THE SITUATION IN THE MIDDLE EAST -- (House of Representatives - February 17, 2012)

[Page: H930]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. *Hurt*). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. *Gohmert*) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a lot of things going on in the Middle East, a

[Page: H931]

lot of things needing to be addressed at this point. I have grave concerns about the manner in which this administration is handling the things in the Middle East, maybe continuing with the policy on international affairs of this administration, which is, apparently, from what we see them doing, if you've been an ally to the United States, if you have been our friend, if you have fought with us, if you have had friends and family that fought with us and lost their lives, then this administration's message is we're going to throw you under the bus and we're going to negotiate and help your enemy and our enemy.

So it almost looks like the best thing to do for people in the United States that want help from the Federal Government: move to an island, declare war against the United States, and then this administration will send you all kinds of money and help, buy you an office in Qatar, all kinds of things we're willing to do if you're an enemy.

One of the latest things to be occurring, this week we're hearing reports from Egypt, after this administration, through an ally with whom agreements had been signed, negotiations continue to be ongoing with Mubarak in Egypt. The man certainly wasn't a Teddy bear by any stretch of the imagination, but he had had some success in keeping some semblance of peace with Israel.

And yet this administration was quick to tell Mubarak, as our ally, he had to get out. Kind of the way that President Carter failed to support another guy that was not a nice man, but the Shah in Iran. And the Carter administration also welcomed the return from exile of a man commonly called the Ayatollah Khomeini. The Carter administration welcomed him as a man of peace. As a result of that, Americans have lost lives and will continue to lose lives. There was nothing intentional in that fiasco by the Carter administration.

[Time: 12:10]

They meant well. They intended good for the country and the Middle East. They just simply didn't know what they were doing.

Right now we're seeing reports this week that the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt--who certainly made clear from their actions they're not our friends. They are

certainly not a friend of Israel. They've been making noise for some time that they did not intend to recognize Israel, they did not want to keep the peace treaty with Israel. In fact, there is an article from February 14, 2011, by Dean Reynolds from CBS Interactive that points out that Egypt's influential Muslim Brotherhood--this was supposedly before the Arab Spring even--never supported the Camp David Accords, and a leading secular politician, Ayman Nur, says they should be renegotiated.

The people that this administration has been so out front and welcoming, sending people over there--those that have been able to get out and come back that aren't being held by this obviously anti-American government that has taken shape--are indicating, at least those in the administration, gee, we've got to send a bunch of money to Egypt, we're going to try to buy them off and buy their allegiance. I've been saying for many years now every term since I've been here something that should be clear to all Americans: When it comes to all this money that we throw at people around the world that hate our guts, that want to see the United States brought down, places where they laughed when 3,000 Americans were killed on 9/11, we're sending them money. The thing I've been saying ever since I got to Congress is: You don't have to pay people to hate you. They will do it for free.

I've had a U.N. voting accountability bill that I've filed in each Congress. It got over 100 votes at one point, and hopefully that will continue to grow. The bill is very simple and it follows the adage that I have been saying for all these years: You don't have to pay people to hate you. They'll do it for free.

The bill is very simple. Any nation that votes against the United States' position in the U.N. more than 50 percent of the time would get no money, no assistance of any kind from the United States. These countries are autonomous, they're independent, and they're free to make whatever decisions they wish, but if they are going to be anti-American and be against all of the human rights positions that we hold dear, whether it is for religion or gender--as we see women's rights being abused so badly around the world in countries we're pouring in money, as we see in areas in the world where we have poured in hundreds of billions of dollars, and yet they are doing all they can to eliminate churches--some have been successful--to persecute Christians and Jews, yet we continue to pour in money.

Since we've seen the position of this administration being anti-religious here in recent days, it's starting to come together and make more sense that this administration is simply being consistent. We admire consistency; but when they want to send money to countries that persecute Christians and persecute those who want to worship freely, I guess that is consistent with what has been done in the President's ObamaCare bill and the latest pronouncement that Catholics just needed to set aside their religious beliefs because they were inconsistent with what the President wanted done.

We've got an article here from February 18, 2011. This headline from Reuters says: Peace Treaty with Israel is Up to the Egyptian People.

This was a year ago:

Spokesman for Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood responds to U.S. National Intelligence director, who said he assumed Brotherhood was not in favor of maintaining peace treaty with Israel.

Well, that's a nice thing for this administration to plant in the head of the Egyptians, the Muslim Brotherhood taking control in Egypt, that, gee, we kind of just assumed you wouldn't want to support the treaty with Israel.

Well, that allowed the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood to say, you know what, gee, we thought you were going to be upset with us if we didn't support the treaty with Israel, but thanks for letting us know that your assumption would be that when you helped us take over that we wouldn't support Israel being there.

Great move. That was the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper. He said this regarding the Muslim Brotherhood:

I would assess that they are not in favor of the treaty.

What kind of diplomatic fiasco is that?

We go to September 12, 2011. This September 12, 2011 article one day past the 10-year anniversary of 9/11, and the headline reads, Muslim Brotherhood: Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty Needs to be Reviewed.

The subtitle: Muslim Brotherhood tells regional Asharq al-Awsat daily peace treaty is of great importance; says Israel generally does not honor the agreement.

Then they quote Mahmoud Hussein, the group's secretary general, as saying:

And like the other agreements, it needs to be reviewed, and this is in the hands of the parliament.

There are others in which some in a position of power in Egypt have called for the complete elimination of any agreement with Israel. There are those who have said, let's put it up to a national vote, and since the Muslim Brotherhood is all about Israel no longer existing and since the Muslim Brotherhood has taken a slim majority in the government there in Egypt, then it would seem that it's likely their position would prevail.

In all of those years, the one crowning glory that the Carter administration can point to, the Camp David Accords, this administration has even thrown the Carter administration under the bus, just like they have some of our allies like the Northern Alliance in Afghanistan, like those who were loyal to Americans in Iraq, like the Kurds in many ways in northern Iraq, like Israel, for example, in the manner in which we've treated them publicly.

It was May 2 years ago that this administration did what some thought was unthinkable, that this administration or any administration would never do, they voted with all of Israel's enemies in demanding Israel disclose their weaponry, particularly nuclear weapons, any that they have. We had never done that before.

For those that bother to look in the Old Testament or the Jewish Bible--the Old

Testament to some of us--you can read the account of Hezekiah welcoming leaders from Babylon. Isaiah

[Page: H932]

was sent to Hezekiah and asked--he knew the answer, but he asked Hezekiah, what have you done? In essence, Hezekiah, King of Israel said: These wonderful leaders--of course this is a Texas paraphrase--these wonderful leaders came over from Babylon and I showed them all our treasure and I showed them all our defenses, our armaments.

[Time: 12:20]

In essence, Isaiah basically said, You fool. Because you've done this, you'll lose the country.

Now, it has been hard for some administrations that took the position in thinking, Gee, if you're just completely open, as Hezekiah was, about our defenses and what all we have, if you bring people on and let them review your nuclear submarines, if you let them see the abilities we have, if you bring them into our military bases and show them how we operate, and if you show them our tactics, that they'll just all of a sudden fall in love with us, and that it will make us stronger.

The lesson throughout history, including the one Hezekiah and his sons had to learn the hard way, is that you don't show your enemies all your defenses. You don't climb into political relationships with those who want to destroy you, with those who want to destroy your best friends. It's not a good message.

In an article from Fox News, it reads:

Al Qaeda on the rise in Syria has a ``marriage of convenience'' with Iran, U.S. intelligence director says.

I would think that was pretty obvious. I'm glad someone with our intelligence department has been able to figure that out. Hopefully, they'll be able to figure that out with regard to Lebanon. Hopefully, our intelligence department will be able to figure that out with regard to Iraq; that the leader in Iraq has shown hostility to this government and to the people in this government.

It's to the point that when five of us were over there, a bipartisan group, we had a couple of questions that Maliki did not particularly appreciate, one about, hey, there were people who were assuring us back in 2001, 2002, 2003 that if we came and got rid of this terrible dictator who hated the United States named Saddam Hussein, that because Iraq was so oil rich, that once we were able to turn the country back over to the Iraqi people after wresting it away from a totalitarian dictator who killed and abused and tortured Iraqi citizens, Iraq would be so grateful once the oil got to flowing that they would help ameliorate some of the vast amounts of treasure that Americans spent to allow them to elect their own leaders, to allow them to elect a leader like Maliki.

He was deeply offended, it appeared, as he was when I brought up Camp Ashraf and the maltreatment--in fact, the killing--of residents of Camp Ashraf, who were Iranian refugees. The concern was the United States had promised the residents of Camp Ashraf, the Iranian refugees in Iraq, that we would make sure they were protected. When Maliki's government took over from us, he, himself, promised Camp Ashraf residents that he and his government would make sure they were safe. Maliki promised the United States that he would keep them safe.

Yet, apparently, the pressure from Iran and the fear that Iran has instilled in the leadership in Iraq, particularly in Maliki, is so profound that since he knew President Obama had made clear we were pulling out completely and that we weren't going to be around to protect them, to help them, and that we were getting out completely and that we were not going to be around to make sure that our investment of American lives and treasure was not wasted--we were pulling out, leaving everything to him, going to leave everything to chance despite the investment--Maliki showed no gratitude. In fact, he showed hostility.

In fact, when our group of five bipartisan Members of Congress was flying out on one of the luxurious C 130s--I am prone to sarcasm. The C 130s are no better than they were when I was in the Army 30 years ago. You're sitting on web seating just like the paratroopers used back then--and still use--and the back end opens down. They're the same C 130s. We were flying out, and we got word by radio that Maliki's government had told us that our group of five Members of Congress was no longer welcome in his country. The man seems to have thrown in with Iran.

I know we have some brilliant intelligence officers. I've interacted with some of our intelligence community. I'm quite impressed with the intelligence of many of our intelligence officers, and I am hopeful that the intelligence at the lower levels of our intelligence agencies will eventually affect those in top positions in our intelligence agencies so they will begin to realize what others have known for a very long time.

In Afghanistan, I understand President Karzai is not terribly pleased with the position that some of us have taken, but some of us are not terribly pleased with the positions of the Karzai Government in throwing in--well, at least in accommodating--the Taliban, in accommodating those who are supplying the Taliban, and in the Taliban itself, as it continues to plot and kill Americans.

But, in fairness to President Karzai, when you look at his situation, President Obama has made clear that the United States is completely getting out of Afghanistan, and that we're going to leave them just as we did Iraq, just as the Democratic Congress demanded in 1974 from Vietnam. We were going to leave our allies, those who had fought with us and assisted us, who had lost family, friends, treasure to support our position because they were enemies of our enemy. This administration was going to leave them high and dry, and this administration has already shown in Iraq that that's what happens.

So, from President Karzai's position, he has got to be sitting there, going, They're about to leave. The Taliban has gotten stronger and stronger with Pakistan's supplying and assisting them. The United States Government will not be here to protect me. Gee, maybe I'd better start being nicer to the Taliban and the

radical elements in the Pakistan Government because that's who's going to determine whether I stay in power or not.

I found out in a meeting with some Afghan officials from the Northern Alliance--and then I've done subsequent research since--that the Government of Afghanistan has about a $12.5 billion budget. They, themselves, collect enough revenue--taxes and whatnot--in Afghanistan that they're able to supply about $1.5 billion of their $12.5 billion budget. The rest comes from other countries, and most of that is from the United States.

It was interesting traveling around Afghanistan before New Year's and after New Year's and going to forward operating bases, talking to some of our troops. We've got some terrific folks on the ground over there, but there is a problem. Those of us who majored in history know and those of us who have bothered to read any history have learned that that is a tough area in which to be an occupier as a foreign country. Foreign countries occupying or trying to occupy in Afghanistan don't do very well. It's not a place we ought to be occupying.

[Time: 12:30]

So I hear some, like some in this administration, it sounds like they're throwing up their hands saying, Well, let's just get out and let happen whatever is going to happen, because they know occupying forces don't do well. They're right about that. But by simply withdrawing without using some intelligence and some lessons learned from history means that we may have to fight the Taliban again. And it may, again, be after a massive loss of American lives. And perhaps the next time it will be when they're armed with nuclear weapons where they can kill hundreds of thousands instead of thousands.

Of course, if you read the communications that were intercepted about 9/11, they were hopeful there for a while that there would be maybe 50,000 people in the Twin Towers that were going to be killed, they hoped were killed when the planes crashed into the Twin Towers in New York City. They didn't care about innocent American lives or all those foreign visiting folks that were in the Twin Towers. They could care less. They wanted to make a point, and make a point by killing tens of thousands.

Well, with the inappropriate strategy of this government, of this administration, the Obama administration, we

[Page: H933]

could end up having this Nation pay a far greater price than has even been paid to date.

Unfortunately, there are consequences for bad decisions. It is important that we select proper leadership in this country. Anybody that reads through the book of Hosea will find a verse--and I had never had it jump out as it did until a few weeks ago. And there are different translations, but I like the translation in which the communication from God to Hosea was:

He was angry with the people of Israel because He said they had chosen leaders who were not God's choice.

There needs to be a lot more praying in this country as we select our leaders, as we select our national leaders for President, for his administration, for those who are elected to Congress, for those who are elected to the Senate, for those who are elected in State and local elections, and a lesson for us in Congress that we elect, within Congress, the proper leaders because, as the Founders believed, we are endowed by our Creator with certain unalienable rights.

One-third of the 56 signers of the Declaration of Independence were not just Christians; they were ordained ministers. One of them has a translation of the Bible--one of the signers of the Declaration--which still can be found in print today. These people understood the lessons from history, and they did not want to make those mistakes.

Here we have, from February 13, an article by Patrick Goodenough entitled, ``Hamas Leader Promises Iran Never to Recognize Israel.''

Now, we've had some in this country, in this administration, who have indicated privately, you know, we don't really have to worry; Sunnis and Shias hate each other. They're never going to come together. So that can help keep one from getting too much power because there is that conflict. Well, because, in small part--but the small part is growing into a larger part due to some of the actions and inactions of this administration--Shias and Sunnis are coming together.

So here you have a Hamas Gaza leader, Ismail Haniyeh, delivering a speech at a rally in Tehran, Iran, last Saturday, marking the 33rd anniversary of the Islamic Revolution. He's speaking, and behind him are the portraits of the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei and his predecessor Ayatollah Khomeini. Here he is in the Gaza Strip as a leader of the terrorist organization Hamas, and he's speaking on behalf of Iranian leaders. We are bringing Shia and Sunni together, like people 10 years ago would never have believed possible, by the ineptitude of what's happening in this administration.

But, the article points out:

Amid growing speculation of a split within the top ranks of Hamas, Iranian leaders at the weekend urged the terrorist group's Gaza leader to continue its campaign of violent resistance and pledged continuing financial support.

This from a terrorist group of leaders who are pledging to support the terrorist Hamas leaders in the Gaza Strip. And the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei told the Gaza Hamas leader, Ismail Haniyeh, people do not expect anything except endurance from Palestine's resistance.

It's time to wake up to what's going on with this administration and their help for groups that hate America, that hate Israel.

Here's an article from February 12, which says, ``Muslim Brotherhood Lawmakers: U.S. Aid to Cairo Assured.'' Well, isn't that special. He's gotten an assurance from this administration, as he told Al-Hayat, that if the U.S. cut aid to

Egypt, it would be a violation of the 1979 peace accords. They've indicated they're not interested in keeping the 1979 peace accords.

Here's an article from February 13, ``Muslim Brotherhood Warns U.S. Aid Cut May Affect Egypt's Peace Treaty With Israel.'' But apparently they're getting assurances--hey, we're going to make sure you keep getting money from us. You hate our guts. You hate Israel. You want Israel gone. So, you know, hey, we're going to keep supporting you.

And, in fact, in another article from February 13 of this year, the headline reads, ``Obama Proposes $800 Million in Aid for `Arab Spring.' '' Well, we've seen what the Arab Spring has done. If you were a Christian while Mubarak was in power, there was some persecution, and it wasn't pretty. But now, all semblance of any efforts to allow Christians to worship freely in Egypt is gone. We saw a headline last year that the last public Christian church in Afghanistan had to be closed. We continue to pour in aid.

Here is a February 8, 2012, headline, ``Pentagon Counters Dim Assessment of Afghan War.'' Then there's another article, ``The Afghanistan Report the Pentagon Doesn't Want You to Read,'' by Michael Hastings. There's one by Lieutenant Colonel Daniel Davis, ``Truth, Lies, and Afghanistan: How Military Leaders Have Let Us Down.'' Here's one from February 10, 2012, ``Roads to Nowhere: Program to Win Over Afghans Fails.''

In talking to some of our troops in forward positions in Afghanistan, some were a bit down, particularly those who have been training Afghans to farm, because we are sending around $3 billion for nothing but projects in Afghanistan, including these types of farming projects, so the people can make their own way.

[Time: 12:40]

Yet we were told they were training the Afghans, they have been training the Afghans; but the billions of dollars the United States Government, the Obama administration has sent to Afghanistan to help them develop farming projects, at least in this one region, has never gotten past the corrupt regional government.

So the projects where they could use these farming skills that are being taught don't exist, and they are not anticipated to exist. We set up a corrupt government in Afghanistan. And I don't know how honest anybody in the Karzai regime was before they got there, but there should be a lesson that can be learned from King David, the only person mentioned in the Bible to have had a heart after God's own, that when there is no accountability, even the best among us can do terrible things.

So when you set up a government in Afghanistan and we, the United States, supported their constitution that said sharia law ruled, that meant there were not going to be any more Christian churches in Afghanistan, and now there're not. Not publicly. And Jews have had to flee from Afghanistan. The last report I read said there was one publicly acknowledged Jew in Afghanistan.

With all of the blood and treasure we shed to eliminate the Taliban, the Taliban has now come back, and now this administration has announced to the world and to the Taliban, Look, we will release all of the people we have in detention that have murdered American troops, we will let them come back. They can keep murdering when we let them go. We'll even buy you a wonderful office in Qatar if you'll just come talk to us.

That is the kind of proposal that everyone has heard, and that's what has allowed Taliban leaders, as one of them did in Afghanistan earlier this month, to announce to all of Afghanistan in their largest television station that, look, we're about to be in charge as soon as the American Government leaves.

So here's the deal. The American Government is--they basically acknowledge we've whipped them, they've lost. So they're doing everything they can to get us to negotiate. So here's the situation. If you have not been totally supportive of the Taliban here in Afghanistan, they say, then it's time to come to us, ask forgiveness, and ask for our providing safety for you. Because if you don't, when we take over, as soon as the U.S. pulls out, you know, you're in trouble. And the result could be the death penalty.

There is a way around totally abandoning the investment we had for a peaceful Afghanistan without a powerful Taliban. It's common sense. You see it throughout history. What you do is support friends who are enemies of your enemy. The Taliban is our enemy. We know that the Taliban can be defeated because they were when we had less than 1,500 American troops in Afghanistan, Special Ops guys, incredibly trained, and some of our best intelligence officers over there from our intelligence agencies, obviously not top intelligence officials because these guys were really competent. And they

[Page: H934]

whipped the Taliban, had them completely on the run. And then we kind of took our eye off the ball in Afghanistan and started looking at Iraq, and the Taliban has made a resurgence, and they have become powerful again in Afghanistan.

In meeting with leaders from the Northern Alliance--even though Secretary Clinton and former Secretary Albright did what they could to keep us from meeting because, apparently, when this administration throws our allies under a bus, this administration wants them to stay under the bus. Some of us believe if somebody has been our ally, has helped fight our enemy, then they need to remain our friends. These are Muslims. These are our friends, and their enemy is our enemy. And I'm told by some of the military, American military leaders, that the Northern Alliance has plenty of weapons; but they don't have all the weapons that they had when they defeated the Taliban before. We do not have to stay in Afghanistan. But if we do not want to have to come back and fight the Taliban again, the thing to do is rearm and reempower the enemy of our enemies.

Afghanistan has never been strong and never had a strong central government. What made us, in our arrogance, think we could force a strong centralized government that would work in that country? It is a very tribal nation. In the northern area, this administration wants to call our allies, our former allies warlords, war criminals, blood on their hands. They were fighting for us and with

us. So in this administration's effort to manipulate the U.S. media, they leak all kinds of stories about how terrible our allies were. They're fighting terrible people. They're fighting people who were training others to come kill thousands and thousands of Americans. These are not nice people, and war is not a pleasant thing.

The Northern Alliance leaders had two asks: one, help us get a constitution amended so that we get to elect our regional leaders. Each province in Afghanistan should be able to elect their local governors. Each province should be able to elect the mayors of the towns within that province. Let them select their own police chief. Let them do as the United States came together to do, not so much in 1983 with Articles of Confederation, but in 1987 with our U.S. Constitution that allowed people to elect local government officials, State government officials, and national officials.

We have a constitution that has been set up in Afghanistan that basically lets the Karzai administration appoint the regional governors, the mayors. They select the police chiefs. That is a system fraught with corruption. No matter how honest anybody is going in, including President Karzai, how in the world could you stay honest and above corruption when you have set up a system that lends itself to corruption?

Well, that's what's happening. So it doesn't seem so much to ask, let the Northern Alliance, as every other area of Afghanistan, elect their local leaders, elect their governors, and then those regional areas become strong again.

And then just as States fuss when the Federal Government of the United States tries to get too powerful, as we've seen with ObamaCare, let's empower those regional provincial governments in Afghanistan to be powerful enough to call down their national leaders when they are corrupt. Let's empower them to fix their own problems, and you don't have to have massive numbers of American troops to do that, but you do have to be smart in the way you deal with a country that has lots of your enemies that want to kill you.

So they asked, let us elect our local, regional leaders. Give us enough equipment where we can defeat the Taliban again, for you and for us.

Now, in meeting and talking to people in Afghanistan, they knew, as did the Baluch leaders in southern Pakistan, that the Taliban is being supplied and equipped with armaments. IEDs that are dismembering and killing our soldiers in Afghanistan are being supplied through the southern area of Pakistan.

[Time: 12:50]

This is an area of Pakistan that hadn't been Pakistan until 1948 when international leaders arbitrarily took pencils and just drew boundary lines, and they included most of Balochistan in with Pakistan. The Balochistanis did not want to be there. They have a very mineral-rich area that is supplying Pakistan with most of their minerals. And yet the Pakistan Government is so badly mistreating the Baluch people. They raid, they torture, and they terrorize the Baluch people in

southern Pakistan.

And if Pakistan is going to so terribly mistreat our Muslim friends in southern Pakistan, in the Balochistan area of Pakistan, then it's time to push for an independent Balochistan that will be a nation of Muslim friends of the United States, and we will remain their friends because their enemy is our enemy, and we won't have to sacrifice American troops, American lives, and massive amounts of American treasure like we have been doing. You simply empower the enemy of our enemy and let them do the work for us.

That is the solution. That would be in keeping with holding dear the American lives that have been lost in fighting the Taliban in Afghanistan. That would be true to our beliefs and our desire only to fight those who want to destroy what we are and who we are. That would truly honor those who have given so much in honor of this country.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I have a friend, Mr. *Mo Brooks*, here. I yield back the balance of my time so Mr. *Brooks* can be recognized.

END