Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and

Members of the Committee. I can’t thank you enough for your gracious

remarks. There is no greater honor than to represent the

United States, and I thank you very much for your kind remarks

at the beginning, and I hope we can end up that way, too.

This may, in fact, be my final time before

you; and I have to say I will miss these opportunities. We don’t always

agree, but the American people can always count on this

Committee to be forward looking and to approach important foreign

policy issues in a bipartisan spirit, and I am sure that those qualities

will be in evidence this morning as we talk about what I think

is a very crucial issue, the United States’ policy toward Russia.

Since the Cold War’s end, America has pursued two fundamental

goals with Russia. The first is to make the world safer through cooperation

on weapons of mass destruction and security in Europe,

and the second is to encourage Russia’s full transition to a free

market democracy. On both we have moved far in the right direction,

but it is not surprising, given Russia’s past, that neither goal

has been fully accomplished within the space of a single decade.

Our focus now is on how to achieve further gains; and through our

efforts on arms control, the United States and Russia have set the

stage for further reductions in our strategic nuclear arsenals to as

much as 80 percent below Cold War peaks.

Since 1992, our assistance has helped to deactivate more than

5,000 former Soviet nuclear warheads. We have also helped to

strengthen the security of nuclear weapons and materials at more

than a hundred sites and purchased more than 60 tons of highly

enriched uranium which could have been used by terrorist or outlaw

states to build nuclear weapons.

Throughout this period, fighting proliferation has been the top

priority in U.S. Russia relations, and we have made considerable

progress, but Russia’s overall record on nuclear and missile exports

remains mixed. We will continue to be frank with Russian leaders

in stating our expectations, and we will take appropriate actions

based on their response.

More broadly, our security cooperation in Europe and elsewhere

has proven steady despite periods of stress. Many predicted that

our differences with Russia would lead to disaster, first on NATO

enlargement and then on Bosnia and later on Kosovo. But today

the NATO Russia partnership is active, and the U.S. and Russian

troops are side by side in Bosnia and Kosovo.

These and other examples of cooperation contrast sharply with

the Cold War years, but here again problems remain. We believe

that the new and democratic Russia should support democratic

principles at home and abroad, and so we have objected strongly

to Russia’s support for the regimes in Baghdad and Belgrade. Russia

has an obligation to observe U.N. Security Council sanctions

against Iraq, and we look to Moscow to show its friendship to the

people of Yugoslavia by supporting the desire they have so clearly

expressed for new leadership and a place in Europe’s democratic

mainstream.

The United States is also engaged with Russia on economic matters,

where we have encouraged openness, reform and an all-out

fight against corruption. Compared to the financial crisis of 2 years

ago, the Russian economy is doing well. President Putin’s policies

have been aided by high oil prices and improved levels of domestic

investment. But the current recovery is fragile and built on a very

narrow base. Russia has not yet made a deep enough commitment

to reform, approved anti-money laundering legislation or initiated

a truly serious battle against corruption. As a result, foreign investors

remain wary, and Russia’s economic prospects are still in

doubt.

Mr. Chairman, I don’t know how many Members of this Committee

have visited both the old Soviet Union and the new Russia,

but I can assure you there is a startling contrast. In the old days,

Russians had no meaningful right to vote, worship, speak, travel

or advocate change. Now they vote regularly and speak freely; and,

with our help, they are beginning to develop the legal structures

required for a rule of law. Over the past 11 years more than 65,000

NGOs have come into being.

But in recent months the future of independent media has

emerged as a revealing test of President Putin’s attitude toward democracy.

Several incidents of media harassment have prompted

many to believe that a broad campaign is under way to intimidate
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or co-opt the media. President Putin has said a free press is the

key to the health of a society, and we obviously agree, but it will

be hard to take his statement seriously if Russia’s state-run national

gas monopoly, Gazprom, succeeds in its current effort to gain

control of the Nation’s largest independent TV network.

Experts agree that after the disruptions of the last decade there

is a widespread desire among the Russian people for leaders who

will create a stronger sense of order and direction within society.

As a result, order has become the big buzzword in Moscow; and

Russia’s new leaders are trying to instill a greater sense of it in

Russian society.

The big question is whether they have in mind order with a

small ‘‘o,’’ which is needed to make Russia function, or order with

a big ‘‘O,’’ which translates into autocracy. This is a fundamental

choice that only the Russians can make.

Their leadership is perhaps more instinctively pragmatic than

democratic, but it appears to understand that Russia cannot succeed

economically unless it establishes and maintains close ties

with the democratic West. Our job is to make clear that economic

integration and democratic development are not separable. If the

Kremlin wants one, it must proceed with the other. This makes

sense from our point of view and also from Russia’s, because most

Russians want to see order established in their society through the

full realization, not the repression, of democratic practices and

rights.

To support this aspiration, the Clinton-Gore Administration has

worked hard to develop relationships with Russians that extend far

beyond the leaders in Moscow. We have done this through our

meetings with local officials and entrepreneurs, through international

exchanges and our support for independent media, trade

unions, and the NGOs.

We have also shown support for Russian democracy by speaking

out against violations of human rights in, among other places,

Chechnya. Since the fighting began in Chechnya more than a year

ago, the United States has been consistent in calling for a political

solution to the conflict and impressing Russia to allow a credible

international presence to investigate abuses. Tragically, Russia still

has no apparent strategy for bringing this war to an end or for reassuring

the Chechen population about its future under Moscow’s

rule. Clearly,a new approach is warranted.

Mr. Chairman, I think both Democrats and Republicans from the

executive branch and on Capitol Hill can take pride in the steps

we have taken to help Russians build a democratic future. It

should not be surprising that neither our efforts nor those of Russia’s

strongest reformers have succeeded overnight. After all, communism

was a 7-decade forced march to a dead end; and no nation

went further down that road than Russia.

It is beyond our prerogative and power to determine Russia’s future,

but we can work together on a bipartisan basis to explore

every avenue for cooperation with Russia on the fundamental questions

of arms control, nonproliferation and regional security. We

can reach out to the people of Russia and help them strengthen

their democratic institutions from the ground up, and we can back

our words and our interests with resources so that the next Presi-
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dent and Secretary of State will have the funds they need to lead

not only to Russia but around the world.

Mr. Chairman, whether one serves as a Cabinet Secretary or as

a Member of Congress, we are all acutely aware that we only occupy

temporarily the chairs of responsibility in American government.

But we know as well that America’s responsibilities are permanent,

and we all do our best in the time allotted to serve well

our Nation and its people. As I have said, it has been my privilege

during the past 7 and three-quarter years to combine my service

to our great country with that of the Members of this Committee.

I listened to your statement very carefully, Mr. Chairman, and

to yours, Congressman Gejdenson, and I would like to say that I

am very glad to have an opportunity to talk about U.S.-Russia relations.

I didn’t come to thinking about U.S.-Russia relations when

I began to sit behind the sign. I have spent my entire adult life

studying Russia, the Soviet Union and then Russia again. I have

taught about it, I have thought about it, and I welcome the opportunity

to discuss it.

I hope that you would see from my statement that the Clinton

Gore Administration has not seen Russia through rose-colored

glasses. We have been very realistic, and we have dealt with something

that has never been dealt with before, of how you deal with

a former adversary that had an empire and help to manage the

devolution of that empire to not recreate an adversary.

I am very pleased to have the opportunity to answer your questions

on this subject.

Let me say there are certain facts about the

election that need to be known. Nearly 70 percent of eligible voters

participated. The election showed that basic democratic processes

and institutions are taking hold and that the Russians citizens are

comfortable about making their voices heard at a ballot box. The

OSCE called the election a massive expression of the will of the

Russian people, but they did cite concern over unbalanced media

coverage and pressure on the independent media.

What I think, and we have made this point and I just restated

it, is that, clearly, Putin did have advantages in terms of having

special access to the media. We have made that very clear, and we

have made the independence of the media very clear. Nobody is

going to believe that the Russian government is committed to

media freedom if, as I said, the independent TV is under government

control. And make no mistake, Gazprom ownership of TV is

government control. But I do think that we need to know that

Putin was the most popular candidate, and he did appeal to the

Russian people after a period of chaos.

I am not sure how much of this you want to hear, but when I

was a professor, I did a study of Russian society, and you could see

that what was going on there already in 1992 was a sense of disorientation

of the Russian people about how they were dealing with
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democracy. They had a sense about democracy and the free market,

but they had lived under a different system for 70 years. The intellectuals

were excited by democracy. The ordinary people were not

sure how to handle it. Putin in many ways by his ability to talk

about order within the chaos has appealed to the Russian people,

and so I do believe that he was elected fairly.

I think that the situation of information in

Russia is quite different than it was in the former Soviet Union

and that it is impossible these days to close down information

sources. There are a variety of information sources, both about

what is going on there and what is going on in the rest of the

world.

We have made very clear, and I will say it again, about the importance

of independent media. But I truly do think that the world

is watching what is going on in Russia, and there are vast amounts

of people who want to see democracy succeed. As I said, there are

the nongovernmental organizations at the local areas where reformers

are trying to change the system.

I do not see Russia as again being governed in the sinister way

that is described in that article. I think clearly there are problems,

but I believe that there are certain changes in Russia that are now

irreversible that we need to support and not see it again in this

kind of sinister way.

As I have said, the sanctions regime for

Iraq has held longer than any in the history of these kinds of regimes,

10 years. There have been lots of discussions. When I was

permanent representative, I was very much a part of them; and I

now obviously give instructions on how we deal with the issue.

What is interesting is that, no matter the discussion about

whether the sanctions are fair and whether the Iraqi people are

suffering, all members of the Security Council, including the Russians,

agree that Resolution 1284 is the guiding resolution. We are

not happy about the fact that these flights are, we believe, not

being dealt with in the way that we would through the Sanctions

Committee, and we wish that the Russians would take a position

that is closer to ours. But you do need to remember that every-
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body—the Russians, the French and others who may disagree—is

saying that Resolution 1284 is a valid resolution.

This is a subject of discussion at all times

and at all levels. We have made our concern very clear. We have

sanctioned the various entities that have been involved, and it is

a regular part of our dialogue with the Russians. They know about

our concern on it. I think we are making progress, but it is an area

of concern. President Clinton has talked to President Putin. I have

talked to the foreign minister, and across the board it is a matter

of discussion.

This is an intelligence issue, and I would

prefer to discuss it in a different venue.

If I might comment on your opening or

what you said at the beginning before you asked the questions, I
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think that I cannot say often enough that we cannot recreate the

enemy. If we do that, we do it at our own peril.

I taught a course—and I won’t take 50 minutes to answer this

question—on U.S.-Soviet relations from the Revolution on. Both

countries missed huge opportunities to have a different relationship.

We are at a crucial turning point. If we see everything in red

terms, we are in trouble. It is much more complicated than that.

I am very discouraged by some of the comments already made, because

I think we are going down the wrong path if we see everything

as going down a black hole there.

We understand the information issue; and to go back on something

that the Chairman said, we have funded the creation of over

80 public-access Internet sites because we agree that access to information

is important. And it is going on. It is not perfect. We

have problems with the media.

As far as Belarus is concerned, I think we are very concerned

about what Lukashenko has done to dismantle democracy. He has

violated the constitution, he has disbanded the legitimate parliament,

and he has been really implicated in the disappearance of

some prominent opposition members. Many Russians remain skeptical

about Lukashenko’s motives, despite the fact that some of

them would like to see this unified approach of Belarus and Russia,

but many members of the government and the Russian Duma have

expressed concern about the cost of this unification for the Russian

economy.

We have worked very hard in Moscow and with our allies to

make sure that we do not support what the Lukashenko regime

has been doing, and we are not planning and have asked them not

to send observers to the fall parliamentary election, which will be

neither free nor fair. There is no difference in your view of Belarus

and ours.

As far as the Murmansk issue, I will have to get you a more complete

answer on what we are doing with that.

In many ways, it is unfortunate that I am

here answering questions on a subject that I know too much about.

It is very hard to limit, especially when you have asked such a

broad and interesting question.

I think that the relationship between the United States and the

Soviet Union, now Russia, over this century have been extremely

complicated in many ways, but simpler for the period of the Cold

War because we understood that they were the enemy and we went

at it in a very systematic and careful way.

Since the end of Cold War, I believe there was an immediate—

immediately after it, a tremendous amount of euphoria about what

it was possible to do with Russia and Eastern and Central Europe;

and to some extent all of us were a part of it. I found again this

survey that I did in 1992, which was also in Central and Eastern

Europe and Russia, in some ways a cold shower even then, because

it showed how difficult it is for countries that had been under this

kind of a system to all of a sudden be able to enjoy the fruits of

openness and democracy and a free market system.

One of the things I always say about the free market system in

Russia, they all said they were for it; and it was like a personality

test. On the first page, you ask, are you an extrovert; and you say

yes. And on the third page, you ask, do you like people; and you

say no. There is some problem.

So they were all for the free market system, but when you began

to talk about do you believe in profit and banks and mortgages,

whatever indicators there are, they didn’t agree with that. So there

was a lot to learn, and I think many people probably didn’t get the

profoundness of the change that was necessary.

I think that we have done a lot to identify with the ordinary people.

About a third of our assistance goes to local government and

NGOs and dealing at the local level.

If you believe, as we did and I believe many of you do, that the

nuclear threat is a very large one, then our threat reduction, which

is the large part of our program, you have to deal with the central

government. It isn’t a mayor in some local area that is in charge

of nuclear weapons, and that is the major problem that we have.
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I believe we have identified very carefully with the local people.

We deal with the elected officials, and I think you can’t expect anything

else.

I also, having been an academic myself, I can understand academic

rivalry, and some of the quotes come from people who have

a certain sense of rivalry.

Let me, first of all, talk about the relationship

that the Russians think that they have with the United States

and the point that you made so clearly about what they expected

between 1989 and 1993.

Again, and I refer to this survey that I did, these were focus

groups and also a huge survey. Ordinary Russians believed that

the United States would do something like the Marshall Plan. They

expected massive assistance, and they did see that all of a sudden

they had the opportunity to say that and they were embarrassed

by what the Soviet Union had done, and they had this feeling that

they had a new opportunity.

There clearly was no Marshall Plan, or even sums of money that

come anywhere near. We have, thanks to all of you, been able to

rename the State Department the Truman Building, which allowed

us to go back and look at what the resource base was. In today’s

dollars, it was $100 billion that the State Department had at that

time for our policies, and now it is one penny out of every Federal

dollar. It is ridiculous.

I have to tell you that the most embarrassing thing is that this—

the richest and the most powerful country in the world spends one

penny out of every Federal dollar on its diplomacy. I fully support

the defense budget, but our diplomats and our diplomacy are the

first line of defense, and I think people need to understand that we

can’t do it. We can’t be the leaders of the world with the kind of

budget slashes that are in Congress now—$2 billion below what we
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even asked. It is the most outrageous thing, and I hope that can

be rectified.

As far as the exchanges, I think that we really want to—that is

a hugely successful program, and we would like to see increases in

that. Because that is how you really can make a difference. I appreciate

your support on that.

Now, in terms of this Administration, Congressman Leach said

that we weren’t dealing enough with other levels of government or

ordinary people. Through the Gore Commission and all of his various

partners in that, that is the way that we have managed to get

into kind of the interstices of the government. There are subgroups

and subcabinet groups, and they are working on every conceivable

issue to do with U.S.-Russia relations on environment, on nuclear

issues, scientific exchanges, across the board. I think it is a remarkable

way to do business. It is the way that you get into the

lower levels and layers, and the Vice President and that commission

has taken a huge lead.

I really do think that saying that this Administration has not

paid attention to corruption and money laundering is ridiculous. It

is a major point of our discussions with the Russians and with everybody

else, frankly. We have pushed on that. We mention it in

every meeting. I have, the Vice President has, the President has,

and I really find that as a charge that has no credibility whatsoever.

I also think what really troubles me is that we are—I am sitting

here and saying that we have a realistic view of Russia. In my

opening remarks and in all of my remarks you have seen that I am

not bending over one way or the other. We are frank. I tell it like

it is. We have problems, but we cannot recreate the enemy.

Dr. Brzezinski and Alexander Haig came to

see me about Chechnya. I have the highest respect for both of

them, and I fully disagree with what they say. One of these days

I will be a ‘‘former,’’ and then I will see what I can say.

I really do think here that we have a problem. Chechnya is a

very serious issue, and I have made that very clear publicly and

privately to the Russians. I have told them that there is no military

solution to Chechnya and that they have a political way to

deal with it.

I led the charge at the OSCE in Istanbul to make sure that they

understood that they needed to have international access to

Chechnya and that we agree with some of the statements that

Mary Robinson, the Human Rights Commissioner at the U.N., has

made.

Every time I speak to Igor Ivanov, I raise the subject of

Chechnya and the wanton crimes that are taking place there

against the people. We have made that very clear, and we will continue

to do so.

I think Chechnya is a disaster for the Chechens and for the Russians.

It is a very serious issue, and it is one that is on our plate,

and we make no bones about it. I never said—I have to make clear,

I have never made any—I have never indicated that I have any
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room for what is going on in Chechnya, and I will continue to do

that.

Let me say—and Mr. Chairman, I would

really request that I have a chance to answer this—the issue of security

is a very important one and a difficult one in this age of

technology and changes in the end of the Cold War.

We have had some security lapses at the State Department

where a missing laptop and various aspects drew everybody’s attention

to the fact that we needed to make sure that our security

regulations, government-wide security regulations, are properly

carried out. I made clear that we had to have zero tolerance and

that all Foreign Service and Civil Service, everybody who works in

the State Department, would have to also be judged on how security

conscious they were and how they carried out their obligations.

Which is one of the reasons that we are asking also for the Under

Secretary for Security, because we have had buildings blow up and

a variety of issues that are security related that require a great

deal of attention.

I think there are many hard things that I have done while I have

been Secretary, but the Martin Indyk issue is among the most difficult.

The recommendation came to me from the professional security

people. My only opportunity in this was to overturn a recommendation.

Correct.

He has not lost his position as ambassador,

and I think that has been a misinterpretation. We are trying to figure

out what we can do within the requirements of the investigation.

Because I do think that Ambassador Indyk has been a valued

person in the peace process, and an already difficult process is

made more difficult.

But I need everybody’s understanding on the fact that the security

issues generally are very difficult in this day and age. We may

be overclassifying, all of us, throughout the government. I am trying

here to find a middle ground in terms of not having witchhunts

or being lax. These are hard decisions, and I think we cannot

have a culture of laxity as far as security issues are concerned.

Martin is a good friend and a highly respected colleague, and this

has been very difficult, but I do believe that we must have proper

security.

Congressman, we have been looking at the

material and have had your request, and I believe that we have

done it as expeditiously as possible.

You now have it.

Could I say absolutely, whatever the problem

has been in delivering documents, I can tell you that we have

done nothing to support the Taliban.

There is no Soviet Union. It is Russia.

We have given money. We have accounted.

We work on accounting the money that has been provided in a variety

of ways. I believe that we have done a very good job in terms

of giving and getting the money to the right places. Obviously, we

need to continue to track it very carefully.

I think there have been some questions that

we have tried to follow up. But I believe it is in our national interest

to be able to provide assistance to reduce the nuclear threat

and to help with the local government.

I have tried very hard through my tenure as Secretary of State,

as I said, I have had my partisan instincts surgically removed. I

may have to go see the surgeon again very quickly. But I do think

that we have to have some consistency here. Either we are not involved

with Russia and are letting the children die and not doing

enough and they hate us, or we are doing too much. I don’t get it.

. I respect the American taxpayers. To go

back to what Congressman Berman said, it is in U.S. national interests

to see where humanitarian horrors are happening, and I

hope that we never think that it is not, and the American taxpayers

support that.

As I understand it, they do not pose any

threat, and I really do think that we are watching various arms

transfers.

I am not going to say that everything in our dealings with Russia

is perfect. It is not. There are problems. We raise it with them.

There are questions. We will continue to ask questions. There is

corruption. We raise those questions all the time. But I think we

have to keep this in context as to what is going on in terms of our

trying to develop a relationship with a former adversary which

serves U.S. national interests.

Thank you.

Let me say that, in terms of North Korea,

it fits into something that I tried to say before, that there are certain

areas with which we will disagree with the Russians, where

our interests are not the same, and certain areas where we have

common interests. North Korea is one where we have a common interest.

We think that it is very important that the issue of missiles

and nuclear potential, there is something that needs to be dealt

with, and we have had a very cooperative relationship.

As far as the Balkans, as I said, the Russians are serving with

us in Kosovo and Bosnia. They are part of the contact group. We

have many discussions about it. We just had a meeting in New

York with the contact group in terms of how we move forward in,

hopefully, a post-Slobodan Milosevic era.

I spoke to Foreign Minister Ivanov yesterday about what is happening

in Belgrade. They are watching it very carefully, and I will

speak to him later this afternoon. I think that—and Foreign Minister

Vadreen is there today also. We are all watching very carefully,

and the Russians had a monitoring group there from the

Duma that had varied views, and they are I think formulating

their reaction.

I agree, and I appreciate very much that

comment. I will use it to good use later.

Thank you. I was very moved by the meeting

with Mr. Sylvester. I called Chancellor Schuessel as quickly as

I could get him. I had a conversation with him. I think it is a serious

issue that needs to have constant prodding, he said he would

relook at things, but I can’t give you a detailed report at this moment.

But I did call immediately, and I will stay with it as we also

look at a variety of cases like this. I think it is one of the very difficult

aspects of our societies these days. I was very moved by Mr.

Sylvester.

Thank you. Let me say the following:

First of all, as I stated in my remarks, we are concerned about

what is happening with the independent media. There is no question

about that, and we—there needs to be an independent media

armed within Russia, as in any country. And President Putin has

said that it is important. However, there cannot be government

control over it, and Gazprom ownership would indicate that.

But that does not mean that, one, we do not have access to other

information, nor that, in many cases, ordinary people don’t have access

to information. Because these days borders are porous, and we

have made Internet available. So there are any numbers of ways

that they now have huge amounts of information that they didn’t

have before. But we are concerned about the independent—the

issue of the need for independent media.

I do think, in some cases, things have gotten better, as you put

it, in terms of the economy. They have benefited from their oil revenue,

and there have been some beginnings of reform that we keep

pressing on.

My own estimation is not so much because Putin is a democrat

but because he is a pragmatist and he understands that certain reforms

have to be put in place if Russia is to be a great nation,

which the Russians and he want. He is a pragmatic person. There

is a lot of psychobabble about Putin, but I think that we need to

be able to analyze where he is going. How is he working within

Russia?

On the question of the nuclear issue, we have been involved in

START III discussions. We think that the Russians are going

through a variety of discussions and debates about their military.

I believe that they do want to cut their nuclear missiles that they

have. We think that it is a good idea for us to be involved in these

START III discussions.

On the question of Chechnya, we have absolutely not done the

things that you have suggested.

First of all, I think you have put your finger

on a very important issue as far as assistance generally is concerned.

During the Cold War, both camps gave foreign assistance

away to attract people. I think one of the reasons that we are having

trouble now in getting the right amount of moneys for foreign

assistance is that people need to see it in a way that it is in U.S.

national interest to have these countries develop economically and

with democratic governments and not just as a counter-communist

activity.

The Russians do maintain contact with some countries. I will

have to give you a more detailed answer as to with whom and how

much. I don’t think that they have given their budget a great deal

of assistance money.

They continue to maintain relationships with Cuba, though they

have had very difficult ones in terms of what Cuba owes them in

terms of debt.

But I think that basically their approach at the moment is that

they are supporting peacekeeping operations, as we try to, in various

countries, but the whole approach to this is entirely different.

But I have to get you more specific numbers as to what they are

doing.

Let me say I am sorry that you feel that

you have not received proper answers on the Lourdes facility.

These are issues that I can’t discuss in public, but if you wish to

have a further briefing we can arrange that.

Let me just say that, on the debt issue, that I know this has been

an issue which has been particularly controversial on the Hill, and

particularly within this Committee. I think that it is very important

to know that, as the Russian financial situation has improved,

in part due to the high oil prices, we have heard much less about

the need for debt relief, and so we have no plans at this time to

participate in any bilateral or multilateral effort to forgive all or

part of the Russian debt.

Let me say generally, as I have said before, that the principal

reason for rescheduling the debt is to maximize the prospect of repayment

in the face of an imminent default; and that was the basis

for the U.S. decision to join the August, 1999, Paris Club Agreement

to reschedule Russia’s Soviet-era obligations that were falling

due in 1999 and 2000.

I think that here, in looking ahead, Russia has to have a new

agreement with the IMF before the Paris club creditors would consider

any further rescheduling for Russia; and as a part of that

process there will be an examination of the Russian financing

needs. As I said, at this stage this is not an issue.

Let me say, on the first question—and let

me deal with China. The Russians and the Chinese have something

like a 3,000 mile common border. They have issues that they need

to deal with. I think we have some disagreements with some of the

approaches that they are taking with China, but I think we fully

understand that it is not a zero sum issue as to whether they have

a relationship with us or a relationship with the Chinese.

Generally, we have questions about some aspects of—with the

others countries, Iran, missile transfer technology issues that we

raise all the time. With Iraq, we have a different approach in terms

of some of the sanctions issues, but they do in fact, although they

abstain on 1284, the resolution on Iraq, they are following through

on it.

On Serbia, I think that we have had some differences. Those may

be coming to an end because I think the people of Serbia have spoken.

I think it is very important for everyone to hear what they

have said wherever that message is heard. I think we should congratulate

the people of Serbia for having made their voices heard

so fully, and they have spoken.
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On the issue of Peru, this has been to start with the elections

themselves. We worked within the OAS to make sure that there

was a dialogue system established. The OAS sent a representative

to Lima, and I believe that was helpful in terms of moving Fujimori

forward generally and looking at how he could improve the democratic

situation in Peru. And I met with Fujimori in New York during

the U.N. Session and made those points very clearly.

On Montesinos, he is in Panama, but we do not believe that he

should have immunity, and there should not be immunity, and I

think that is our message. If there is, in fact, to be a democratic

dialogue, that has to happen; and we want to make sure that the

election process goes forward on a schedule; and we will continue

to make that point.

Thank you. On the Armenian resolution, I

think that this is a very important issue, and I thank you very

much for asking because it is very much on our minds.

President Clinton has traditionally commemorated Armenian Remembrance

Day on April 24 by issuing a statement that recognized

the loss of huge numbers of innocent Armenian lives in 1915 and

after, and he has challenged all Americans to ensure that such
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events never occur again. We have emphasized to both Turkey and

Armenia that we can neither deny history nor forget it, and we

need to come to terms with it. But the legislative measures such

as this one can hurt our efforts to encourage improved relations between

Armenia and Turkey. This can’t help promote peace and security

in the region.

I have to tell you, frankly, that passage could also undermine

U.S. national interests in which Turkey is a partner, not just bilateral

relations with a NATO ally, but also Turkey’s cooperation on

the Cyprus talks and the Nagorno Karabagh process in Iraq. So I

think that it is very important that this resolution not go forward.

As far as people not knowing about this whole issue, I think that

people have studied this. They know it. Our Foreign Service officers

are very much aware of it, and this is something that is of

great concern to us. But this resolution at this time is damaging.

Thank you very much.

Let me just say, on the family planning issue, this was a onetime

thing where the President and I came back and said that we

needed to make sure family planning was properly funded and

there was not an international gag rule. It has tremendous effects

on the lives of women all over the world. Women have died because

they have not had the opportunity of choice, and I think that it is

very important to see this not as pro-abortion but pro-choice. That

is what this is about. We have made that very clear. We need to

put the money back that was taken out. The United States needs
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to play a key role in this, and I hope very much that we will have

support, because otherwise the bill will not see the light of day.

On the issue of Hadassah, I will look into that particular issue,

but I have to tell you that, on the whole, the atmosphere for Israel

is much better in the United Nations. They now are allowed to be

in WEOG in New York, but they want to be in the other parts, in

Geneva and the other parts of this. We obviously want to see Israel

having the full rights of membership that they ought to have in the

United Nations, and I will look into the Hadassah issue.

Let me say that this is obviously a very serious

case, and we have raised it repeatedly at the highest levels.

The news today is that they are going to go ahead for a trial. We

believe that this is not the way that it should be done. It is evident

that this case needs to be handled at the highest levels, and we

have talked about Mr. Pope every time that we have had the opportunity

to do so. We consider what has happened here as outrageous.

Let me just say that I truly do think that

the allegations that somehow we have not taken seriously what has

happened in Russia in terms of the corruption and various aspects

are just wrong.

I also believe that it is very important to understand that for us

not to engage with Russia and not to be able to show that we need

to see reform cuts off an ability for us to work.
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We have looked at this very carefully. We are aware of the problems,

but I think that it is a mistake to merely look at this as we

are passing out money that is going down a black hole.

On the loans for shares, we strongly oppose

that. So I think the important point here is to have the story

straight.

At the moment, we are working on trying

to get a stronger mandate for the peacekeeping operation there and

trying to get the numbers of troops up. We need to get our peacekeeping

money operating so that we are able to support that.

I really think, and this has to go with the point that Congressman

Berman raised before, it is in our national interest to care

about what happens in Sierra Leone. And I ask you to look at this

picture of this child. I held a child like that in my arms when I

was in Sierra Leone. It is in U.S. national interest to do something

about it.

Mr. Chairman, if I can just say one thing.

This has been a pretty sharp meeting, and I think that it is very

important that I say the following thing:

I believe that it is essential that there be a debate about U.S.-

Russia relations. It is a very important aspect of our foreign policy,

and so I appreciate the fact that these questions have been asked,

but I think we have to be fair with each other about assessing the

record and what the future is. I truly do believe that it is a service

to have a discussion about U.S.-Russia relations. Thank you.

Well, I have always believed that Congressional

Members should travel to see the places that we talk about.

It is the only way to learn. I have always been a supporter of Congressional

travel; and as somebody who has now been to 118 countries,

I fully support traveling.