Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Listening to your remarks,

I am not sure whether we’ve gone back to the old Cold War,

or it is the new political war over foreign policy here in Washington.

I frankly felt 6 months ago when I heard the Republicans

were going to make foreign policy the campaign issue for this year,

I thought that the press had gotten its message wrong. But clearly,

by your opening remarks, by the kind of blunders we have seen on

the House floor on the situation in Kosovo, with the Speaker slinking

in at the end and voting for the policy and the whip on the floor

breaking arms to defeat the resolution, it is clear it is going to be

very difficult to have a logical and thoughtful dialogue about our

foreign policy.

It seems to me that Russia is a big problem, and it is also a tremendous

opportunity. Sometimes, when I hear these statements, I

get a sense there is a longing for the old Soviet Union so that it

was nice and simple, we could just confront them and hope to defeat

them someday. We have defeated them. They are in chaos, and

we have to help find a way out of that chaos, and we are not going

to do it just with polemics, trying to create blame for a situation

that is inherently unstable.

It is a government that has never been a democracy. It is not a

country that had democratic institutions and then lost them for a

period of time. There were never serious democratic institutions in

the Soviet Union. There were none in Russia, and today it is in the

infancy of developing a democracy.

I come to the floor and I see amendments to cut Nunn-Lugar

funds that helped do away with Russian weaponry. We need to find

a way to engage the Russians not simply as the old Cold War

enemy; we have to find a way to work with them, to deal with their

economic and political crisis.

I think there is no question that we are trying to create in some

quarters in this Congress the kind of isolation of Russia that was

created after World War I. I don’t think that is a good move. If we

want to just create a new military adversary, then let’s isolate the

Russians, let’s try to increase their own paranoia, and we will be

back where we started, having missed a great opportunity to reduce

the danger in the world.

Are there lots of dangers in Russia? You can be sure of that.

When you look at people who operate nuclear power plants, who

can’t pay their employees for 5 or 6 months at a time, forget about

the fissionable material; the scientists themselves will leave in

order to feed their families.

We have to come up with a dynamic policy in dealing with Russia

that encourages their good behavior where they make profits on

legitimate activities like satellite launches, and discourages the

proliferation of technology and personnel who have the knowledge

of creating more proliferation.

We have to work with them to try to build both an economic system

that we once fought, going from communism to capitalism, but

we also have to support the development of a political system.

It doesn’t take a political scientist to see what chaos they are in

today. We have to think what consequences our actions will bring

about in Russia, how do we help them get control of dangerous

technologies, get an economy where they can afford to keep their

scientists instead of having scientists work for renegade nations

around the world; and I think we would do a better job of that if

we held hearings that were based on really achieving a policy and

had fewer attacks on the President.

Will the gentleman yield?

I agree that there are lots of people on your side

and on my side who have different views.

I think some of what is happening, though, particularly with the

majority whip, Mr. DeLay, is not about a reflection——

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me say that I agree there will be tremendous pressure from

Capitol Hill not to increase the Soviet launches of American satellites.

Even though I think we will damage the United States

more in that process than we will the Russians. The less legitimate

business we do with Russia in the kind of economic crisis that exists,

aren’t you just then increasing the pressure on them to proliferate?

So if they can’t do launching, what can they do—because

that is where we are going to punish them.

We are going to punish them in places where they are doing legitimate

business. I would say the Administration needs to stand

up to Congress and go after those sectors where they are involved

in illegal activities, trying to pressure Russia on those.

The problem in Russia is, we all love democracy, but democracy

and economic collapse don’t usually go together, and I think what

you are seeing there, the pressures on the system, are the failure

of their new freedom and economic system to improve the life of the

average Russian. Then the politics play out, the nostalgia for the

old Soviet Union where at least it was stable and at least there

were no bread lines.

So I would like you to know—if you do what you say you are

going to have to do, aren’t you really encouraging the Russians to

sell more weapons, to do more proliferation?

Second, I would like to understand the assessments I have heard

on the news, that the feeling is that Yeltsin sacked his prime minister

in order to shore up his own position in the upcoming impeachment

situation. I would like you to help us understand why

it strengthens Yeltsin to sack his prime minister.

And last, I would like to know, on Russia-Belarus unity, is this

just rhetoric to keep everybody in each country feeling that they

are still part of something bigger, or is there potential that there

would be a joining of Belarus and Russia?

Let me interrupt for one second. The problem

with that theory is the Russian Government can’t collect taxes. It

can’t control these technologies because there is no system of government

there, and maybe there is not the will either.

But let me tell you, I would think they would have the will to

collect the taxes so they could pay their pensioners, so they could

do the things they need to. They can’t do it. It seems to me it is

a wonderful theory, but it seems to me also that there is more involved.

I hope you can answer the last two, also.

Belarus?

Would the gentlemen yield? I am sure the Ambassador

doesn’t know, and I can tell that you I do know. It came

from language the Senate had passed by, I think, 57 votes a short

time earlier. Frankly, we didn’t believe that it would become a big

political battle with the Whip’s actions on the floor.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let me say that I do

think that, General Scowcroft and Dr. McFaul, you are both correct.

I mean, the most astounding I think I have learned in sitting

on this Committee for 18 years is how much is just personal.

If the President doesn’t visit the country enough, if the Secretary

of State doesn’t go there, if the Vice-president hasn’t been there,

they become obstreperous; and sometimes when you see areas of

the world where we get a little trouble, you find that they at one

point thought they were the center of activity; and now they think

they are on the back road where nobody stops.

Whether they do it consciously or subconsciously, they always get

our attention. I think we do need to pay a lot more positive attention

to Russia and not just in these situations of crisis.

I agree in essence with both of you on the satellite launches. But

I guess my question would be, if you agree with my position, that

it is a bad place to put pressure, how do I convince Mr. Berman

that there are good places to create pressure so that we have them

clean up their act on proliferation without damaging their economy

by limiting satellite launches. Frankly, I was one that would like

to see an increase in Russian launches and a decrease in Chinese

launches to make up for that shortfall we will face.

On arms proliferation, the United States sells about half the

arms worldwide. It is a little hard for us to stand up and kind of

vent our moral outrage at Soviet arms sales to keep their defense

industries alive while we participate in a similar practice with

other countries.

We think they are better countries, but the economic dynamic is

similar in that it helps bring down the cost of this equipment when

our own military buys it.

We have bipartisan problems in the Congress of the kind of insensitivity

you mentioned. We recently had a gratuitous vote, in

my opinion, that simply stated we will deploy an ABM, an antimissile

system; and, one, we are not ready to do that.

Two, it was aimed at the North Koreans, who may have a missile

that can reach us; but as you have said, simply ignored what is the

largest number of missiles that could be aimed at the United

States. How do we move forward there? I would like to hear more

about that.

Third, one of our colleagues, Mr. Rohrabacher, continues to suggest

that we simply pull out of NATO, that this Cold War is over

and that we no longer need NATO or participate in NATO. So I

would appreciate answers for those.

So you would be a very important voice on that

issue in the coming months as Congress presses for the opposite,

to shut off the launches, and I hope you speak out loudly.

General SCOWCROFT. I will be happy to because we have forgotten

U.S. interests here. We need places to launch our satellites. We

do not have the capability here, and we are going to fall way behind

unless we can solve this problem somehow.

On the ABM treaty, it is a very complicated problem. I really do

think we ought to try to enlist the Russians cooperatively. I think

Michael makes a very good point, they are pretty hopeless now.

They probably can’t do anything even if they tried, but the psychological

impact of our making the effort would be good.

We also need to think, in the whole missile business, about the

Chinese and their attitude toward missile defenses and so on.

There is no point in doing something which will create the problems

we are trying to avoid.

On arms sales, I don’t disagree with you, but I think we are

thoughtful about our arms sales. It doesn’t always work out, but

the Russians are really not being thoughtful. They will sell to anybody

who has the money to pay for it, and unfortunately, that is

mostly the rogue states.

NATO, I think, is still of critical importance to the United States;

and it is less what NATO does than the fact of NATO. It represents

American participation in the security of Europe; and if we have

learned anything in this century, it is that that is critical. We can-

not have a decent relationship, security relationship with Europe

unless we have that kind of umbrella of NATO.