Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to welcome Ambassador Sestanovich to our hearing this

morning. In the real spirit of bipartisanship, I wanted to make a

statement earlier that I do associate myself with the comments

made earlier by the gentleman from California, Mr. Lantos.

As you know, Ambassador, we had such a tremendous high when

the Berlin wall came down, and there was tremendous expectation

on the part of the world to think that now Russia is going to be

part of us, living as a free people without communistic practices.

All this has happened now after the many years that we have

tried.

I wanted to ask you, do you perceive a danger or, at least in the

Administration, a real danger of the failure on the part of the

Western industrialized nations to provide substantive economic assistance

to a former nuclear power as is the Soviet Union? There

seems to be a little repetition of what happened. With the failure

of the Allies in World War I, we ended up really, really having the

more serious situation of having to deal with a Nazi Germany.

Do you see any real sense of nationalism happening in Russia

that will end up producing another Stalin? I sense that we have

failed on the part of the economic industrialized nations in providing

the proper economic assistance to Russia. You had mentioned

earlier that 75 percent of our own economic assistance goes

to the nuclear issues and not economic assistance. Can you correct

me on that?

What is the total? What is the bottom-line

dollar value?

Billions? Hundreds of millions?

And they are still asking for more.

I am sorry, Mr. Ambassador, but I would

like to yield to my friend from Massachusetts for a question.

I would like to restore my time if there is

any way to.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, Mr. Ambassador, I think the Chairman alluded to earlier

about—as you had indicated—the Security Council. I think my

question is relevant because Russia is a member of the Security

Council. Will that be OK? I am just curious. As you know, the

members of the nuclear club have the absolute veto for the Security

Council wherever or whenever there are crises, especially military

involvements, and all of these are taken into consideration. I have

always been given the impression that if there was a crisis—not

just the Kosovo crisis, let’s just look at Yugoslavia as a whole with

Slovenia and Croatia and Bosnia came into the picture—I have always

been under the impression that the Security Council would

be the base organization to which nations like ours and the 19

member nations of NATO would appeal in the United Nations to

resolve this conflict. It is a military conflict. We’ve got a problem

with Milosevic obviously, but then also you have to separate the

good people of Serbia or those of Serbian ancestry. Sometimes we

have a difficult time, having forgotten a little bit about the history,

why there’s such a close affinity between Russia and Serbia. That

has been alluded to earlier, in World War II they were both fighting

a common enemy, and that was Nazi Germany. I think I also

understand the fact that Serbia would never want any German to

come to their turf, if you will.

One of the successes as to why Tito was able to control Yugoslavia

was because he was not only part Serbian, but I think he

was also part Croatian. But because of that and the strong arm of

Tito, even the mighty Soviet Union couldn’t come in and take over

Yugoslavia like they did Hungary and Czechoslovakia.

My point here, Ambassador, is why wasn’t the Security Council

the controlling organization of this whole crisis in Yugoslavia? Why

NATO? My understanding is that NATO is supposed to be a defense

security organization. Here is the point I am making: Ethnic

cleansing, my gosh, there is ethnic cleansing all over the world. I

can tell you about the 100,000 Melanesians or West Papua New

Guineans against which the Indonesian Government has been conducting

military atrocities, murders, killings, rapes, and all of

this—it is found in West Papua New Guinea.

My point is, does this mean that we are looking into ethnic

cleansing, perhaps having security organizations in Asia, a NATO

in Asia, a NATO in Africa, in the same way that we have a NATO

that is supposed to defend countries in Europe? Because this is

what we are leading into. I just am curious, did the Administration

consult closely with President Yeltsin of Russia when the Yugoslavian

crisis came to the front? Not just Kosovo, but the time that

Slovenia and Croatia and Bosnia came into the picture.

Here is the concern that I raise, Mr. Ambassador. When the

North Korean crisis became nuclear, we never bothered consulting

with the South Korean leaders, and they were a little miffed about

that. In the situation with China; we went to China; Japan also felt

a little miffed about consulting with them and expressed their concerns.

So now the situation is in Yugoslavia. I was just curious, Mr.

Ambassador, had there been close consultations by the Administration

with President Yeltsin way before the Kosovo thing ever came

into being?

Did President Yeltsin agree to the provisions

of the Rambouillet proposal to President Milosevic? As I understand,

some of those provisions were very harsh.

Mr. Chairman, my time is up. I will try the

next round. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman.

Could I just convey a question to the Ambassador

before he leaves. I really would appreciate it.

Mr. Ambassador, I understand there’s a

Russian company who is in concert with a New York firm that

wants to set up a multi billion dollar nuclear storage facility somewhere

in the South Pacific.

Can you check that out for me, Mr. Ambassador, if this is true?

I want to know the name of the Russian company and also want

to find out if this is in accordance with our stated public policies

about Russian companies that go out setting up nuclear storage facilities.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I personally

want to welcome General Scowcroft and Dr. McFaul for our Committee

hearing this afternoon.

General Scowcroft, I have always been an admirer of your perception

and especially of the expertise, tremendous expertise, that

you have in having to serve previous presidents, especially in the

area of security.

You had indicated earlier that NATO, as a security, regional organization,

was a must in order to provide stability in Europe,

much to the chagrin, as you well know, of the Russians, because

we know that the original purpose of NATO really was for defense

purposes.

At that time, at the height of the Cold War, we were fighting the

former Soviet Union, Socialist Republics. Now there is no more Soviet

Union, and you are advocating that we should still have NATO

for the sake of stability in Europe.

I would like your opinion as to where the Security Council of the

United Nations comes into play? If we are going to have a regional

security organization like NATO-Europe, why wouldn’t we have

one in Asia? Why shouldn’t we have one in Africa?

When you are talking about basic foreign policies involving ethnic

cleansing, we have them in Africa, we have serious problems

in the Asia Pacific region—and for the very fundamental humanitarian

reasons, I fully support the President’s position on why we

had to go to Kosovo because, for anything else, you remember it’s

the same reason why President Bush went to Somalia.

I want your opinion on this. If you think that NATO’s is that important

for Europe, shouldn’t we also have regional security organizations

in Asia and other regions of the world?

General Scowcroft, I beg to differ with you

on this issue. When NATO was founded, de Gaulle pulled out. For

some 40 years we single-handedly had to defend these European

nations. Where was France?

Now, all of a sudden President Chirac is shining out like a good

example of being one of the brothers of this compact that they were

never a part of, and constantly, France is always on our heels, always

disagreeing on policies that we have had even in this current

Administration.

My question, too, where were our European allies when we were

fighting in Vietnam? The South Koreans are the only ones that I

saw when I was there. Are you also suggesting that the Japanese

are not democratic enough to support these same fundamental

principals that we are talking about?

My time is up. Thank you, gentlemen.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

Gentlemen, we have learned a lot of lessons from Vietnam, and

coming down to the question of using military force in our dealings

with the Russian Government, as my friend from Iowa alluded earlier,

it has become known as the Powell Doctrine. If you will, General

Scowcroft, carry a big stick and if you are going to use military

force, use it all the way. But it seems that our policy now is that

we have gotten rid of the basic Powell Doctrine, if you will, in the

Gulf War, but now we are using limited use of force and you are

suggesting it is OK to use limited use of force.

We learned our lessons from Vietnam. We bombed the heck out

of those people. In fact, it energized the Vietnamese, whether they

were Communists, pro-democratic or patriots, it energized those

people to the point they became nationalists, and I believe that we

are doing the same thing to the Serbian people. Forget Milosevic.

We are doing the same thing to the Serbian people.

I would like to ask the gentlemen, where are we going with this

continued bombing? Do you think we should resort to a more forceful

use of force of arms?