Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I like the title of these

hearings, ‘‘Is U.S. Policy Up to the Challenge?’’ The obvious answer

is, ‘‘No.’’

It has not been, as every year North Korea builds nuclear bombs.

They have got about 10 now as far as I can tell from unclassified

sources. My theory is they will get about 15 to protect themselves

from the neocons; the 16th goes on eBay.

There is a lot of focus on the intercontinental ballistic missile

test. I have got news for the North Koreans. You don’t have to be

a rocket scientist to smuggle something into the United States

about the size of a person. It has been done; you could. And a nuclear

bomb could easily be smuggled into the United States in a

bail of marijuana.

So whether or not they have the missile, they certainly have the

bomb. They have got more bombs every year, and we have not been

up to the challenge of stopping them.

The reason is, we don’t have enough carrots and we don’t have

enough sticks. And we send great men like the Secretary here out

to negotiate, but we tell them, you can’t give the North Koreans a

nonaggression pact, so go out there and use your skill to convince

them they don’t want one. But more importantly, we don’t give you

the ability to turn to China and say, if you don’t occasionally interrupt

your subsidies to North Korea, as necessary in a coordinated

plan, to put some pressure on them to get them to do the right

thing, then your trade with the United States could possibly be

slightly a little bit temporarily interrupted.

And the reason I don’t think you have been successful—and

every day they are building nuclear bombs, so I know you have had

some success on the diplomatic front, but in terms of the physics

of it, the uranium neutrons continue to be bombarded with protons,

or whatever it is.

And I think, Mr. Secretary, the reason you have had a problem

is that you are outranked by the chairman of Wal-Mart. And in determining

what is important to our country, cheap imports from

China come first; and then we send you out there to try to convince

the Chinese with nothing but your good looks to convince them.

And you have done an admirable job, given how little you have

been given in the way of tools; and I am not commenting in any

way on your good looks, but that tool, in and of itself, has not been

sufficient.

Has there been discussion, Mr. Secretary, at the State Department

of hinting to China in some way that its access to United

States markets, which has allowed them to build the largest trade

surplus in the history of bilateral trade, could possibly be slightly,

occasionally impaired if they are not more assertive with regard to

North Korea?

I am hoping it is a yes-or-no answer. Have there been discussions

of that or not?

Have there been such discussions?

Has anybody at any of those meetings said, And

we might not let the next boatload of tennis shoes come into the

Long Beach Harbor if we can’t get their attention?

Obviously, you have had meetings about what our relationship

with China is. Has anyone in our meetings suggested any impairment

or threatened impairment or hint of threatened impairment

that the Chinese would notice regarding their access to United

States markets?

They could be more convincing if they went a

week without delivering subsidized oil.

And I am loathe to say that it is the fault of our constituents

that they have not embraced or developed or forced upon us a better

foreign policy. If you ask what the American people think, it is

that their State Department and Congress should devise a policy.

But if you really ask them, are you willing to go a day without

tennis shoe deliveries in order to move forward with a plan to prevent

North Korea from developing nuclear weapons, they would say

that even the best tennis shoes will not allow you to run away from

the radiation if the nuclear bomb explodes.

So I think the American people are not behind us, they are

ahead of us.

Let me ask, though, a similar question.

Have there been discussions of changing our policy toward

Chechnya as part of an effort to secure Russian support with re-

gard to the two greatest threats to our country, the Iranian and

North Korean nuclear weapons programs, or either of them? And

I realize Iran is outside your bureau’s responsibility.

That shows you the bureaucratic problem we

have. Your problem is to do something about North Korea, and yet

you cannot turn to Russia and say, we need your help on this, and

we can do this or that with regard to Russia, because Russia is not

in your department. So I think you would be apprised of any multifaceted

effort to get Russia on board.

Are you aware, whether it would be in your department or not,

of thoughts that we need to link—whether it is trade, whether it

is Chechnya, whatever the issue is—to get what we absolutely

need, which is Russia’s and China’s support on these nuclear

issues?

But you were not authorized at that time to talk

about Chechnya, were you?

So we are trying to get them to do what we want,

but we are not authorized to talk about what they want. You would

have to have spectacularly good looks under those circumstances.

I assure you that China puts an extremely high

value on its access to markets, that they have concluded that Wal-

Mart is more powerful in this country; and the desire of a business

community to make billions on imports is far more powerful than

those who are concerned with either the North Korean or the Iranian

nuclear program; and that when—and the hearing subject—

is U.S. policy up to the challenge—if the challenge is to allow huge

profits to be made on imports, the answer is, ‘‘Yes.’’