
Nancy received the 2009 Milestone Award from the Asian American Institute and the first Sandra Otaka Legacy Award from the Asian American Action Fund, Chicago Chapter. She was the recipient of the 2004 Risk Taker and Enabler Award from the Organization of Chinese Americans and the 2009 Distinguished Career Service Award from the U.S. Department of Labor.

Nancy is a skilled organizer, an expert网络er, public servant, and a good friend. Her advocacy and the policies that she helped create will continue to empower and strengthen women even after her retirement. Her accomplishments are many, and I want to congratulate her on her decades of service to women and families.
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Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Madam Speaker, I would like to submit the following for the RECORD:

REMARKS

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

In its annual reports on religious freedom, the United States government has consistently documented the severe persecution of religious minorities in Saudi Arabia and other countries in the Middle East and North Africa. These reports have called for the promotion of religious freedom and the protection of human rights. The government has also imposed restrictions on the freedom of expression, assembly, and association. These restrictions have been used to silence political opponents and opposition leaders. Furthermore, the government has been accused of human rights abuses, including disappearances and torture.

Saudi Arabia has a long history of persecution and discrimination against religious minorities. In the 20th century, the government has been accused of systematic acts of violence and torture against religious minority groups, including the Shi'a, the Isma'ilis, and the Baha'is. These groups have been targeted for their religious beliefs and practices, which are considered a threat to the stability of the state.

The government has also been criticized for its treatment of women, who are subjected to discrimination and violence. In some cases, women have been subjected to honor killings, forced marriages, and other forms of violence. The government has also been criticized for its treatment of children, who are often subjected to child labor and other forms of exploitation.

The government has been accused of using its power to suppress political dissent and opposition. This has included the use of mass arrests, torture, and other forms of violence to silence political opponents and opposition leaders. The government has also been accused of using its power to suppress the freedom of expression, assembly, and association.

In conclusion, the government has been accused of perpetrating human rights abuses, including disappearances and torture, as well as targeting religious minorities and women. The government has also been accused of using its power to suppress political dissent and opposition. This has included the use of mass arrests, torture, and other forms of violence to silence political opponents and opposition leaders. The government has also been accused of using its power to suppress the freedom of expression, assembly, and association.
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only hope that the House of Saud is not aimed human Rights and religious freedom try like the U.S. that has always championed human rights and religious freedom has been able to free a young man who had been imprisoned for 17 years because of his religious belief as an Isma’ili Shi’ite. I can only hope that the House of Saud is not aiming religious minorities unfairly—because I have heard that a $90 billion arms deal is in the works.

Recently, the Saudi daily Al-Jazirah refused to publish an article by female university professor Fawziyah Abdullah Abu Khaled. In her article, Abu Khaled called the government’s expansion of fatwas to senior religious leaders for the purposes of controlling policies to be part of society and for it to stop persecuting and criminalizing them. She wrote: “Peaceful opposition is part of the socio-political society, and it should not be handled with hostility, eradication, or constant persecution.”

The only people who enjoy freedom of expression are the radicals—as long as they do not call for Jihad against the House of Saud. Sheikh Abdel Rahman Al-Barak has called many times for the killing of Shi’ites and many times for the killing of Jews and Christians. He issued a new fatwa stating that the U.S. is the real enemy of the Muslims and that Jihad cannot be superceded by international conventions.

You ask about the launch of the Saudi national dialogue, the establishment of King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, the appointment of the first female vice minister for women’s education, the municipal election, the interfaith conferences organized by the Saudi government to which Christians and Jews were invited, and the recent ruling restricting the right to issue fatwas to senior religious leaders.

The national dialogue has accomplished nothing. The fatwah fatwa is a closed, isolated institution for international students and a very few Saudis that is aimed at producing Saudi engineers and doctors, not at encouraging unfettered research, and certainly not to produce new and modern interpretations of the Koran that are peaceful and that respect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This university is one of dozens of Islamic universities in Saudi Arabia. The appointment of Noura Al-Fayz as the first female member of the Saudi Arabia Council of Ministers means nothing—the children still cannot drive a car, travel by herself, go jogging or engage in other sports, choose her own husband, or receive decent child support if she is a relative of the domains. We all know that women were not allowed to vote; and the interfaith conferences will remain meaningless until a church is built in Saudi Arabia and Christians are allowed to worship freely. As to the restriction on fatwas, no one pays any attention at all; new fatwas are issued on a daily basis.

The kingdom is not just any country with powerful oil wealth to control people’s lives. Whether conservative or liberal, ultimately people need to put faith in the government and long as long as everything in the kingdom is controlled by the government, it will be very difficult to both cross red lines and make a living. That is how the House of Saud maintains its game of balance.

I understand this on a very personal level; I have seen how people struggle to swim up the education and support for terror. As he wrote in the Washington Post last June, to end support for such terror, among other steps: “We must focus on key locations to ensure that inclusions have no place in curricula and textbooks...”

Under the Saudi Education Ministry’s latest report, the inclusion of Wajeha is banned from writing in Saudi newspapers. Wajeha is the president of the Saudi High School Textbooks, which is the publisher of the Saudi high school textbooks. Students of Saudi high school textbooks are instructed to consult his writings when they face vexing moral questions. West Point’s Center for Combating Terror found that Ibn Timiyya’s are “by far the most popular texts for modern jihadis.”

The intellectual pioneer of takfiri doctrine is the medieval Islamic scholar Ibn Timiyya. He wrote: “We must focus on key locations to ensure that inclusion has no place in curricula and textbooks...”

Under the Saudi Education Ministry’s latest report, the inclusion of Wajeha is banned from writing in Saudi newspapers. Wajeha is banned from writing in Saudi newspapers. Wajeha is the president of the Saudi High School Textbooks, which is the publisher of the Saudi high school textbooks. Students of Saudi high school textbooks are instructed to consult his writings when they face vexing moral questions. West Point’s Center for Combating Terror found that Ibn Timiyya’s are “by far the most popular texts for modern jihadis.”

Meanwhile, Saudi royals have stepped up their philanthropy to higher education around the world, for which they have garnered many encomiums and awards. Hardly a month goes by without a news report that one of the princes has opened a center of Islamic and Arabic studies, or a business or scientific department, at a foreign university. The king himself recently founded a new university for advanced science and technology inside Saudi Arabia.

These efforts have bought the royal family more influence and prestige, but they detract from our political leaders from the central concern of the Saudi 12 religious curriculum. This is not the time for heaping unqualified support for such reforms. Their reactions, though, have alternated over the years between insisting that reforms had already been made and calling for time by stating that the reforms would take several years more to complete, maybe banking on the hope that American attention would drift.

Four years ago, the Saudis gave a solemn and specific promise to the United States. Its terms were described in a letter from the U.S. assistant secretary of state for legislative affairs to Sen. Jon Kyl, then chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee on Terrorism and Security: “In July of 2006, the Saudi Government confirmed to us its policy to undertake a program of textbook reform to eliminate all passages that disparage or promote hatred toward any religion or religious groups. Furthermore, the State Department letter reported that this pledge would be fulfilled “in time for the start of the 2008 school year.”

Saudi Arabia has failed to keep its promise to the United States. One Wikileaks cable from the U.S. embassy reports that Saudi education reform seems “glacial.” In its newly released 2010 annual report on religious freedom, the State Department reported that the Saudi government booklet distributed to students, textbooks—including in the newly edited, heavily redacted texts used in the Islamic Saudi Academy, a school operated in Fairfax County, VA, by the Saudi embassy. Students of Saudi high school textbooks are instructed to consult his writings when they face vexing moral questions. West Point’s Center for Combating Terror found that Ibn Timiyya’s are “by far the most popular texts for modern jihadis.”
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Meanwhile, Saudi royals have stepped up their philanthropy to higher education around the world, for which they have garnered many encomiums and awards. Hardly a month goes by without a news report that one of the princes has opened a center of Islamic and Arabic studies, or a business or scientific department, at a foreign university. The king himself recently founded a new university for advanced science and technology inside Saudi Arabia.

These efforts have bought the royal family more influence and prestige, but they detract from our political leaders from the central concern of the Saudi 12 religious curriculum. This is not the time for heaping unqualified support for such reforms. Their reactions, though, have alternated over the years between insisting that reforms had already been made and calling for time by stating that the reforms would take several years more to complete, maybe banking on the hope that American attention would drift.
The State Department needs to begin regular and detailed reporting on the remaining objectionable and violent passages in Saudi government textbooks and to press in a sustained manner for the kingdom to keep its 2006 pledge to us regarding textbook reform. As USCIRF recommends, the administration should also lift the indefinite waiver of any action that might designate Saudi Arabia as a “Country of Particular Concern” under the International Religious Freedom Act—the only “CPC” to receive an indefinite waiver.

In one of the Wikileaks cables written earlier this year on Saudi King Abdullah to Secretary Clinton, U.S. Ambassador James Smith wrote: “Borders reflect his Bedouin roots, he judges his counterparts on the basis of character, honesty, and trust. He expects commitments to be respected and sees actions, not words, as the true test of commitment....”

Bedouin or not, we should start demanding the same from him.

REMARKS BY R. JAMES WOOLSEY, FORMER DIRECTOR OF THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY

I met on several occasions with the late President of Indonesia, Abdurrahman Wahid, after 9/11 while he was leading the world’s largest libertarian Muslim organization, Nandlatul Ulama. What a truly magnificent man he was. Nandlatul Ulama’s members, for the vast majority of Indonesia’s Muslims, espouse essentially the Enlightenment’s embrace of reason and in particular its separation of the spiritual and secular realms. Indonesia’s traditions in this regard harken back hundreds of years, and this country that contains more Muslims than any other does not call itself a Muslim nation.

There are hundreds of millions of such truly moderate Muslims in the world, including a very substantial share of those in the U.S. They would be regarded as our colleagues and friends in trying to build a peaceful and prosperous modern world. To use a very rough analogy to the Cold War years, the truly moderate Muslims are something like the Social Democrats and Democratic Socialists—George Orwell, Helmut Schmidt—who were our colleagues in winning the Cold War against a communist empire that called itself “socialist” but whose essence was totalitarianism.

Of course, neither Muslim nor not, are not our colleagues and friends but our enemies through and through, just as were the communists’ communities of violence in the time of Stalinalma. But some have come to believe that in the world of Islam today these two groupings—moderate Muslims and terrorists—are the only ones that exist. Sadly such is not the case.

During the Cold War there were non-violent totalitarianists—such as many members of the American Communist Party—who fervently supported the triumph of world-wide caliphate—a theocratic totalitarian state. Along the way to this objective adherence to totalitarianism entails accepting a set of doctrines that sanctify the death of apostates and homosexuals, brutal treatment of women, rejection of democracy (and indeed all man-made law), anti-semitism, and much else.

In contrast to the caliphate—the complete rejection of Article VI of the Constitution—it is not always tactically wise to utilize violence, or violent jihad. Sometimes what Muslim Brotherhood writers call “civilization jihad” is a shrewder tactic. It is well-defined in a document. “An Explanatory memorandum on the Strategic Goal for the Group” entered into evidence in the 2008 case, United States v. Holy Land Foundation. The document was written by Mohamad Amin el-Hakim and his colleague in the U.S. and a member of the Board of Directors of the Muslim Brotherhood in North America. The document makes it clear that what is involved is the use of “infiltration and influence” lead by the Muslim Brotherhood that constitutes a “grand jihad in eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within and sabotaging its institutions” through the hands of both conscious agents and through the hands of the believers that so it is eliminated. . . .”

In the Holy Land Foundation case, which dealt with terrorist financing, it was established that a number of Muslim Brotherhood organizations such as CAIR and ISNA, though not indicted, were part of the terrorism financing conspiracy.

In short, as during the Cold War, we need to understand that the central distinction is between those who accept democracy and the Western way of life and those who do not. We were on the same side during the Cold War as socialists George Orwell and Helmut Schmidt and both the Red Army and Gus Hall were on the other. Today we can make common cause with all Muslims who are neither planning to blow up airliners nor working on “eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within.”

But we must not ignore those who are making such efforts or be deterred from dealing with them just because they engage in name-calling such as labeling those who call them to account as “Islamophobes.” Those who bravely stood up against the Spanish Inquisition—whether Muslims, Jews, or Christians—were not “Christianophobes.” We need to find Constitutional means—drawings on our experiences during the Cold War—to thwart the Islamist sabotage called for by the Muslim Brotherhood document and to do so in such a way as to protect the rights of those Muslims who are not engaged in either violent jihad or “civilization jihad” against us.

This will require us to think clearly about how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally on some aspects of fighting terrorism, but also how to deal with Saudi Arabia, our ally. We were on the same side during the Cold War, as socialists George Orwell and Helmut Schmidt and both the Red Army and Gus Hall were on the other. Today we can make common cause with all Muslims who are neither planning to blow up airliners nor working on “eliminating and destroying the Western civilization from within.”

Mr. BISHOP of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise today in the House of Representatives to honor the memory of a son of New York...
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