Thank you, Senator Lugar.

Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Senator Voinovich is the preeminent Balkan expert, as far as I’m

concerned, and I pay very close attention. He’s been there many,

many times. I’ve only been there three times, but I’ve been to

Kosovo as recently as back in January. First question, do we know

for sure if Russia would veto a Security Council resolution for

Kosovo independence?

That is the first best choice. There’s no option——

Well, I understand the ‘‘kick the can’’ comment

and the ‘‘do nothing’’ comment, with which I also associate myself.

I do think what Senator Voinovich said, in the possible situation

where there is a veto, if things move forward, hopefully, the first

step will be with the European Union and our European partners.

They need to be a critical part of whatever happens, in the absence

of that resolution, I would think. And I agree wholeheartedly with

Senator Voinovich.

In January, I had the privilege of being at the

International Security Conference, in Munich, with Secretary Scowcroft,

who’s here and going to testify later, and heard the Putin

speech that’s gotten so much comment. You made a statement in

your testimony—and I heard it, I didn’t read it, so if I said this

wrong—but you said, ‘‘The United States and Russia wish to avoid

a rhetorical race to the bottom.’’ I believe that was the quote. Is

that right?

Well, I’m glad you said it that way in response,

because when I heard that speech, which Secretary Scowcroft and

I were just discussing, there very definitely was the return-to-thecold-

war mentality at the beginning. There definitely were some

less-than-positive comments about the West in the middle. But, in

the end, there appeared, to me, a little bit of a plea for recognition,

and that that was the motivation of the speech, more than taking

the rhetoric to the bottom.

So, with that, my comment on what you’ve said about the agenda

coming up at Kennebunkport, I think, is very important, because

the rhetoric that comes out of that, and the commentary that

comes out of that, will be that two roads diverged in a yellow wood,

you’re going to go down one or the other. And I hope they come out

of it with a little bit better message than has happened in the individual

comments that have been made, including the speech by

Putin, in January, and subsequent ones that have been made.

Last, on the Iranian situation and Russia’s recent

positive moves, over the missile defense, the President did

quite a good job of—to me—of explaining the missile defense idea

was not aimed at Russia, but it was aimed at a potential rogue nation

that might have one or two or three warheads in the protection

of that area. Do you think making that point helped Russia

take a look at the United Nations and the world concerns with

Iran, and maybe be more positive than he had been in the past?

Because—and I say that, because—excuse me for interrupting before

you spoke—because they have their difficulties, such as

Chechnya, and things of that nature, so they very well, themselves,

could see themselves as a potential beneficiary from a missile defense system.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.