt's elections, millions of Egyptians had legitimate grievances with the way the Morsi government was governing, prompting large-scale popular protests. There was considerable unrest, and the potential for greater violence. U.S. officials at all levels engaged the Muslim Brotherhood in an effort to convince them to address the people's legitimate concerns, make compromises, govern in a more inclusive manner, respect human rights, and promote minority rights. Today, in the wake of recent events, it is critical that those attempting to shepherd the transition back to democracy change that dynamic by attempting to govern on behalf of all Egyptians, including those with whom they disagree. This is a message the administration is sending through all channels, including, most recently, through the very public comments by Deputy Secretary Burns in Cairo. The administration is eager to stand with the Egyptian people as they rebuild their economy and their political system so that it is truly democratic and respects human rights. Our assistance and long-standing ties with the government, the military, and the people give us a platform from which to urge them to promptly and responsibly get back on a path toward an inclusive and sustainable democracy.

Syria is the most complex and tragic of the issues confronting us, our allies and the entire Middle East. The President has put in place a multifaceted approach designed, with our international partners, to strengthen moderate elements of the opposition and bring about the too-long-awaited political transition to democracy. In addition to imposing crippling sanctions against the Assad regime, we have contributed nearly a billion dollars' worth of humanitarian aid, and critical nonlethal assistance to strengthen opposition capabilities and institutions. In addition, the President announced recently that—in response to Assad's chemical weapons use—we would provide additional forms of support to vetted units in the opposition military. We have encouraged the opposition, which has been woefully fractured, to unite so the people in Syria view them as a viable alternative. This is very much a work in progress, and nobody is satisfied with the state of events on the ground, especially as more than 100,000 Syrians have been killed and the conflict continues to destabilize the broader region.

These are just a few examples of a region in flux and tumult. The best way for us to capitalize is to continue to be engaged, understanding that the path will not be smooth nor without setbacks. We need to work with the governments and groups who represent democratic values and respect for human rights, and who understand the need to create jobs and economic opportunity. The President is committed to seeing that happen, and I am committed to supporting his efforts throughout the region.

As with all of these issues, if confirmed, I will need to rely on your thoughts and advice. As I said in my meetings and at my hearing, I cannot do this job without you.

Question. The administration has been criticized for not speaking out frequently and forcefully enough in support of democratic movements and freedom fighters over the last 5 years. How do you judge the administration's record in this area? If confirmed, how would you use your platform at the United Nations to highlight the plight of those oppressed by their governments?

Answer. Support for democracy and human rights defenders is a core American value, and the Obama administration has not shied away from speaking out for those who are seeking their universal fundamental freedoms. As I said in my opening statement, if confirmed, standing up for human rights and human dignity will be one of my priorities as Ambassador to the United Nations. I believe peoples suffering human rights violations look to the United States for leadership. And often in our history the U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. has raised a loud voice on behalf of American values and fundamental freedoms.

In his first address to the U.N. General Assembly in 2009, President Obama stated, "there are basic principles that are universal; there are certain truths which are self evident. And the United States of America will never waver in our efforts to stand up for the right of people everywhere to determine their own destiny."

President Obama firmly supported the international effort to ensure the emergence of an independent South Sudan. Likewise, U.S. leadership was key in building an international coalition to prevent a massacre of civilians in eastern Libya, and to support the Libyan people to overthrow the Qadhafi regime and begin a transition to democracy after four decades of brutal dictatorship. More broadly, in response to the Arab Spring, the United States has spoken out strongly for political change that gives citizens a greater voice in their government, for the rights of free speech and peaceful protest, and for the political participation of women and minorities.

Obviously, when fewer than half the countries in the United Nations are fully free, we cannot be satisfied. When men, women, and children are being slaughtered in Syria we cannot be satisfied. When individuals are routinely jailed, harassed, and abused for advocating for their freedoms, and when governments are cracking down on civil society around the world, we have to find fresh ways to influence governments and support freedom and those who struggle to promote it. I would welcome any further ideas you have to achieve our shared ends.

As a means to highlight their struggles and improve their situations, the United States joined more than 60 other countries in 2011 to cosponsor a resolution at the U.N. Human Rights Council renewing the mandate for the Special Rapporteur on the situation of human rights defenders. Additionally, in March 2012, the U.S. cosponsored a resolution on the promotion and protection of human rights in the context of peaceful protests.

Question. If confirmed, as a member of the Principals Committee, what unexplored options for influencing the outcome in Syria and achieving the fall of Assad would you advocate?

Answer. I agree with the premise of your question, which is that the administration should leave no stone unturned and no option unexplored. The administration has said repeatedly that the President continues to review all options for addressing the crisis in Syria, as the situation changes on the ground. If confirmed, it will be my responsibility to contribute to that constant assessment and review of the situation and potential options for U.S. policy, given the truly outrageous situation on the ground in Syria. If confirmed, I will work with my colleagues to explore, evaluate, and reevaluate every means we might use to bring about the day when the Syrian people can be rid of Assad's tyranny, and begin to rebuild their country with a government that respects their rights and gives them the opportunity for a better future. I would also like to consult very closely with Members of the Congress who care deeply about this issue, to be sure that we are considering all variables and all options that could help influence outcomes in Syria in a manner that advances our national security interests.

Question. In an essay titled "Full Force" published by the New Republic on March 2003 you recommended "a historical reckoning with crimes committed, sponsored, or permitted by the United States." These views strike me as outside the mainstream American view of our Nation's role in the world, and I would like to give you an opportunity to clarify them.

- Which crimes do you believe have been committed by the United States that need reckoning?
- Which crimes do you believe have been sponsored by the United States that need reckoning?
- Which crimes do you believe have been permitted by the United States that need reckoning?

Answer. Thank you for the opportunity to expand on my response to your question regarding language in the 2003 New Republic article. The passage you cite does not accurately reflect my view of the United States. If I had it to do over, I would have used very different language, especially because the article itself is an extended and

passionate call for America's moral leadership in the world. Promoting American values as a pillar of our foreign policy has been the objective of everything I have written about American foreign policy. There have been times when we have failed to live up to our high standards and when American leaders of both parties have acknowledged error and changed course, often after vigorous domestic policy disagreements and sometimes at the behest of Congress. This ability of the United States to honestly explore areas of policy disagreement and move forward is a hallmark of our strength. In my testimony I cited President Clinton's discussion of his feelings about the genocide in Rwanda. I might also have cited President Reagan, who in 1988 in signing the Civil Liberties Act memorably said, "We must recognize that the internment of Japanese-Americans was just that: a mistake." Such statements help set us apart from those countries that tolerate no criticism, trample on checks and balances, and deny their people the fundamental freedoms that Americans enjoy.

If I have the privilege of representing this country at the United Nations, I will work tirelessly to protect the interests and values of the American people.

I will defend America because I am proud of America.

RESPONSES OF SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR CHRISTOPHER A. COONS

Question. Mali.—The events in both Mali and Libya show how instability in one country can destabilize an entire region, and create attractive targets for extremist groups intent on harming local and American interests.

- In the case of Mali, do you think it is important for the international community to deploy U.N. peacekeepers to the north in an effort to secure the gains made by the French earlier this year?
- What effect do you think greater stability in northern Mali will have on the region as a whole?

Answer. The United States believes it is vitally important for the international community to deploy U.N. peacekeepers to consolidate the gains achieved by French forces earlier this year and to make progress in addressing the underlying causes of instability in northern Mali. Bert Koenders, Special Representative of Secretary General Ban Ki-moon and Head of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), said: "The establishment of MINUSMA is the result of a unanimous decision of the United Nations Security Council and has reaffirmed the engagement of the international community to accompany the people of Mali in their quest for stability, peace, and prosperity."

MINUSMA has a comprehensive mandate to stabilize key northern population centers, support the political process, and contribute to strengthening Mali's institutions, which are crucial to ensuring that northern Mali is no longer hospitable to extremist and terrorist forces, whose protracted entrenchment contributed to state collapse in Bamako last March. The United Nations envisions that MINUSMA will maintain a relatively light presence in Bamako, while deploying to key northern cities, including Gao, Timbuktu, Kidal, Tessalit, and Douentza.

Greater stability in northern Mali is critical to international peace and security, and particularly, the stability of the Sahel region, which faces complex and inter-related security and governance challenges, including from al-Qaeda. If confirmed, I will work with colleagues in the United States Government, as well as the United Nations and our allies and partners, to support and implement an integrated strategy for peace and security in the Sahel.

Question. Mali.—With more than 12,600 uniformed personnel deployed to a vast and extremely difficult operating environment, it will be critical for MINUSMA to possess the resources and equipment necessary to be effective. Because of the timing of the crisis, this mission was not included in the administration's budget request.

- How would a lack of adequate U.S. funding affect MINUSMA's ability to operate and carry out its mandate?

Answer. It is essential that all U.N. peacekeeping operations have the resources they need to fulfill their mandates, which are critical to the maintenance of international peace and security.

Insufficient funding may lead to personnel and capability shortfalls in U.N. peacekeeping operations that negatively impact their ability to fulfill their mandates, undermining the effectiveness of peacekeepers and threatening the lives of both the peacekeepers and the civilians they are mandated to protect.

In the case of Mali in particular, the consequences of insufficient funding to the U.N. Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) could

undermine the recent progress and fragile peace and endanger stability in the region, which would directly damage our own national security interests.

The administration will continue to explore all available options to meet President Obama's commitment to pay our dues on time and in full, consulting closely with Congress on the appropriate way forward.

Question. Peacekeeping operations are now being termed "stabilization operations" in DRC and Mali, and being asked to use force and undertake roles and responsibilities that far outstrip existing U.N. military doctrine, training, capacity (e.g., intelligence and command and control), not to mention civilian capacity. The United States authorized these mandates.

- How will you ensure that new iterations of peace operations do not make the United Nations more vulnerable to belligerent threats or increase risks to civilians that peacekeepers are mandated to protect?
- How do you view this new mandate, and the supply of unmanned aerial vehicles, impacting the situation in the DRC specifically?

Answer. The world is more dangerous, and the challenges and threats to peacekeepers more acute than they were 30 or 40 years ago. While the fundamentals of U.N. peacekeeping remain unchanged—such as the use of force only in self-defense or in defense of the mandate—the circumstances in which peacekeepers are needed today are often far more complex and challenging than traditional operations implementing a peace agreement between two warring states. Instead, they are often needed to help protect civilians and build peace in fragile states facing armed groups and other spoilers to the peace, as in Mali and Congo. Al-Qaeda and its affiliates have also targeted U.N. personnel on numerous occasions. To operate in such challenging environments, U.N. personnel require a wide range of military, police, and civilian skills and capacity, as well as adequate security.

The United States helps to build this capacity by actively supporting the U.N.'s development of modern doctrine, guidance, and training, and by providing training and equipment. This includes the new infantry battalion manual the United Nations recently released, and the development of similar manuals currently being drafted for other peacekeeping units, as well as work on issues such as command and control, protection of civilians, gender, and child protection. State and Defense offices work in very close cooperation on these issues, including through the Global Peace Operations Initiative which helps troop-contributing countries prepare their contingents to serve in U.N. missions, including through the provision of personal protective equipment.

The administration has been very engaged for several years in reforms to the U.N.'s process for recruiting, hiring, and retention of staff with the necessary skills, including addressing the incentives and working conditions necessary to keep good people in the field. The United States commissioned a study on the reasons for the shortage of helicopter assets, which is a key step toward finding solutions. The administration is actively encouraging and supporting the implementation of recommendations from that study. The administration is also a lead proponent of contingency planning for crises, including support to the U.N.'s new Operations and Crisis Center and mission-specific plans, in particular related to protection of civilians.

As for the U.N. mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, it has long had the authority to use force to protect civilians from the predations of armed groups. Security Council Resolution 2098 of March 2013 did not change that authority or the mission; it only made it more explicit, by adding a brigade that is trained, organized, and equipped to deal with armed groups and other threats to civilians. We will encourage the troop contributors to enforce the critical mandate. Similarly, the introduction of unarmed, unmanned aerial systems in Congo will permit the U.N. mission to detect and react more rapidly to threats to the civilian population and to the mission itself.

Question. President Obama announced the creation of an interagency Atrocities Prevention Board (APB) during a speech last year at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. The Atrocities Prevention Board, previously under your leadership, has been tasked with creating new tools to prevent wide-scale violence against civilians, in addition to identifying countries at risk of such crimes. Over the past year, the APB has sparked preventive action in places like Burma and Kenya, in addition to crafting important bureaucratic reforms to mainstream atrocities prevention training and early warning. However, the United States has yet to meaningfully engage diplomatically with other countries' on strengthening their own atrocities prevention capacities.

- In your new role at the United Nations, should you be confirmed, how will you engage with U.N. members states on atrocities prevention and challenge them to create structures similar to the APB?

Answer: As President Obama said in his August 2011 Directive on Mass Atrocities, “preventing mass atrocities and genocide is a core national security interest and a core moral responsibility of the United States.” In the same directive, the President also sent a strong signal on the importance of sharing that responsibility with other countries. Just as the United States is committed to strengthening our own capabilities to focus on preventing and responding to mass atrocities, this administration is committed to working with a wide range of partners to ensure that the international community is well-positioned to be effective in this regard.

While many of our partners already have strong commitments to civilian protection and conflict prevention, the administration believes that the process we have undertaken in formulating our comprehensive atrocity prevention strategy and standing up the Atrocities Prevention Board has generated new and useful insights into how governments can do more to position themselves to prevent and respond to the worst crimes known to humankind. For more than a year, we have sought opportunities to share our experience and insights with our partners in a range of settings.

For example, the administration regularly discusses our efforts on atrocity prevention with those who join the U.N. Security Council in order to see how we can learn from each other, develop stronger tools, and enhance cooperation.

Given the important role of regional organizations, the United States has held technical discussions at the regional level on strengthening our joint capabilities for conflict prevention, which can help protect civilian populations vulnerable to the threat of violence and atrocities.

A significant part of the administration’s effort is its partnership with the United Nations. The United States is working to build the capacity of the United Nations for atrocity prevention by advocating for better coordinated crisis planning and response across U.N. bodies; deepening our partnership with the Office of the Special Advisor on the Prevention of Genocide; urging all U.N. field missions to enhance their early warning capacity; and contributing voluntary funding to U.N. preventive diplomacy.

To bolster the administration’s diplomatic engagement with countries on atrocity prevention matters, the United States has also joined with other member states in fora dedicated to the discussion of atrocity prevention and to promoting the use of mediation as a tool for conflict prevention.

If confirmed, I will work to deepen this cooperation, look for new ways to share the lessons the administration has learned, and foster new and enhanced partnerships that will advance our efforts to prevent atrocities.

Question. Great Lakes.—Despite the passage of a U.N. resolution, the creation of a multilateral Peace, Security and Cooperation Framework for negotiations, and the appointment of an envoy to the Great Lakes, the crisis in eastern Congo continues.

- If you are confirmed, what steps will you take up in New York to support implementation of the Framework and cessation of external support to militias, which has been documented by the United Nations, that continue to destabilize the DRC and create human misery.

Answer: The administration’s overarching goal is to help stop the cycle of violence that has plagued eastern DRC for nearly two decades and to allow political stability and economic development to take root. The United States welcomed the signing of the Peace, Security, and Cooperation Framework for the DRC and the Region. The administration is also encouraged by the appointment of former Irish President Mary Robinson as the U.N. Special Envoy to the region and supports her mandate to lead the implementation of the Framework. If confirmed, I will work with U.N. Special Envoy Robinson, as well as U.S. Special Envoy Feingold, and partners on the Security Council, to encourage the Framework’s signatories to fully and quickly implement their commitments, including prioritizing the regional commitments to not support armed groups and to respect the territorial integrity of neighboring states. As the President recently said, all the parties concerned need to follow through on their commitments in order to bring about a lasting solution in the DRC and Great Lakes Region. There is no question that civilians in this region have suffered far too long, and we must find a way collectively to forge a path that better secures their physical security and human rights.

The administration believes that its diplomatic engagement over the past 6 months has had an impact. However, the United States is deeply concerned by recent reports that external support to armed groups within the DRC—while lim-

ited—continues. There are also reports of collusion between state forces and armed groups. All such support, as well as any government collusion, must end.

The administration will continue to closely monitor the role of the U.N. peacekeeping mission, MONUSCO, which must be a critical part of the effort to stabilize the DRC and needs to help provide political and security conditions space for a lasting settlement under the PSC Framework. In March, the Security Council approved an Intervention Brigade (IB) within MONUSCO tasked with neutralizing and disarming armed groups. The United States strongly supports the IB and the larger mission, but we recognize that we and other Security Council countries who supported this deployment must stay vigilant about the mission and the broader security challenges, seeking to ensure that it makes a meaningful difference on the ground.

Question. The United Nations plays a significant role in South Sudan. Since its independence, there have been a number of worrisome developments that indicate the country may be moving in the wrong direction. In fact, earlier this month the U.N. Representative to the Secretary General noted that “[t]he deterioration in the security situation in parts of South Sudan has been accompanied by human rights violations by both armed groups and national security institutions.

- What steps will you take, if confirmed, to help address the challenges in South Sudan and what aspects of the U.N. system do you think will be most useful to such an effort?

Answer. I am deeply disturbed by mounting reports of abuse of civilians, including ongoing killings, beatings, and looting and destruction of homes and humanitarian facilities in Jonglei State. I am extremely concerned about the detrimental impact that these ongoing clashes have on the physical security and humanitarian situation of tens of thousands of affected South Sudanese. The rainy season, currently in progress, makes travel difficult or impossible across vast swathes of South Sudan, and this—combined with SPLA restrictions on U.N. movement into active conflict areas—greatly complicates international efforts to gather firsthand information about the extent of the conflicts, deliver humanitarian assistance, or to respond to the violence that the United States believes to be underway.

The administration continues to strongly advocate for the U.N. Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), U.N. humanitarian agencies, and NGOs to have full, unfettered access to all areas in order to protect civilians. This access would allow UNMISS to conduct timely patrols and air reconnaissance and by permit humanitarian workers and U.N. representatives to provide assistance and protection to all affected populations. The United States has also called on the Government of South Sudan to meet its obligations to ensure the safety and security of all civilians regardless of their background or ethnicity. The United States has reiterated that the Government is responsible for preventing SPLA attacks on UNMISS or humanitarian staff and assets.

If confirmed, I will also continue to press the Government to hold accountable those individuals who are responsible for the violence and who have committed abuses—including members of the security forces—through transparent judicial processes that respect the rule of law. I am also keenly aware of the mobility issues facing UNMISS, particularly restrictions affecting the use of helicopters, and will work vigorously with the United Nations and other stakeholders to fill these gaps. I am also interested in obtaining the views of Congress and advocates with long histories of working on South Sudan as we think through what additional steps may be taken.

RESPONSES OF SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR JEFF FLAKE

Question. Over the past several years, the Palestinian Authority has successfully sought end-runs around direct negotiations with Israel by getting votes in various U.N. bodies to upgrade its status. Such attempts undermine the long-held belief that peace between Israel and the Palestinian Authority can only come about as a direct result of direct negotiations.

- What is your plan to stop initiatives like this from even coming before U.N. entities, or the General Assembly, for a vote?
- How will you address future attempts by the Palestinian Authority to achieve statehood through the United Nations?
- Will you support current U.S. law that requires the cessation of U.S. assistance to U.N. entities which recognize Palestinian statehood?

Answer. There are no shortcuts to Palestinian statehood, and I and other U.S. officials have long made that clear. As I said in my testimony on July 17, the administration has been absolutely clear that it will continue to oppose firmly any and all unilateral actions in international bodies or treaties that circumvent or prejudice the very outcomes that can only be negotiated, including Palestinian statehood. As President Obama's U.N. adviser, I helped coordinate and lead the delivery of this message. If confirmed, I will strongly support this effort, and I will work tirelessly to contest any effort that seeks to delegitimize Israel or undermine its security.

The administration will continue to stress, both with the parties and with international partners, that the only path for the Palestinians to realize their aspiration of statehood is through direct negotiations, and that Palestinian efforts to pursue endorsements of statehood claims through the U.N. system outside of a negotiated settlement are counterproductive. The administration remains vigilant on this matter and works in close coordination with the Israeli Government and our other international partners to firmly oppose one-sided action in international fora and to reinforce the importance of resumed direct negotiations between the parties as the only way to address their differences and achieve lasting peace. There is simply no substitute for the difficult give-and-take of direct negotiations.

The administration has requested a waiver to allow the President to continue to provide contributions to U.N. specialized agencies when he determines it is in the national interest. The waiver would allow the United States to maintain our vote and influence within the United Nations and its specialized agencies, and to remove from the Palestinians or their allies any ability to force a contribution cutoff and diminish our influence within these agencies.

Without a national interest waiver the administration's ability to conduct multilateral diplomacy and pursue U.S. objectives will be eroded, and the United States standing and position in critical U.N. agencies will be harmed. As a result, the United States ability to defend Israel from unfair and biased attacks in the United Nations will also be greatly damaged.

Congress has passed legislation that provides the United States with additional tools that are better suited for the purposes of deterrence than the contribution cutoff mechanism. Legislation passed in the aftermath of the Palestinians' successful UNESCO bid, if triggered, would place limits on U.S. economic support to the Palestinian Authority and would require the closure of the Palestinians' Washington, DC, office if they obtain membership as a state in a U.N. specialized agency going forward. These requirements are, appropriately, directed at the Palestinians in the event they engage in conduct that we are seeking to discourage. By contrast, the implications of the contribution cutoff will be most felt by the United States and the partners whose interests we defend across the spectrum of the U.N. system.

The proposed waiver, if enacted, will not diminish the administration's commitment to supporting Israel and defending our interests at the United Nations. It will not alter the administration's conviction that Palestinian status issues can be appropriately resolved only on a bilateral basis in direct negotiations with the Israeli Government, and that seeking to do otherwise undermines prospects for securing long-term peace. We prove our commitment and our conviction day in and day out, as we have over the past 4 years at the U.N. The waiver will allow the administration to continue to wage that fight more intelligently and more successfully, and at the same time better protect U.S. interests across multilateral organizations—including halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons, defending intellectual property rights, and preventing and tracking potential pandemics.

Question. Elections in Zimbabwe are slated to occur on July 31, even though it is widely believed that that date is far too soon to accommodate free, fair, and credible elections.

- Many believe that the election results have already been determined due to a large-scale effort to intimidate voters in Zimbabwe which began with elections in 2008 and has gone on since. If this is the case, and Mugabe pulls out a re-election, what role do you see the United Nations playing in the wake of those elections? What sort of cooperation—or opposition—would the United States have in the Security Council?
- Regardless of the elections, there will come a point when there is a transition to democratic governance in Zimbabwe. What role do you see the United Nations playing in Zimbabwe as that transition takes place?

Answer. The July 31 Presidential election is a critical moment for the people of Zimbabwe that will build on progress since the Global Political Agreement was agreed in 2008. Zimbabwe's economy has begun to recover from devastating economic mismanagement and hyperinflation, and the people of Zimbabwe peacefully approved a new constitution in March.

Nevertheless, the administration remains deeply concerned about the lack of transparency in preparations for the upcoming Presidential elections, as well as continued partisan behavior by state security institutions and the technical and the logistical issues hampering the administration of a credible and transparent election. The administration is troubled by reports of targeted harassment against civil society groups and other individuals in the weeks leading up to the elections and has stressed that civil society organizations, independent media, political parties, and regular citizens in Zimbabwe must be afforded the right to operate without harassment, detention, and intimidation.

To date, the United Nations has implemented humanitarian aid programs for children and women, economic growth and empowerment projects, and social service expansion programming. While these efforts must be commended, it is worthwhile for the United Nations to explore and encourage opportunities to expand their programmatic footprint in Zimbabwe.

At present, the United Nations supports the continued efforts by the South African Development Community (SADC) to encourage all parties in Zimbabwe to work together in completing the critical reforms outlined in the Global Political Agreement (GPA), SADC electoral roadmap, and Zimbabwe's new constitution, including media, security sector, and other reforms. Regardless of the outcome of the elections, the U.N. Country Team in Zimbabwe must continue to provide the high level of humanitarian and development aid assistance that it offers despite operating in a difficult environment.

As it has shown through critical ongoing support to democratic transitions from authoritarian regimes in countries such as Tunisia, Yemen, Libya and Iraq, the United Nations could play a constructive role in supporting a democratic transition in Zimbabwe. Depending on the particular circumstances and dynamics of such a transition, the United Nations has an array of expertise that it could provide to a transition in Zimbabwe, including electoral assistance, mediation among stakeholders as well as support for national reconciliation and transitional justice processes, strengthening human rights, and providing humanitarian aid. The U.N. could also provide political support to the efforts of Zimbabweans, the Southern African Development Community, and other international partners to promote long-term peace and development. I would strongly advocate for the U.N. to utilize all its tools and capabilities, as appropriate, to support a peaceful democratic transition for the people of Zimbabwe.

RESPONSES OF SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR TOM UDALL

Question. I have been increasingly concerned by the administration's attempts to circumvent the Congress and arm Syrian rebels, whom we know little about. I am especially concerned about plans to arm rebels with heavier weapons. From what we know, the motivation of rebels is diverse, ranging from individuals who truly want a free and secular society, to those who are intent on establishing an intolerant theocracy and who are allied or sympathetic with al-Qaeda. Some of these elements were reportedly active in Iraq attacking U.S. and coalition forces.

I believe that until we know more about the rebels, until we can trust the Syrian opposition to control their weapons, the Congress should not allow the President to have the authority to transfer heavy weapons. There is too high of a chance that those weapons could be used against the United States or our friends and allies.

- At the United Nations, will you actively work to pursue a diplomatic solution to the conflict or will you pursue arming of Syrian rebels?
- You supported air strikes in Libya. The situation, and the players in Syria are much different, do you or the President plan on advocating for an international military response to the situation in Syria as some on this committee have called for?

Answer. Thank you for your question. I share the concern expressed by the administration and by so many members of this committee regarding the ongoing crisis in Syria, and the brutal atrocities committed by Bashar al-Assad's forces against the Syrian people in a conflict that has left more than 100,000 Syrians dead and has destabilized the broader region. As I said in my testimony, Syria is one of the most critical issues facing us today, and one of the most devastating cases of mass atrocity that I have ever seen. I also share your assessment of the rebels and agree that the presence of those allied or sympathetic with al-Qaeda has further complicated a complex situation that has brought such horrible suffering to the Syrian people.

The President has put in place a multifaceted approach designed, with our international partners, to strengthen moderate elements of the opposition and bring about the too-long-awaited political transition to democracy. In addition to imposing crippling sanctions against the Assad regime, we have contributed nearly a billion dollars' worth of humanitarian aid, and critical nonlethal assistance to strengthen opposition capabilities and institutions. In addition, as you mention, the administration announced recently that—in response to Assad's chemical weapons use—we would provide additional forms of support to vetted units in the opposition military. We have encouraged the opposition, which has been woefully fractured, to unite so the people in Syria view them as a viable alternative. Nobody in the administration is satisfied with the conditions on the ground in Syria.

To your question, our priority remains achieving a political settlement that achieves Assad's departure and that leads to a transitional governing body with full Executive power. If confirmed, I will work with other members of the administration to continue to explore the prospects of convening, under the U.N.'s auspices and working with our partners as well as Russia, diplomatic negotiations to achieve this political transition. The administration and I agree that it is a top priority to prevent the emergence of terrorist safe havens in Syria that al-Qaeda and other extremists could exploit to threaten the United States and our interests.

As you know, the U.N. Security Council should be supporting these efforts at achieving a political solution. But Russia's obstruction has consistently prevented the Council from taking appropriate action to address the Syria crisis. This is a disgrace that history will judge harshly. The administration has worked through other parts of the U.N. system to galvanize international support for political transition. The United States has backed resolutions in the U.N. General Assembly that have highlighted the regime's overwhelming political isolation; for the most recent resolution in May, Syria could only muster 11 other countries in opposition. The administration also has worked through the U.N. Human Rights Council to promote accountability for the atrocities the regime has committed, establishing a commission of inquiry to investigate and document these violations. And the administration has supported and provided information to the U.N.'s chemical weapons investigation team as they work to gain access to the sites where we and others believe Assad has used chemical weapons against the Syrian people.

Separate from the actions of these U.N. bodies comprised of member states, U.N. officials have also shown important leadership during this crisis. U.N. Secretary General Ban and other senior U.N. officials have been vocal and consistent in demanding an end to atrocities and attacks on civilians. And in the field, U.N. humanitarian workers put their own lives at risk every day to bring assistance to more than 1.8 million Syrian refugees, and nearly 7 million more Syrians displaced within the country. The United States remains by far the largest donor to the U.N.'s humanitarian appeal for Syria.

Recognizing your very legitimate concerns about some of those who comprise the opposition, the administration's view is that the political solution we all seek does not appear to be immediately within reach. In providing direct assistance to the Syrian Military Council the administration is working with General Idris and the SMC to channel U.S. assistance to moderate, vetted recipients. The assistance is designed to strengthen the effectiveness of the opposition, as it resists continued vicious assaults from the regime, and to help coordinate the provision of assistance from U.S. partners and allies, from where we would seek to reduce the risk that materiel the opposition is receiving from others falls into the wrong hands. The administration has encouraged moderate opposition partners to distance themselves from extremists who are also fighting against the Assad regime, and minimized the risk of U.S. assistance being diverted. The administration also has sanctioned the anti-Assad extremist group and al-Qaeda-affiliated al-Nusra Front, both under U.S. domestic sanctions and through our support for the sanctions the U.N. Security Council adopted in June.

The administration has said repeatedly that the President continues to review all options for addressing the crisis in Syria, as the situation changes on the ground. If confirmed, it will be my responsibility to contribute to that constant assessment and review of the situation and potential options for U.S. policy, given the truly outrageous situation on the ground in Syria. If confirmed, I will work with my colleagues to explore, evaluate, and reevaluate every means we might use to bring about the day when the Syrian people can be rid of Assad's tyranny, and begin to rebuild their country with a government that respects their rights and gives them the opportunity for a better future.

Question. New Mexico and other Western States have begun to experience the impact of climate change. NASA, the United Nations, our national labs, and the over-

whelming majority of scientists have noted . . . our climate is changing. And in some areas, such as the arid West, this is contributing to record temperatures, a drought that is crippling agriculture, and catastrophic wildfires. While climate change is a global problem, it is also a local problem that is hitting the Western United States hard.

- Will we have your commitment to continue to address the issue of climate change in the United Nations, and how do you intend to use your office to pursue the climate goals of the administration and to work with other nations ahead of the COP20 summit which will be held next December in Peru?
- Would you agree that much more can be done internationally to address climate change prevention and mitigation?

Answer. If confirmed, I will continue the strong commitment of the Obama administration to engage on climate change. Addressing climate change at home and abroad is a priority for President Obama and for Secretary Kerry, and the administration is working actively across the U.N. system and through complementary initiatives to address this global challenge. This includes continued active engagement in the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to reduce emissions. The administration is already working closely with the hosts of UNFCCC COP19 (Poland), COP20 (Peru), and COP21 (France) to ensure that those meetings are successful and continue to move the issue forward.

This is a global challenge that requires a global solution. In addition taking leadership at home to reduce our own greenhouse gas pollution, the United States has been working internationally to craft an approach in which all countries reduce emissions. This includes not only negotiations around the UNFCCC but also work to reduce emissions in concrete and ambitious ways through the Major Economies Forum and the Climate and Clean Air Coalition, and greater bilateral cooperation with countries critical to solving this challenge. We have made great strides, but I agree that much work remains.

Question. This week the Panamanian Government held a ship bound from Cuba to North Korea due to the discovery of missiles and missile components hidden inside a sugar shipment. While many of us are still waiting for a full briefing on this seizure, I am first, grateful to the Panamanian authorities who made the seizure, and concerned about other attempts to circumspect U.N. Security Council resolutions and sanctions which prohibit countries from providing North Korea with advanced weaponry.

- I would like to know what your thoughts are regarding how the United States should address this situation, and what in your opinion, can be done to ensure that future shipments are not actually attempts to arm the North Koreans?

Answer. The administration has commended Panama for the recent actions it has taken to implement relevant U.N. Security Council resolutions with regard to the North Korean ship *Chong Chon Gang*. The United States will work closely with the Government of Panama, which has requested our assistance and the administration intends to provide assistance as best it can.

North Korea's nuclear, ballistic missile, and proliferation-related activities constitute a serious threat to international peace and security and undermine the global nonproliferation regime. Shipments of arms or related material to or from North Korea, and services related to such items, would violate U.N. Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874, as reaffirmed this year in Resolutions 2087 and 2094. These Security Council resolutions generally provide that all states shall prevent the direct or indirect transfer of weapons from their territory or by their nationals to North Korea and shall prohibit procurement of such weapons from North Korea.

Panama has informed the U.N. Security Council DPRK Sanctions Committee of the incident and has invited the Panel of Experts, which assists the United Nations Security Council North Korea Sanctions Committee, to conduct an investigation.

Panama's actions regarding the Sanctions Committee as well as requesting the involvement of the Panel of Experts will help clarify the involvement of the Government of Cuba with this issue. The administration hopes that the Sanctions Committee, with the support of the Panel of Experts, will investigate this case thoroughly, identify parties responsible and recommend actions to be taken in response. The administration notes that the Sanctions Committee has the ability to impose targeted sanctions (asset freeze/travel ban) on individuals and entities found to have contributed to prohibited activities or to evasion of the sanctions.

The administration will look at all possibilities regarding appropriate actions once the Committee and Panel complete their work. The administration will keep you and your staff informed of progress and would welcome your recommendations on next steps.

The United States will continue to work closely with all U.N. member states to ensure the full and transparent implementation of U.N. Security Council resolutions concerning North Korea. This will make it harder for North Korea to acquire the technology, know-how, and funds to develop its nuclear and ballistic missile programs, which the international community has repeatedly condemned. The administration will likewise continue to exercise our national authorities, where and when appropriate, to impede Pyongyang's nuclear, ballistic missile, and proliferation-related activities.

Question. I was greatly disappointed that the Senate did not ratify the U.N. Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities as well as the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea. I believe that both of these treaties advance U.S. interests and ideals, and also work to create a more just and equitable world.

- In light of our failure to ratify these important treaties, how will you work to ensure that U.S. interests are represented in these bodies?

Answer. The administration continues to work with a bipartisan Senate coalition, disability groups, veterans groups, and others in pursuit of ratification of the Disabilities Convention. The administration understands that some Senators have concerns about the treaty, and we are working with Democratic and Republican Senate sponsors to address those concerns, so that the United States is in a position to join the over 130 countries that are party to the Disabilities Treaty. We are eager to establish a foundation for more impactful leadership on these issues—leadership designed to ensure that protections for persons with disabilities does not end at the Nation's shores.

In advance of progress on the treaty, U.S. diplomats continue to encourage governments to eliminate discrimination on the basis of disability and to develop and enforce laws and policies to protect the rights of persons with disabilities. Ratification of the Disabilities Treaty will ultimately make a difference to the millions of disabled Americans, including our wounded warriors, who often face severe challenges and indignities when abroad.

Accession to the Law of the Sea Convention also remains a priority for this administration. As a non-Party, the United States must rely on customary international law for the navigational rights and freedoms reflected in the convention.

U.S. accession to the Law of the Sea Convention will protect and advance a broad range of U.S. economic and national security interests, will secure as treaty law highly favorable provisions that guarantee our military and commercial vessels worldwide navigational rights, and will accord to the United States the ability to assert expansive sovereign rights over offshore resources, including oil and gas on the Continental Shelf beyond 200 nautical miles from shore.

RESPONSES OF SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR RAND PAUL

Question. As you know, I have been an outspoken critic of the administration's perceived unwillingness to leverage our aid to Pakistan for the release of Dr. Shakil Afridi. During the July 16, 2013, meeting in my office, you stated that it was your assumption that the administration was working behind the scenes to secure his release.

- What do you think is holding up the release of Shakil Afridi? In your estimation, will his continued incarceration have a chilling effect on our ability to access human intelligence around the world? If confirmed, will you work with me to advocate for the freedom of Dr. Afridi?

Answer. Dr. Afridi remains in prison awaiting a hearing on his appeal. The administration continues to raise Dr. Afridi's case with the Government of Pakistan and have repeatedly said he should be released. If confirmed as Ambassador to the United Nations, I will eagerly join these efforts. The administration believes that the impact of Dr. Afridi's case on intelligence activities is unclear. The administration has also made clear to Pakistan that Dr. Afridi's prosecution and conviction sends the wrong message about the importance of our shared interests and the value of our cooperation.

Question. As you may know, I have been a critic of the United Nations, both because I feel it jeopardizes our sovereignty, but also because it is an organization rife with corruption. If confirmed, please outline specific steps you will take to improve the performance of the United Nations.

Answer. The United Nations is a valuable partner for advancing U.S. interests, but as I said in my testimony, there is much we need to do to improve its effective-

ness and performance and to hold Secretariat staff accountable. Therefore, the United States has been actively working to make the U.N. a more effective and accountable organization that is capable of addressing complex global challenges. If confirmed, I will continue the administration's push for strong management, sound budgeting, increased accountability, and greater transparency.

As a result of intense U.S. engagement and leadership across administrations the U.N. has adopted reforms to promote accountability, including: the establishment of the Office of Internal Oversight Services, the U.N. Independent Audit Advisory Committee, and the U.N. Ethics Office; advancement in U.N. transparency by making the Office of Internal Oversight Services' internal audit reports publicly available; reforms to the current U.N. air travel policy that put in place common sense restrictions on use of business class travel and abolishment of several unnecessary and costly reimbursement practices; and improvements to U.N. human resources policies, including a pay freeze and right-sizing exercise pending the outcome of comprehensive reviews of staff needs and compensation and enhancements to performance management and management accountability.

In addition, the State Department's U.N. Transparency and Accountability Initiative (UNTAI) allows the United States to verify that concrete improvements in management and accountability are being made in the U.N. system.

If confirmed, I will continue to work diligently across the U.N. system with other likeminded member states to ensure that U.S. tax dollars are well spent and that the U.N. lives up to both its ideals and potential. As I said in my testimony, improving the U.N.'s effectiveness and efficiency is a priority. "In these difficult budget times, when the American people are facing tough cuts and scrutinizing every expense, the United Nations must do the same. This means eliminating waste and improving accounting and internal management. This means strengthening whistleblower protections and ending any tolerance for corruption. It means getting other countries to pay their fair share. And it means closing down those missions and programs that no longer make sense. As both the U.N.'s principal founding member and its largest contributor, the United States has the right and the duty to insist on reform. I will aggressively pursue this cause."

On peacekeeping, we must continue to closely review mandates to ensure that the missions have the means to accomplish their assigned tasks. Peacekeeping is not immune from the need to do more with less, and when a mission has outlived its usefulness it should close. To drive down the cost of peacekeeping, we should continue to eliminate redundant back-office operations, continue moving to longer 12-month deployments, and strengthen oversight of peacekeeping operations to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

If confirmed, I will continue to work with the United Nations and member states to strengthen the U.N.'s response to sexual exploitation and abuse. I view pressing for ending impunity for U.N. personnel as particularly important, as well as taking the steps needed to ensure that the U.N.'s database can effectively prevent previous offenders from serving again in the U.N. system, in any capacity.

The United States remains concerned that countries with poor human rights records continue to be elected to seats on the Human Rights Council. The United States actively seeks to positively influence the elections both by encouraging countries with strong human rights records to seek seats and by encouraging competitive elections for the HRC. The United States has also worked behind the scenes with other countries to oppose the election of some of the worst human rights violators to the Human Rights Council and other important global bodies and will continue to do so. A relentless diplomatic campaign by the United States helped keep Syria, Iran, and Sudan from becoming members in the recent past. We agree it should not take this kind of effort to keep countries in regional blocs from voting for bad actors. But we pledge to fight aggressively such disturbing campaigns which undermine the Council and the broader human rights agenda.

RESPONSES OF SAMANTHA POWER TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED
BY SENATOR JOHN BARRASSO

Question. During your testimony before the committee, you expressed your support for transparency of U.S. funding to the United Nations.

- What is the total annual U.S. contribution to the United Nations from all U.S. agencies, including in kind support?

Answer. The total amount of U.S. assessed and voluntary contributions to the United Nations System in 2012 were approximately \$6.7 billion. These funds support a wide array of activities such as U.N. peacekeeping and special political missions, nonproliferation activities by the International Atomic Energy Agency, health

programs provided by the World Health Organization, food aid provided by the World Food Programme, and humanitarian assistance provided by the U.N. Offices of the High Commissioner for Refugees and the Coordinator for Humanitarian Affairs. Many of these programs and activities are described in detail in the Department's annual congressional budget justifications.

Question. What percentage of the U.N. budget is directed to the day-to-day administrative and personnel costs?

Answer. The United States and other major contributors to the United Nations have been working very hard to limit growth in the U.N. regular budget. The administration has been successful in keeping the 2012–2013 budget level below the level of the 2010–2011 budget, marking only the second time in 50 years that the U.N. regular budget decreased from the previous biennium.

Approximately 75 percent of the U.N. regular budget goes to personnel costs, including salaries and benefits. The United Nations employs a wide array of personnel that work in the areas of peace and security, human rights, humanitarian assistance, development, the environment, and drug control and crime prevention. However, as the United Nations becomes a target and continues to operate in countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq, security costs must also be considered.

Rising U.N. personnel costs are a significant concern. The United States and other member states have been striving to rein in these costs, including through a 6-month pay freeze that the United States was instrumental in achieving last fall.

Question. How much has the budget of the United Nations grown over the past 10 years?

Answer. The U.N. regular budget has grown from \$3 billion in 2002–2003 to \$5.4 billion in 2012–2013. The primary drivers of the growth are increased personnel costs and the costs of new and expanded special political missions, particularly in Afghanistan and Iraq. The United States and other major contributors to the United Nations have been working very hard to limit growth in the U.N. regular budget, and have been successful thus far in keeping the 2012–2013 budget below the level of the 2010–2011 budget.

The limitation in growth up to this point was only possible because of U.S. efforts to ensure that the initial approved budget for 2012–2013 was \$5.15 billion, marking only the second time in 50 years that the U.N. regular budget decreased significantly from the previous biennium. The annual U.N. peacekeeping budgets has grown from \$2.6 billion in 2003–2004 to approximately \$7.3 billion for the U.N. peacekeeping fiscal year 2012–2013, with the number of U.N. peacekeepers deployed nearly tripling over that period. Many of the peacekeeping missions that the U.N. Security Council has authorized over the past decade have been larger and deployed to more dangerous and logistically demanding environments than before, as new missions were established in the Congo, Darfur, South Sudan, and Mali, and al-Qaeda has made no secret of its aim of targeting the U.N., successfully killing U.N. humanitarian workers and personnel in places like Afghanistan, Iraq, Nigeria, and elsewhere.

With this budget the United Nations is able to field more than 100,000 troops, police, and civilians in some of the most austere, dangerous, and demanding places on earth. If confirmed, I will continue to further U.S. efforts to improve the performance, efficiency, and accountability of U.N. operations through initiatives such as the Global Field Support Strategy and the reforms proposed by the Senior Advisory Group on peacekeeping issues, which have already yielded significant savings of \$560 million in the peacekeeping budget that help keep peacekeeping costs down.

Question. Do you support Congress and the American people receiving an annual report from the Office of Management and Budget listing the total U.S. contributions to the United Nations from the State Department as well as all other U.S. departments and agencies?

Answer. Yes.

Question. I would like to follow up on my questions regarding the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. You testified that you do not support a United Nations gun registry that includes law abiding U.S. citizens. There has been speculation that President Obama will sign onto the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty in the near future.

- As you familiarize yourself with the U.N. Arms Trade Treaty over the weekend, can you please describe in detail how the United States will comply with Articles 12 and 13?

Answer. The Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) addresses international trade in conventional arms. It does not require or impose controls on domestic transfers of conventional arms, or the rights of U.S. citizens to possess firearms. Nothing in the treaty

violates or is inconsistent with the rights of U.S. citizens including those conferred by the second amendment. In fact, the treaty includes an explicit reaffirmation of "the sovereign right of any State to regulate and control conventional arms exclusively within its territory, pursuant to its own legal or constitutional system." The ATT does not require or in any way reference the creation of a gun registry of any kind, U.N. or domestic.

As Secretary Kerry said on June 3 when the treaty was opened for signature, the United States fully supports the ATT and looks forward to signing it as soon as the remaining translation issues have been satisfactorily resolved. The United States looks forward to all countries having and implementing effective national systems to control the international transfer of conventional arms, as the United States does already. Progress in other countries in raising their standards nearer to the level we already set would advance U.S. and global security by curbing illicit arms transfers and potentially reducing the access of wrong-doers to the arms that they employ to commit gross violations of human rights.

U.S. recordkeeping practices with respect to international transfers of conventional arms are already consistent with Article 12 of the treaty. Article 13 requires States Parties to report on measures undertaken to implement their obligations under the treaty as well as an annual report concerning the authorized or actual exports and imports of conventional arms covered under the treaty. The administration notes that the reporting requirement does not address purely domestic transactions in any way.

If the United States were to become a Party to the treaty, the first reporting requirement could be fulfilled by providing a summary of existing U.S. export and import controls, along with references to existing U.S. law and regulations, such as the Arms Export Control Act. For the annual report, the United States already reports much of this information to the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms, the Wassenaar Arrangement, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and to Congress.

Question. What is your evaluation of the effectiveness of the U.N. Security Council in addressing the situations in Iran and Syria?

Answer. On Iran, the United States led a global coalition to create the toughest, most comprehensive international sanctions on the Iranian regime, and effective multilateral diplomacy at the U.N. Security Council has been critical to this effort. U.S. diplomacy led to the adoption of four rounds of U.N. Security Council sanctions on Iran since 2006, underscoring international consensus against its acquisition of a nuclear weapon and demanding Iran address international concerns over the nature of its nuclear program. U.N. Security Council sanctions on Iran have impeded Iran's ability to procure items necessary to expand its nuclear program, and have provided the international community with the basis to counter Iran's illicit activities, including restricting its access to technology and funding for its nuclear and ballistic missile programs. As the President has said repeatedly, the administration is committed to preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and we will continue working with all of our partners at the United Nations and more broadly to demand that Iran fulfill its international obligations. Because Iran has not halted its pursuit of a nuclear weapon, we cannot be satisfied, and, if confirmed, we will look for additional ways to increase the pressure on Iran to halt its activities in violation of UNSC resolutions.

Russia's obstruction has consistently prevented the Council from taking appropriate action to address the Syria crisis. This is a disgrace that history will judge harshly. The administration has worked through other parts of the U.N. system to galvanize international support for a political solution to the crisis in Syria. The United States has backed resolutions in the U.N. General Assembly that have highlighted the regime's overwhelming political isolation; for the most recent resolution in May, Syria could only muster 11 other countries in opposition. The administration also has worked through the U.N. Human Rights Council to promote accountability for the atrocities the regime has committed, establishing a commission of inquiry to investigate and document these violations. And the administration has supported and provided information to the U.N.'s chemical weapons investigation team as they work to gain access to the sites where we and others believe Assad has used chemical weapons against the Syrian people.

Separate from the actions of these U.N. bodies comprised of member states, U.N. officials have also shown important leadership during this crisis. U.N. Secretary General Ban and other senior U.N. officials have been vocal and consistent in demanding an end to atrocities and attacks on civilians. And in the field, U.N. humanitarian workers put their own lives at risk every day to bring assistance to more than 1.8 million Syrian refugees, and nearly 7 million Syrians more displaced

within the country. The United States remains by far the largest donor to the U.N.'s humanitarian appeal for Syria.

Question. What type of cooperation does the United States currently expect from Russia at the U.N. Security Council?

Answer. Both at the U.N. Security Council and more broadly, the administration has cooperated with Russia where we can advance our mutual interests, engaged Russia in a frank discussion of our policy differences, and firmly stood by our principles, our partners, and our allies. The United States has worked with Russia and other members of the Security Council on several issues of paramount concern to the United States, including imposing strong sanctions on both Iran and North Korea, building robust peacekeeping missions in the Sahel and Central Africa, and helping strengthen fragile states from Afghanistan to Somalia.

However, as I stated in my testimony, we need to be clear-eyed about the prospects for cooperation with Russia on Syria. The administration believes that Russia and the United States should share an interest in preventing the further growth of extremism in Syria. The administration believes that Russia and the United States should share an interest in preventing chemical weapons use. And we believe Russia should share the desire to achieve a political settlement so that state institutions can be preserved and state failure prevented. However, the three vetoes Russia has cast on draft resolutions aimed at addressing the crisis in Syria does not bode well for Russia's willingness to use the Security Council to maintain international peace and security in Syria and the broader region.

Question. How do you plan on addressing Russia's continued insistence on supplying arms to the Assad regime?

Answer. The administration has made it absolutely clear that we oppose Russian arms transfers to the regime. We have also sought to enlist other countries in delivering this message. Russia's continued support to the Assad regime—military and otherwise—is prolonging the conflict and the suffering of the Syrian people. Since the conflict in Syria began, the administration has advocated publicly and privately against Russian support to the Syrian regime, including arms transfers, and ongoing Russian obstruction of Security Council action.

At the same time, the administration recognizes that it is in everyone's interest that Russia uses its influence to help bring the regime to the negotiating table in a serious manner. Despite grave differences with Russia concerning this conflict, the administration continues to stress to the Russians that the transition to a post-Assad future is inevitable, and that the United States and Russia share an interest in a stable and inclusive Syria that neither harbors extremists and terrorists nor uses or proliferates chemical weapons.

Question. I am very concerned that the Obama administration's budget request provides \$77.8 million for the U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Last year, the United States terminated its funding for UNESCO as a result of the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) being admitted as a full member. The administration's budget proposal shows the Palestinians that the United States is not serious about our concerns with their disregard for the peace process and unilaterally seeking a change in status through the United Nations. The United States needs to continue to send the message that we will not fund international institutions that make these types of decisions.

- Do you unequivocally oppose the Palestinians' efforts to circumvent the peace process and seek state recognition and membership in the United Nations?

Answer. There are no short cuts to Palestinian statehood, and I and other U.S. officials have long made that clear. As I said in my testimony on July 17, the administration has been absolutely clear that it will continue to oppose firmly any and all unilateral actions in international bodies or treaties that circumvent or prejudice the very outcomes that can only be negotiated, including Palestinian statehood. If confirmed, I will strongly support this effort, and I will continue to stand up to any effort that seeks to delegitimize Israel or undermine its security.

The administration will continue to stress, both with the parties and with international partners, that the only path for the Palestinians to realize their aspiration of statehood is through direct negotiations, and that Palestinian efforts to pursue endorsements of statehood claims through the U.N. system outside of a negotiated settlement are counterproductive. The administration remains vigilant on this matter and works in close coordination with the Israeli Government and our other international partners to firmly oppose one-sided action in international fora and to reinforce the importance of resumed direct negotiations between the parties as the only

way to address their differences and achieve lasting peace. There is simply no substitute for the difficult give and take of direct negotiations.

Congress has passed legislation that provides the United States with additional tools that are better suited for the purposes of deterrence than the contribution cutoff mechanism. Legislation passed in the aftermath of the Palestinians' successful UNESCO bid, if triggered, would place limits on U.S. economic support to the Palestinian Authority and would require the closure of the Palestinians' Washington, DC, office if they obtain membership as a state in a U.N. specialized agency in the future. These requirements are, appropriately, directed at the Palestinians in the event they engage in conduct that we are seeking to discourage. By contrast, the implications of the contribution cutoff will be most felt by the United States and the partners whose interests we defend across the spectrum of the U.N. system.

Question. How would restoring funding to UNESCO send that message to the Palestinians?

Answer. We agree with the critical importance of sending the message to the Palestinians that there are no shortcuts to statehood and that we will contest any effort to delegitimize Israel in the international system. The administration has requested a waiver to allow the President to continue to provide contributions to U.N. specialized agencies when he determines it is in the national interest. The waiver would allow the United States to maintain our vote and influence within the United Nations and its specialized agencies. This would, remove from the Palestinians or their allies any ability to force a contribution cutoff and diminish our influence within these agencies, which, given our vocal leadership would present spoilers with a double victory.

Without a national interest waiver the administration's ability to conduct multilateral diplomacy and pursue U.S. objectives will be eroded, and the United States standing and position in critical U.N. agencies will be harmed. As a result, the United States ability to defend Israel from unfair and biased attacks in the United Nations will also be greatly damaged.

Congress has passed legislation that provides the United States with additional tools that are better suited for the purposes of deterrence than the contribution cutoff mechanism. Legislation passed in the aftermath of the Palestinians' successful UNESCO bid, if triggered, would place limits on U.S. economic support to the Palestinian Authority and would require the closure of the Palestinians' Washington, DC, office if they obtain membership as a state in a U.N. specialized agency in the future. These requirements are, appropriately, directed at the Palestinians in the event they engage in conduct that we are seeking to discourage. By contrast, the implications of the contribution cutoff will be most felt by the United States and the partners whose interests we defend across the spectrum of the U.N. system.

The proposed waiver, if enacted, will not diminish the administration's commitment to supporting Israel and defending our interests at the United Nations. It will not alter the administration's conviction that Palestinian status issues can be appropriately resolved only on a bilateral basis in direct negotiations with the Israeli Government, and that seeking to do otherwise undermines prospects for securing long-term peace. We prove our commitment and our conviction day in and day out, as we have over the past 4 years at the United Nations. The waiver will allow the administration to continue to wage that fight more intelligently and more successfully, and at the same time better protect U.S. interests across multilateral organizations—including halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons, defending intellectual property rights, and preventing and tracking potential pandemics.

Question. The Palestinians continue to unilaterally circumvent the peace process by attempting to seek statehood recognition at the United Nations. In November, the United Nations General Assembly voted to allow the Palestinians to change their status. The best path to peace is through direct negotiations between the Israelis and the Palestinians—not through manipulations at the United Nations.

- What additional efforts do you recommend the United States take in order to persuade the Palestinians to cease their efforts to upgrade their status within the U.N. system?
- How can the United States build opposition among member states to these types of efforts?

Answer. If confirmed, just as I did as President Obama's U.N. adviser, I would take every opportunity to make clear the administration's position that one-sided actions in international fora will not advance the aspirations of the Palestinian people. The only path for the Palestinians to realize their aspiration of statehood is through direct negotiations, and Palestinian efforts to pursue endorsements of statehood claims through the U.N. system outside of a negotiated settlement are counter-

productive. We make the costs of unilateral action clear to the Palestinians and to those who have supported counterproductive unilateral action in the United Nations.

If confirmed, I will work tirelessly to oppose firmly unilateral actions in international bodies or treaties that circumvent or prejudice the very outcomes that can only be negotiated, including Palestinian statehood. If confirmed, I will also continue to stand up to every effort that seeks to delegitimize Israel or undermine its security. I will also build on this administration's extensive coordination with Israel and our outreach efforts to combat any further action by the Palestinians.

Congress has passed legislation that provides the United States with additional tools that are better suited for the purposes of deterrence than the contribution cutoff mechanism. Legislation passed in the aftermath of the Palestinians' successful UNESCO bid, if triggered, would place limits on U.S. economic support to the Palestinian Authority and would require the closure of the Palestinians' Washington, DC, office if they obtain membership as a state in a U.N. specialized agency in the future. These requirements are, appropriately, directed at the Palestinians in the event they engage in conduct that we are seeking to discourage. By contrast, the implications of the contribution cutoff will be most felt by the United States and the partners whose interests we defend across the spectrum of the U.N. system.

The message from the United States to the Palestinians and in capitals around the world is consistent. The only way to establish a Palestinian state and resolve all permanent-status issues is through the crucial work of direct negotiations between the parties. There is simply no substitute for the difficult give and take of direct negotiations.