Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for being

so late. This is obviously a very important hearing. Unfortunately,

we all have more than one duty, and I am on the judiciary committee,

and there is a major crime bill that I have introduced. I

was asked to speak to the National Sheriff’s Association downtown,

and I committed to do that, and I apologize for being late.

My staff briefly has told me almost all the questions I would

want to ask, and your testimony was graphic and compelling. I

have two questions, one of which may not have been asked, I hope.

If it has, just tell me, and I will literally read it in the record. I

do not want to trespass too much more on your time.

Is there anything that, from a broad policy perspective, the next

United States president should read from Putin’s pursuit of the

war in Chechnya, and does it have implications, if you are prepared

to speak to it, for how Russia will deal with other parts of

what is still the territory of Russia and former republics of the Soviet

Union, where the Islamic faith predominates?

Tell me a little bit about how much of this relates to the attitude

of Putin, in your view, and the Russian military, towards Islam. I

find an incredible dichotomy between the way in which the Russian

agencies, and possibly the Kremlin itself, will promote and deal

with Iran in terms of missiles and missile technology, and yet deal

so brutally with Chechnya. I do think you are dead right, though,

Tom, that these old wounds run centuries deep.

But is it just that? Is there something unique about Chechnya

alone, or is there something more that relates to the present Russian

leadership’s attitude toward Islam? Is that a fair question?

Do you all agree with that?

Thank you. Karen?

Mr. Chairman, if I could take 30 more seconds.

Let me tell you the one part that I worry about

in terms of the Administration’s policy. I am not asking you to comment.

I think the way in which, my observation, the State Department

handled the dramatization of the capture and the disappearance

of the press representative was wrong.

I think they were so worried about affecting other aspects of the

relationship that are being negotiated now, that they tip-toed

around what they should have done.

I will not be overly specific here, but literally, in terms of not letting

press in the country know until ten minutes before that they

are going to be on. I mean that is malarkey.

But I have seen that sort of thing in every administration, and

everybody gets clientized in this process, and their little piece is

the piece that they want to make sure does not get rolled, and if

there is something else important, they are afraid to act.

I think we have to have a franker relationship with Russia. I

predict to you, for what it is worth, my predictions are usually

wrong, but I predict to you that Putin is going to cooperate with

us more on the big ticket items, but he is going to become more

oppressive and anti-democratic as he moves on.

We are going to be faced with sort of a China dilemma here, in

a broad sense, where you going to have a circumstance where the

Chinese are cooperating with us on trade, there is liberalization,

there are a lot of things that make sense for us, and at the same

time they are still cracking down on the free press, they are cracking

down on any dissidents.

I think the next president is going to be faced with an interesting

dilemma here. You may very well get cooperation on nuclear weapons,

while at the same time they are crushing democratic movements

in other places, or limiting what is thought to be, by the

West, democratic institutions.

I think we are in for an interesting ride here, but I think the controlling

feature of it, Tom, should be frankness. I do not mean

demagoging, I mean just frankness, frank confrontation on the

places we don’t agree.

Where I might or might not disagree with the other two witnesses,

I didn’t hear your testimony, so I do not know, is I do not

think that the way to respond is to cut off all other intercourse

with Russia on, for example, START II. I am not suggesting you

said that. I am just trying to make the point that we should be

frank.

Let me conclude by—Dr. Haltzel, who is one of the main reasons

I love having him on my staff, he is so knowledgeable about history,

he passed me the following note. ‘‘On the other hand, the 19th

century writer Lermontov romanticized the people in the

Caucasus.’’

So it is nice to have, well, I always kid him, my double PhD behind

me here. He does not really have two PhD’s, but he has the

drawback of having gone to Harvard and Yale, and it worries me,

but it is one of these things. So I am going to have to read both

to find out where the truth lies.

Anyway, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for

the good work you are doing, and for not relenting on—

Mr. Chairman, may I ask that my statement be

placed in the record?

Thank you.