

this time, but logic did not prevail with our Iraq policy and look at the mess we have there. Besides, both sides, the neoconservative extremists and the radical Islamists, are driven by religious fervor. Both are convinced that God is on their side, a strange assumption since theologically it is the same God.

Both sides of the war in the Middle East are driven by religious beliefs of omnipotence. Both sides endorse an eschatological theory regarding the forthcoming end of time. Both anticipate the return of God personified and as promised to each. Both sides are driven by a conviction of perfect knowledge regarding the Creator, and though we supposedly worship the same God, each sees the other side as completely wrong and blasphemous. The religiously driven Middle East war condemns tolerance of the other's view. Advocates of restraint and the use of diplomacy are ridiculed as appeasers and equivalent to supporting Nazism and considered un-American and un-Christian.

I find it amazing that we in this country seem determined to completely separate religious expression and the state, even to the detriment of the first amendment, yet we can say little about how Christian and Jewish religious beliefs greatly influence our policies in the Middle East? It should be the other way around. Religious expression, according to the First Amendment, cannot be regulated anywhere by Congress or the Federal courts. But deeply held theological beliefs should never dictate our foreign policy. Being falsely accused of anti-Semitism and being a supporter of radical fascism is not an enviable position for any politician. Most realize it is best to be quiet and support our Middle East involvement.

Believing one can have perfect knowledge of God's will and believing government can manage our lives and world affairs have caused a great deal of problems for man over the ages. When these two elements are combined, they become especially dangerous. Liberty, by contrast, removes power from government and allows total freedom of choice in pursuing one's religious beliefs. The only solution to controlling political violence is to prohibit the use of force to pursue religious goals and reject government authority to mold the behavior of individuals.

Both sides in the Middle East are enamored with the so-called benefit that chaos offers to those promoting revolutionary changes. Both sides in situations like this always underestimate the determination of the opposition and ignore the law of unintended consequences. They never consider that these policies might backfire.

Declaring war against Islamic fascism or terrorism is vague and meaningless. The enemy that we are fighting at the expense of our own liberties is purposely indefinable. Therefore the

government will exercise wartime powers indefinitely. We have been fully warned to expect a long, long war.

The Islamic fascists are almost impossible to identify and cannot be targeted by our conventional weapons. Those who threaten us essentially are unarmed and stateless. Comparing them to Nazi Germany, a huge military power, is ridiculous. Labeling them as a unified force is a mistake. It is critical that we figure out why a growing number of Muslims are radicalized to the point of committing suicide terrorism against us. Our presence in their countries represents a failed policy that makes us less safe, not more.

These guerilla warriors do not threaten us with tanks, gunboats, missiles or nuclear weapons, nor do they have a history of aggression against the United States. Our enemies' credibility depends instead on the popular goal of ending our occupation of their country.

We must not forget that the 9/11 terrorists came principally from Saudi Arabia, not Iraq, Iran, Lebanon or Syria. Iran has never in modern times invaded her neighbors, yet we worry obsessively that she may develop a nuclear weapon some day. Never mind that a radicalized Pakistan has nuclear weapons and our so-called friend Musharraf won't lift a finger against bin Laden who most likely is hiding in Pakistan. Our only defense against this emerging nuclear threat has been to use and threaten to use weapons that do not meet the needs of this new and different enemy.

Since resistance against the Iraq war is building here at home, hopefully it will not be too long before we abandon our grandiose scheme to rule the entire Middle East through intimidation and military confrontation.

But economic law eventually will prevail. Runaway military and entitlement spending cannot be sustained. We can tax the private economy only so much, and borrowing from foreigners is limited by the total foreign debt and our current account deficit. It will be difficult to continue this spending spree without significantly higher interest rates and further devaluation of the dollar. This all spells more trouble for our economy and certainly higher inflation. Our industry base is shattered, and our borders remain open to those who exploit our reeling entitlement system.

Economic realities will prevail regardless of the enthusiasm by most Members of Congress for a continued expansion of the welfare state and support for our dangerously aggressive foreign policy. The welfare/warfare state will come to an end when the dollar fails and the wealth simply runs out.

The overriding goal should then be to rescue our constitutional liberties which have been steadily eroded by those who claim that sacrificing liberties is required and legitimate in times of war, even the undeclared and vague war that we are currently fighting.

A real solution to our problems will require a better understanding of and a greater dedication to free markets and private property rights. It can't be done without restoring a sound asset-backed currency. If we hope to restore any measure of constitutional government, we must abandon the policy of policing the world and keeping troops in the four corners of the earth. Our liberties and our prosperity depend on it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MCKINNEY (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. WOOLSEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MCCARTHY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EMANUEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RAMSTAD) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, today and September 14.

Mr. NUSSLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, September 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. GILCHREST, for 5 minutes, September 12, 13, 14, and 15.

Mr. GOHMERT, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 8, 2006, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9190. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Bifenazate; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2006-0327; FRL-8090-1] received August 25, 2006, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9191. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental