Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thought this was a hearing on Russian foreign policy, not on

American policy toward Kosovo. I truly don’t totally understand the

point of my friend from Iowa. I understand why he thinks a policy

that seems to have exacerbated that which it was designed to contain

doesn’t make a lot of sense. I don’t understand the Ambassador’s

comments that he was not talking about Russian reactions

to American policy in Kosovo, he was talking about a much broader

question of anti-Americanism in Russia.

I guess I want to throw out a different theory that really isn’t

about hostility for Western—it is not really—the anti-Americanism

isn’t necessarily an attack on democracy. It is a feeling probably as

much from what precipitated it—a cumulation of lots of things, but

as much precipitated by what happened in August with, sort of the

bottom falling out, as it is by the Kosovo episode. It is the sum

total of a belief that we tried it their way, and look what we got.

As a witness later today says, we are the size of Denmark economically.

Add to that NATO expansion and just a whole accumulation

of things, plus politics.

There is an election coming up, which is, by the way, something

to say, in Russia. There is an election coming up both for the Duma

and for the President, and some anti-American rhetoric now is

probably good politics in the context of that election. I think you

can probably be a democrat, small ‘‘D,’’ and articulate sort of an

anti-American position, and there is nothing much we will be able

to do about this for the next year or so other than pursue sensible

policies. We are still going to get that reaction because domestic

politics in Russia requires it, and we shouldn’t drive ourselves

nuts, because there is not too much we can do about it.

Or created by the reforms of 1993 or everything.

One last point, much narrower. Mr. Gejdenson, the

gentlemen from Connecticut, raised the issue on the space

launches, and I just want to praise your answer. It is crazy not to

allow space launches by an entity that is not proliferating, that is

employing a lot of people, that is doing something that is helpful

to us and helpful to American economic interests and Russian interests?

In the course of doing that, the idea of leveraging realistic

things, not change—not total tax collections, but some of the things

you mentioned, are they putting monitors in some of these questionable

plants? Are they actually going to pass the export control

regime they have now talked about for a year and 3 months? Those

specific kind of things—as part of reaching this—the Russians have

a million people, as I understand it, that are employed in this program.

There is some leverage there.

I hope at the end of the day we get to the point where they are

doing some of the things we would like them to do on proliferation

and we are lifting the cap, because that seems to me like the best

possible outcome.