

But tragically this past month, during an emergency cesarean section to save the lives of their twin girls, doctors learned Jenna was suffering from a rare and very serious form of cancer. She and the medical teams at Cross Hospital and Upstate Medical Center in Syracuse fought the disease heroically for 2 months, but on May 5 she passed away.

Jenna and her family's story touched the lives of so many people, strangers and friends alike, from around the world who were devastated to hear of Jenna's passing.

There is no way to truly express the deep sadness that comes from losing someone so young with such a bright future ahead, to think about the beautiful baby girls that will have to grow up without their mother physically on this Earth.

Mr. Speaker, the family gave me this bracelet to remind me to pray for Jenna Hinman while she was still alive. It says: "Prayers for Jenna, God protect this family."

Mr. Speaker, I pray that God will protect Jenna's husband, her parents, her brother, and particularly these young girls, and may God bless Jenna Hinman, a true American hero.

NIGERIAN KIDNAPPED GIRLS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this week, women Members of the United States House of Representatives went to the Nigerian Embassy to plead and to insist on the fight to bring our girls home and, as well, to establish a victims' fund and to find and bring the thug Sekau, the leader of the Boko Haram terrorist group, to justice.

Today, I am going to read a few names of those girls that are missing for those mothers who are longing for their return:

Rebecca Luka, Laraba John, Saratu Markus, Mary Usman, Debora Yahonna, Naomi Zakaria, Hanatu Musa, Hauwa Tella, Juliana Yakubu, Suzana Yakubu, Saraya Paul, Jummai Paul, Mary Sule, Jummai John, Yanke Shittima, Muli Waligam, Fatima Tabji, and Eli Joseph.

I will put all of them in the RECORD.

In honor of Mother's Day, I mourn with those mothers, I pray for mothers across America, and I pray for the Nigerian mothers whose children are still missing.

May I ask prayers for all who are longing now for their children to return, and may I offer my blessings to my late mother, Ivalita Jackson.

NIGERIAN KIDNAPPED GIRLS

Deborah Abge; Awa Abge; Hauwa Yirma; Asabe Manu; Mwa Malam Pogu; Patient Dzakwa; Saraya Mal. Stover; Mary Dauda; Gloria Mainta; Hanatu Ishaku; Gloria Dama; Tabitha Pogu; Maifa Dama; Ruth Kollo; Esther Usman; Awa James; Anthonia Yahonna; Kume Mutah; Aisha Ezekial; Nguba Buba; Kwanta Simon; Kummai Aboku; Esther

Markus; Hana Stephen; Rifkatu Amos; Rebecca Mallum; Blessing Abana; Ladi Wadai; Tabitha Hyelampa; Ruth Ngladar; Safiya Abdu; Na'omi Yahonna; Solomi Titus; Rhoda John; Rebecca Kabu; Christy Yahi; Saratu Emmanuel; Deborah Peter; Rahila Bitrus; Luggwa Sando; Kauna Lalai; Lydia Emmar; Laraba Maman; Hauwa Isuwa; Comfort Habila; Hauwa Abdu; Hauwa Balti; Yana Joshua; Laraba Paul; Saraya Amos; Glory Yaga; Na'omi Bitrus; Godiya Bitrus; Awa Bitrus; Na'omi Luka; Maryamu Lawan; Tabitha Silas; Mary Yahona; Ladi Joel; Rejoice Sanki; Luggwa Samuel; Comfort Amos; Saraya Samuel; Sicker Abdul; Talata Daniel; Rejoice Musa; Deborah Abari; Salomi Pogu; Mary Amor; Ruth Joshua; Esther John; Esther Ayuba; Maryamu Yakubu; Zara Ishaku; Maryamu Wavi; Lydia Habila; Laraba Yahonna; Na'omi Bitrus; Rahila Yehanna; Ruth Lawan; Ladi Paul; Mary Paul; Esther Joshua; Helen Musa; Margret Watsai; Deborah Jafaru; Filo Dauda; Febi Haruna; Ruth Ishaku; Racheal Nkeki; Rifkatu Solomon; Mairama Yahaya; Saratu Dauda; Jinkai Yama; Margret Shettima; Yana Yidau; Grace Paul; Amina Ali; Palmata Musa; Awagana Musa; Pindar Nuhu; Yana Pogu; Saraya Musa; Hauwa Joseph; Hauwa Kwakwi; [No name released]; Hauwa Musa; Maryamu Musa; Maimuna Usman; Rebecca Joseph; Liyatu Habitu; Rifkatu Yakubu; Naomi Philimon; Deborah Abbas; Ladi Ibrahim; Asabe Ali; Maryamu Bulama; Ruth Amos; Mary Ali; Abigail Bukar; Deborah Amos; Saraya Yanga; Kauna Luka; Christiana Bitrus; Yana Bukar; Hauwa Peter; Hadiza Yakubu; Lydia Simon; Ruth Bitrus; Mary Yakubu; Lugwa Mutah; Muwa Daniel; Hanatu Nuhu; Monica Enoch; Margret Yama; Docas Yakubu; Rhoda Peter; Rifkatu Galang; Saratu Ayuba; Naomi Adamu; Hauwa Ishaya; Rahap Ibrahim; [No name released]; Deborah Solomon; Hauwa Mutah; Hauwa Takai; Serah Samuel; Aishatu Musa; Aishatu Grema; Hauwa Nkeki; Hamsatu Abubakar; Mairama Abubakar; Hauwa Wule; Ihyi Abdu; Hasana Adamu; Rakiya Kwamtah; Halima Gamba; Aisha Lawan; Kabu Malla; Yayi Abana; Falta Lawan; Kwadugu Manu.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE DAVE CAMP, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable DAVE CAMP, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Committee on Ways and Means has received an administrative subpoena, issued by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, for documents.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoena, I will make the determinations required under Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DAVE CAMP,
Chairman.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF DIRECTOR, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HEALTH, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Brian Sutter, Staff Director, Subcommittee on Health, Committee on Ways and Means:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2014.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received (i) an administrative subpoena, issued by the United States Securities and Exchange Commission, for documents and testimony, and (ii) a grand jury subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, for testimony.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoenas, I will make the determinations required under Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

BRIAN SUTTER,
Staff Director,
Subcommittee on Health.

FASCIST INTOLERANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to read the background of an incredible woman. We have different religious views because I am a Christian and she is apparently an atheist at this time, but what an extraordinary woman: Ayaan Hirsi Ali. She is a visiting fellow with the American Enterprise Institute:

Ayaan Hirsi Ali, an outspoken defender of women's rights in Islamic societies, was born in Mogadishu, Somalia. She escaped an arranged marriage by immigrating to the Netherlands in 1992 and served as a member of the Dutch parliament from 2003 to 2006. In parliament, she worked on furthering the integration of non-Western immigrants into Dutch society and defending the rights of women in Dutch Muslim society. In 2004, together with director Theo van Gogh, she made "Submission," a film about the oppression of women in conservative Islamic cultures. The airing of the film on Dutch television resulted in the assassination of Mr. Van Gogh by an Islamic extremist. At AEI, Ms. Hirsi Ali researches the relationship between the West and Islam, women's rights in Islam, violence against women propagated by religious and cultural arguments, and Islam in Europe.

Her background, as mentioned, she was a member of the parliament in the People's Party for Freedom and Democracy, the Netherlands, 2003 to 2006. She was a researcher at the Wiardi Beckman Foundation in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, 2001 to 2002. And she had been an interpreter and adviser in the Office of Intercultural Communication, Leiden, the Netherlands, 1995 to

2001. She has her master's from Leiden University, the Netherlands.

So this extraordinary woman should be paid tribute. It was wonderful to see recently that Brandeis University was paying tribute to her.

But we have had an interesting development in the United States of America from the time I was in college. I attended what was at the time a conservative university, Texas A&M University, and a majority there had very conservative views, but we loved to have liberal speakers come speak in my college, not because it was liberal but because we welcomed the exchange. There were always people coming to my university that students disagreed with.

□ 1245

See, at that time, we thought universities were places at which you could have those debates and where you could have a liberal speaker come speak, even though you disagreed with him, but we have seen the rise of fascism in American universities.

Back 30, 40 years ago, students could get involved and listen to liberal speakers, conservative speakers, moderate speakers, far right, far left speakers at universities and then make their own conclusions because, back then, that is kind of what we thought education was; but now, with this new intellectual fascism that has arisen in our universities, some of them—far too many of them, actually—say: if you disagree with our position, we don't want you here. We want you eliminated. We don't want you to have work. We want your family defiled. We just don't want you to succeed in any way whatsoever.

In fact, we see these kinds of receptions for conservatives, for Judeo-Christian believers and followers, people eliminated from being on television because they hold the view espoused by Moses and by Jesus of marriage being between a man and a woman.

It is as Moses said and as Jesus repeated, after He said a man will leave his mother and a woman will leave her home and the two will become one, what God has joined together, let no one pull apart.

Now, we find out that there was a show yesterday that we were told was considered hateful because it believed what a majority of Americans does and what Moses believed and what Jesus believed, which is that marriage would be between a man and a woman.

People like me are vilified—oh, you are hateful—but the people whose show was canceled made what sounded like a very Christian response of, look, we love homosexuals, we love all people, if you don't, then you are not following the teachings of Jesus, to be sure, but it doesn't mean that you have to support, embrace, encourage particular lifestyles that you believe are harmful to the individuals and harmful to society in general.

So it is amazing that, in the name of liberality—in the name of being toler-

ant—this fascist intolerance has arisen. There are people who stand up and say: I agree with a majority of Americans—I agree with Moses and Jesus—that marriage is between a man and a woman.

Now, all of a sudden, people like me are considered haters—hatemongers—evil, which really is exactly what we have seen throughout our history, going back to the days of the Nazi takeover in Europe.

What did they do?

First, they would call people haters and evil and would build up disdain for those people who held those opinions or religious views or religious heritages. Then next came: those people are so evil and hateful, so let's bring every book that they have written or has to do with them, and let's start burning the books because we can't tolerate their intolerance.

As shrinks testified before me during my days as a judge, it was called projecting. It is those who have a characteristic and to divert condemnation on themselves, they project their characteristic on someone with whom they disagree—so the most intolerant in America.

Then especially people like they who were going to be on the television show before it was canceled—people like me—yes, we can get upset. We can't stand to see our Nation torn apart. We can't stand to see our Judeo-Christian values, on which the Nation was founded, demeaned, depicted as somehow evil.

We stand up for those things, but there is no hate for individuals, yet those who are the most hate-filled, who do not follow the teachings of Jesus, seek to impose or to project upon those of us who are Christians—and some orthodox Jews and even atheists or secularists, like Ms. Ayaan Hirsi Ali—their own hate, their own intolerance. We really need to understand what is going on.

It is not tolerance that becomes intolerant and says a woman who was tortured—I don't know what else you would call some of the procedures that were done to her most private areas in the name of religion. It was not voluntary.

She was ordered into a marriage she wanted no part of. She did not want to have to be covered up and stay in a back room and never own property and never drive. She kind of thought, like most of us do in America, except for the intolerant fascist liberals, that: gee, women ought to be able to own property, we ought to be able to marry whom we wish, we ought to be able to espouse our own views without being called hatemongers.

Brandeis University chose to honor the intolerant and turn against someone who went through a living hell in Somalia. Because she has stood up for what she believes, including in the Netherlands, and put together a film with Mr. van Gogh, her partner was assassinated—murdered; yet Brandeis

University, in having some cowards in the administration, without one fraction of the courage of Ms. Hirsi Ali, says: we are going to back off and not honor this woman who has overcome so much.

To honor someone doesn't necessarily mean that you embrace everything about his life. Like I say, I stand in tribute to a woman who has overcome so much, who has been fighting against the true war against women.

I don't believe at all in her religious views as, apparently, an atheist, but I can recognize this is a woman of courage, that she is a woman who is brilliant, who has overcome so much.

It is really heartbreaking that universities around this country, which were once beacons to debate and to disagreement, have now been taken over by so many liberal fascist cowards that, if you disagree with something they think or if you disagree with something somebody who is more violent than you thinks, then they are going to succumb to the fascist violence and say: oh, we don't want to snub you, really, but there is this other group over here that may get violent with us if we stand up for your rights and acknowledge your courage.

So we are going to be cowards, and we are not going to acknowledge your amazing courage. We are going to snub you because we are afraid of these people who may become violent.

You have to wonder if the State Department of the United States, under the leadership of Secretary Hillary Clinton, may not have succumbed to this same type of fear: gee, we don't want to make the terrorists mad, so let's don't stir them up.

There was a time, for example, when Thomas Jefferson was President and radical Islamists in northern Africa were attacking American ships and taking crews hostage and selling them back to America if we came up with the price required, the extortion fee.

Jefferson finally had had enough and had sent this group of—at that time—men, called Marines. They went to the shores of Tripoli, and they fought with everything they had against the radical Islamists.

They fought hard enough and showed that we were not weaklings who would lay down in the face of Islamist terrorism, but that we would fight. Those Marines fought hard enough that the radical Islamists said, okay, all right, we will leave you alone—because that is all radical Islamists understand.

We have this article from *The Wall Street Journal*, May 8, written by Ayaan Hirsi Ali, who is the same lady I was just speaking about. She knows something about radical Islam. She has had people she has cared about and loved killed by radical Islam. She, herself, was physically harmed by radical Islam.

She knows a lot about it, and she also knows about intolerance, the type that was seen—and the lack of courage—at Brandeis University. Hopefully,

someday, someone at Brandeis will recall the Jewish influence in the university that understood the threat of intolerance—like fascist intolerance—and, instead of succumbing to fascist intolerance, stand up and acknowledge courage and extraordinary human behavior.

For those who may be tempted to say: Now, LOUIE, how in the world could you put radical Islam and fascism or the Nazis together?

All one would have to do is look back at the history prior to and during World War II, and the connection was already made. The alliances were made. One type of intolerance, Nazi fascism, seemed to ally and work well and become allies of radical Islamist fascists.

In this Wall Street Journal article, as Hirsi Ali says:

Since the kidnapping of 276 school girls in Nigeria last month, the meaning of Boko Haram—the name used by the terrorist group that seized the girls—has become more widely known. The translation from the Hausa language is usually given in English language media as “Western Education is Forbidden,” though “Non-Muslim Teaching is Forbidden” might be more accurate.

But little attention has been paid to the group's formal Arabic name: Jam'at Ahl as-Sunnah lidda'wa wal-Jihad. That roughly translates as “The Fellowship of the People of the Tradition for Preaching and Holy War.” That's a lot less catchy than Boko Haram, but is significantly more revealing about the group and its mission. Far from being an aberration among Islamist terror groups, as some observers suggest, Boko Haram in his goals and methods is, in fact, all too representative.

□ 1300

The kidnapping of the schoolgirls throws into bold relief a central part of what the jihadists are about: the oppression of women.

Boko Haram sincerely believes that girls are better off enslaved than educated. The terrorists' mission is no different from that of the Taliban assassin who shot and nearly killed 15-year-old Pakistani Malala Yousafzai—as she rode a schoolbus home in 2012—because she advocated girls' education. As I know from experience, nothing is more anathema to the jihadists than equal and educated women.

How to explain this phenomenon to baffled Westerners, who these days seem more eager to smear the critics of jihadism as “Islamophobes” than to stand up for women's most basic rights. Where are the Muslim college-student organizations denouncing Boko Haram? Where is the outrage during Friday prayers? These girls' lives deserve more than a Twitter hashtag protest—

As we saw from former Secretary Hillary Clinton.

Back to the article. It says:

Organizations like Boko Haram do not arise in isolation. The men who establish Islamist groups, whether in Africa (Nigeria, Somalia, Mali), Southeast Asia (Afghanistan, Pakistan), or even Europe (UK, Spain and the Netherlands) are members of long-established Muslim communities, most of whose members are happy to lead peaceful lives. To understand why the jihadists are flourishing, you need to understand the dynamics within those communities.

I might insert parenthetically that the Muslims who wish to live in peace

can be and are our friends. Though we disagree on our religious beliefs completely, we can be friends.

I was with my dear friends MICHELE BACHMANN and Congressman Dr. MICHAEL BURGESS, and I turned to see a very surprised look on their face when we made it through the midst of the Afghanistan capital. There were people holding rocket-propelled grenades as we turned down the alley to get to the Masood family compound.

We pulled into the gate in the drive there within the inner part and I saw my Muslim friends coming out on the porch and down the stairs.

So I jumped out. And I looked back and saw they looked a little surprised as I jumped out and these well-known Muslim Northern Alliance members spread their arms open wide, as I did, and we embraced strong, heartfelt embraces. Because I knew what they had been through in fighting radical Islam. I know that they do not want radical Islam taking back Afghanistan when we leave.

I know that because this administration has turned its back on those Muslim non-extremists, we are putting their lives in danger as we leave them to the radical Islamist extremists poised and ready to take over in the vacuum that we leave. We owe our allies who fought and defeated the Taliban by early 2002 better than that.

And my heart breaks as I think about the absolute horrors that will unfold in Afghanistan as our former allies have to defend themselves against radical Islam because they dare to be our friends and allies. That is no way to treat people who fought with you, for you, for themselves, because of that common desire not to be under the yoke and threat and hate of radical Islam.

Back to Ms. Hirsi Ali's article. She says:

So, imagine an angry young man in any Muslim community anywhere in the world. Imagine him trying to establish an association of men dedicated to the practice of Sunnah, (the tradition of guidance from the Prophet Muhammad). Much of the young man's preaching will address the place of women. He will recommend that girls and women be kept indoors and covered from head to toe if they are to venture outside. He will also condemn the permissiveness of Western society.

What kind of response will he meet? In the U.S. and in Europe, some might quietly draw him to the attention of authorities. Women might voice concerns about the attacks on their freedom. But in other parts of the world, where law and order are lacking, such young men and their extremist messages thrive.

Where governments are weak, corrupt or, nonexistent, the message of Boko Haram and its counterparts is especially compelling. Not implausibly, they can blame poverty on official corruption and offer as an antidote the pure principles of the Prophet. And in these countries, women are more vulnerable and their options are fewer.

But why does our imaginary young zealot turn to violence? At first, he can count on some admiration for his fundamental message within the community where he starts

out. He might encounter opposition from established Muslim leaders who feel threatened by him. But he perseveres because perseverance in the Sunnah is one of the most important keys to heaven. As he plods on from door to door, he gradually acquires a following. There comes a point when his following is as large as that of the Muslim community's established leaders. That's when the showdown happens—and the argument for “holy war” suddenly makes sense to him.

The history of Boko Haram has followed precisely this script. The group was founded in 2002 by a young Islamist called Mohammed Yusuf, who started out preaching in a Muslim community in the Borno State of northern Nigeria. He set up an educational complex, including a mosque and an Islamic school. For 7 years, mostly poor families flocked to hear his message. But in 2009, the Nigerian government investigated Boko Haram and ultimately arrested several members, including Yusuf himself. The crackdown sparked violence that left about 700 dead. Yusuf soon died in prison—the government said he was killed while trying to escape—but the seeds had been planted. Under one of Yusuf's lieutenants, Abubakar Shekau, Boko Haram turned to jihad.

In 2011, Boko Haram launched its first terror attack in Borno. Four people were killed, and from then on violence became an integral part, if not the central part, of its mission. The recent kidnappings—11 more girls were abducted by Boko Haram on Sunday—join a litany of outrages, including multiple car bombings and the murder of 59 schoolboys in February. On Monday, as if to demonstrate its growing power, Boko Haram launched a 12-hour attack in the city of Gamboru Ngala, firing into the market crowds, setting houses aflame, and shooting down residents who ran from the burning buildings. Hundreds were killed.

I am often told that the average Muslim wholeheartedly rejects the use of violence and terror, does not share the radicals' belief that a degenerate and corrupt Western culture needs to be replaced with an Islamic one, and abhors the denigration of women's most basic rights.

This is Ms. Hirsi Ali saying this.

She says:

Well, it is time for those peace-loving Muslims to do more, much more, to resist those in their midst who engage in this type of proselytizing before they proceed to the phase of holy war.

Parenthetically here, Mr. Speaker, it should not have even required a FBI or CIA investigation into the older Tsarnaev brother to find out that he had been radicalized. It should not have required the Russians tipping our intelligence and the FBI that they were ignorant of how radicalized Tsarnaev had become. It shouldn't have required the FBI to go out to the mosque and make inquiry about Tsarnaev and what Muslim teachers he was drawn to, what Muslim books he was reading.

It shouldn't have required that, but it did.

Unfortunately, the FBI didn't do those things. Unfortunately, the FBI didn't even bother to notify the Boston police, as far as we can tell, that Tsarnaev had been radicalized—or, at least the Russians said he was—because I would be willing to bet if he

had, the Boston police would have gotten to the bottom of it before the Boston marathon bombing occurred.

Ms. Hirsi Ali says in her article:

It is also time for Western liberals to wake up. If they choose to regard Boko Haram as an aberration, they do so at their peril. The kidnapping of these schoolgirls is not an isolated tragedy; their fate reflects a new wave of jihadism that extends far beyond Nigeria and poses a mortal threat to the rights of women and girls.

If my pointing this out offends some people more than the odious acts of Boko Haram, then so be it.

It should be also pointed out Ms. Hirsi Ali is a fellow of the Belfer Center at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government. She is the founder of the AHA foundation.

So I commend Harvard for having the courage to have someone to espouse the views that Ms. Hirsi Ali does. She has been there. She has courage.

I hope and pray that universities across the United States, even though many of them are offered major Middle Eastern money if they will do this, and have a seminar on Islamophobia and help eradicate anyone or any thought that radical Islam is a threat, and let's just suppress anything like that. I applaud universities that have the courage to do that. But too many don't. And they don't stand up as they should.

And what is amazing is, we have people in this country and in this city and in the media who take the gutless position that they will try to portray Republicans or conservatives as hating women. Why? Because they know we are not going to kill them. We will disagree with them, we will debate them, we will say they are wrong, but we are not going to kill them because of what they believe.

In Western society, in every State and Federal law it has always been true, except those that are allowing sharia law to creep in, but it has always been true that provoking words are never an offense to a physical assault. That is kind of 101 criminal law in most any law school, except, of course, if it is teaching sharia law.

Under sharia law, provoking words, no matter how minor, can be the basis for capital punishment. You offend a radical Islamist, that is the basis for killing them.

We have never believed that in Western society. As Judeo-Christian ideals have spread even among atheists, secularists, and other religious believers, that has been a good, sound doctrine. Provoking words—or a cartoon—may evoke anger and may provoke anger, but it should not provoke physical violence.

□ 1315

It is time liberals rose up with enough courage to say: You know what? Wow, there is a war against women, and it is killing women.

There are laws in some places of radical Islam that say: if you are a woman who is raped, if you don't have four

men who are respected Muslims who can stand up and be eyewitnesses that you were raped, then we may need to stone you to death for allowing such to occur.

That is not an American ideal. That is a war on women. I have prosecuted, and I have sentenced enough rapists that it is something that is very difficult for me to sit and listen to, and to think that so many of the cases for which I sentenced rapists to prison could never have been brought and the woman would have to live in fear and horror if we were living under the kind of law where there really is a cultural war on women and, sometimes, a physical war on women.

In the United States, I know families where the parents are Christians and the children chose not to believe in Jesus as Lord, and it breaks the hearts of the parents; but the thought would never, ever cross their mind to engage in violence.

I have been told about someone we are trying to help, whose family was Islamist, radical, in another part of the world. When he became a Christian, that made him worthy of the death penalty. It made his child worthy of the death penalty, in their opinion. He has been killed.

Other family members that have tried to help, who were moderate Muslims and didn't believe someone who became a Christian should be murdered, have paid the price with their lives.

These things are happening around the world, and it is time liberals fought a more courageous fight and stood—and instead of screaming about Islamophobia, stood and said, you know, there are Muslim friends and allies, but there is a radical Islamist part in this world, a sect in this world that wants to kill, destroy anything, including what we consider to be innocent children, women, men.

Until we confront that fact, this country is going to continue to be subjected to threats against American lives here and abroad. It is easier to attack Americans abroad.

Americans, including this body—I mean, we were outraged at what happened to those Nigerian children, boys killed, the girls threatened with being sold into what basically would be a slave-type marriage. It is outrageous.

So you wonder why in the world the State Department would not have the courage to take a stand. There was an excellent article by Andrew McCarthy, and he incorporates much of a fantastic article from Josh Rogin, from the Daily Beast, and it is dated May 8.

It says:

"We must stand up to terrorism," bleated Hillary Clinton a few days ago in a tweet expressing outrage against Boko Haram, the jihadist organization that has abducted hundreds of young girls in Nigeria. Yet, when she was actually in a position to stand up to Boko Haram's terrorism as Secretary of State, Ms. Clinton instead protected the group.

Josh Rogin reports at the Daily Beast:

The State Department under Hillary Clinton, fought hard against placing the al Qaeda-linked militant group Boko Haram on its official list of foreign terrorist organizations for 2 years; and now, lawmakers and former U.S. officials are saying that the decision may have hampered the American government's ability to confront the Nigerian group that shocked the world by abducting hundreds of innocent girls.

While Ms. Clinton now issues indignant tweets, Rogin elaborates on her failure to mention that her own State Department refused to place Boko Haram on its list of foreign terrorist organizations in 2011, after the group bombed the U.N. headquarters in Abuja. The refusal came despite the urging of the Justice Department, the FBI, the CIA, and over a dozen Senators and Congressmen.

"The one thing she could have done, the one tool she had at her disposal, she didn't use, and nobody can say she wasn't urged to do it. It's gross hypocrisy," said a former senior U.S. official who was involved in the debate. "The FBI, the CIA, and the Justice Department really wanted Boko Haram designated, they wanted the authorities that would provide to go after them, and they voiced that repeatedly to elected officials."

In May 2012, then-Justice Department official Lisa Monaco (now at the White House) wrote to the State Department to urge Clinton to designate Boko Haram as a terrorist organization. The following month, General Carter Ham, the chief of the U.S. Africa Command, said that Boko Haram provided a "safe haven" for al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb and was likely sharing explosives and funds with the group; and yet, Hillary Clinton's State Department still declined to place Boko Haram on its official terrorist roster.

As Mr. Rogin further details, placing an organization on the terrorist list enables the government to use various investigative tools for law enforcement and intelligence-gathering purposes. It also squeezes the organization by criminalizing the provision of material support to it and the conduct of business with it.

After numerous Boko Haram atrocities, Republicans attempted to force Secretary Clinton to designate the group or explain why she refused to do so. The State Department heavily lobbied against the legislation. Only after John Kerry replaced Clinton and after a series of jihadist bombings against churches and other targets did the State Department finally relent and add Boko Haram to the terrorist list last November.

The excuses now being offered in explanation for Clinton's dereliction are specious. As Rogin explains, Clinton's State Department claimed that Boko Haram was merely a local group with parochial grievances that was not a threat to the United States.

Have a look, though, at the State Department's list here. Several of the listed groups are waging local terrorist campaigns that do not threaten our country, the Basque ETA, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam, the Real Irish Republican Army, et cetera. A significant reason for having the list is to promote international cooperation against terrorism and discourage its use against anyone, anywhere. The fact that a terrorist organization may have only local grievances and may not directly imperil the U.S. has never been thought a reason to exclude it from the list.

Fox News has further reported about another rationale of Clinton apologists: Hillary did not want to raise Boko Haram's profile and assist its recruiting which, they reason, would be the effect of designation by the Great Satan. That is ridiculous. The main point of having the list and the sanctions that accompany a terrorist designation is to

weaken the organization by depriving of it assets and material support. The logic of what Clinton supporters are claiming is that U.S. counterterrorism law—much of which was put in place by the administration of Bill Clinton—does more harm than good. Does anyone think they really believe that?

What happened here is obvious, although the commentariat is loath to connect the dots. Boko Haram is an Islamic-supremacist organization. Ms. Clinton, like the Obama administration more broadly, believes that appeasing Islamists—avoiding actions that might give them offense, slamming Americans who provoke them—promotes peace and stability. See Egypt for a good example of how well this approach is working.

Furthermore, if you are claiming to have “decimated” al Qaeda, as the Obama administration was claiming to have done in the runup to the 2012 election, the last thing you want to do is add jihadists to the terror list—or beef up security at diplomatic posts in jihadist hot spots or acknowledge that jihadists rioting in Cairo or jihadist attacks in Benghazi are something other than “protests” inspired by “an Internet video.”

It is very simple. Most of us on the national-security right recognize that Islamic supremacism is an ideology rooted in Muslim scripture—a strict, literal, ancient interpretation of Muslim scripture, that is. Essentially, it advocates the adoption of shari’a, Islam’s legal code and societal framework. It is not the only way of construing Muslim scripture.

And I add, fortunately.
He said:

And we certainly hope that more benign constructions become dominant, but Islamic supremacism is far more mainstream than the West likes to admit, particularly in the Middle East and growing swaths of Africa. It is an ideology that endorses violent jihad, the treatment of women as chattel, sex slavery, child marriages, and the horrible stuff that outfits like Boko Haram are into. Even though these organizations—quite naturally—terrorize locally, their aspirations are global, and they are a threat to us because their ideology unites them and regards the West as the enemy.

The left, by contrast, seems to believe that “Islamists”—which are adherents of Islamic supremacism—are motivated not by an ideology derived from scriptural commands, but by American policies that promote national defense, pursue U.S. interests, and regard Israel as a key ally. Indeed, progressives like Ms. Clinton are anti-antiterrorists in the sense that they portray the national security right as a greater threat than Islamic supremacism.

Ms. Clinton and her cohort do not deny that they are terrorists motivated by Islam, but they see terrorists and Islamists as separate categories, not united by single ideology.

□ 1330

Anyway, the article goes on and makes very clear that there are too many in America who think they will just beat up on conservatives, beat up on Republicans, beat up on conservatives who have the same ideas about marriage that Barack Obama did during the campaign of 2008, that John F. Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, people that were considered liberal did in prior years, to beat up on Americans who hold those same beliefs in the Bible. It is easier to beat up on conservatives because we are not going to kill you. We will argue with you. We will get frustrated with you.

But real courage is found in people like Ms. Hirsi Ali who know that her life and their lives are at risk every day, every minute of every day because, to this supremacist ideology, provoking words are not only a defense, but they are a reason to kill people, to brutalize them unmercifully.

And then we have this article from May 7 by Patrick Goodenough from CNSNews.

A man displays copies of several local newspapers during a demonstration calling on the government to rescue the kidnapped schoolgirls outside defense headquarters in Abuja on Tuesday, May 6, 2014.

Secretary of State John Kerry, on Wednesday, underlined the issue of the poverty as a recruitment tool for extremist groups like Boko Haram, although analysts and Nigerian officials have for months been reporting that the organization is forcibly conscripting civilians, including children, into its ranks.

During his recent Africa trip, leaders had told him that much of the challenge in confronting violent extremist groups like Boko Haram lies in fighting poverty, Kerry said at a Council of the Americas conference in Washington. “They all talked about poverty and the need to alleviate poverty, and that much of this challenge comes out of this poverty where young people are grabbed at an early stage, proffered a little bit of money,” he said. “Their minds are bended, and then the money doesn’t matter anymore. They’ve got the minds, and they begin to direct them into these very extreme endeavors.”

The Islamist terrorist group has waged a violent campaign against Nigerian Christians and government targets since 2009, but shot to global prominence in recent weeks with its kidnapping of more than 200 schoolgirls in the country’s northeastern Borno State. Its leader has described them as “slaves” and is threatening to sell them or “marry” them off.

In a new attack this week, as many as 300 people were reportedly killed.

But it is interesting. This follows the Obama administration’s ideology campaign rhetoric: Gee, we are not at war with radical Islam. The real problem here is poverty. If we can eliminate poverty, then we can eliminate radical Islam. And that flies in the face of the facts.

People that have looked under the surface at all are aware Osama bin Laden was wealthy. Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, who is credited with planning the 9/11, not tragedy, as might be said here, but murders of thousands of Americans and is proud of it, and he has said in his own pleadings that he, himself, prepared and that have been declassified: If our efforts on 9/11 caused you terror, then praise be to Allah. And he points out in his pleadings that it is Allah who has commanded them to be at war and kill people, such as Christians and Jews—Jews

because they are vermin and, as Muslim Brothers have said, are descended from apes and pigs.

But Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, in his pleading, points out that also it is fine to kill Christians because they believe in a Holy Trinity. They believe and say that God had a Son, Jesus. And Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, in his pleading, points out the verse in the Koran that there is no authorization to combine anyone or anything with Allah; and, therefore, if you do that, as Christians do, believing in the Holy Trinity, believing that Jesus is the Son of God, then that justifies capital punishment, killing you, torturing, whatever they care to do, because, under their way of thinking, you are worthy of death.

Well, because of the approach of Secretary Clinton’s State Department and of this administration, when the Egyptian people went to the streets by the millions—the estimates, 33 million. Even 20 million would have been larger than any protest in the history of the world. Morsi only claimed to have gotten around 13 million votes to be President. There were many who believed with all their hearts and had evidence, they say, that he got the vote by fraud. But threats were made behind the scenes: If you contest this election, people will die, and we will burn this country down.

Well, when the Egyptian people—the moderate Muslims, the Christians, the Jews, the secularists—had had enough of radical Islam, they rose up and demanded Morsi’s removal, as he continued to usurp more and more power not given to him under the constitution. And since the constitution didn’t allow for impeachment, the only thing the people could do was rise up before he got the kind of power Chavez had in Venezuela. Because when a dictator begins pulling power into himself, you have got to stop him early, or it will cost so many more lives.

And that is why this was one of the banners that Egyptian protesters held up. On one half, an American flag with a green checkmark; on the other half, they had our great President’s face with a red x. What they were saying and what they made clear in other banners and statements was that this administration is supporting the radical Islamists, and that we moderate Muslims, we Christians, Jews, secularists, we don’t want the Muslim Brotherhood, these radicals that have been properly classified as a terrorist organization.

And this administration has kowtowed repeatedly, just as Brandeis University did, to the Council on American-Islamic Relations, CAIR, who were cited by a U.S. district judge and upheld by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals as being a front organization. They had plenty of evidence to support that they were a front organization for the Muslim Brotherhood and were related and working with the Holy Land Foundation, as it supported terrorism.

It is time Americans woke up. The Egyptians certainly woke up as they raised their hands and said: We don't want radical Islam.

Now, I don't agree with this, but this is what the Egyptians were marching around Egypt with. And why would they say Obama supports terrorism? It is because the United States, under this administration, supported Morsi, supported the Muslim Brotherhood, and the Egyptian people had had enough, and they decried anyone in the United States that was supporting these terrorists.

And as some of us travel around the Middle East, moderate Muslim leaders say: Why are you not helping us in the war against terrorism anymore? You are helping the bad guys. You helped the al Qaeda-backed rebels in Libya.

And as I speak, there are training camps in Libya, like there were in Afghanistan before we went in with less than 500 Americans. But we helped the Northern Alliance Muslims take out the radical Islamic Taliban.

My friend is coming to the floor. He and I have traveled around those parts, and he had been engaged with many moderate Muslims in fighting the Russians, even, back before my predecessor Charlie Wilson was in Congress.

I am very proud to consider him a friend. I am proud of the efforts we have made to reach out to our allies. It was my friend from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) who introduced me to Massoud and General Dostum and so many of the moderate Muslims that just want out from under the oppression that radical Islam brings.

So, Mr. Speaker, as we conclude this week, I want to encourage those in Egypt who are standing up to radical Islam. I want to encourage universities to stand up against radical Islam and have the courage to recognize moderate Muslims who will stand up and have the courage to speak up against the real war on women in this world. And it is not by conservatives. It is by radical Islam.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOHMERT. My time is about expired, but I will certainly yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I would like to note for the gentleman—and I am sure we will have your support—that the gentlewoman from California, LORETTA SANCHEZ, and myself today are starting a Support Egypt Caucus, which will be aimed at supporting General el-Sisi in his fight to make sure radical Islam does not take over Egypt and thus threaten the entire stability of the world.

Mr. GOHMERT. And I greatly appreciated being with you and Ms. SANCHEZ in Egypt. And my dear friend from California knows good and well, I am totally on board. Count me in.

And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

MEDICAL MARIJUANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HUDSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue that currently affects more than half the States in our Nation, and that is the inconsistency between Federal and State laws pertaining medical marijuana. Yes, Mr. Speaker, a majority of our Nation's States—Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Washington, as well as the District of Columbia—all have some form of medical marijuana law on the books. Of course this means that these States allow their residents to engage in activities that are expressly prohibited by the Federal Government. To be exact, there are already 26 States that allow doctors to recommend the medical use of marijuana or its derivatives, and many more States are expected to take the step and do the same thing in the near future.

Importantly, the States listed are not dominated by conservatives or liberals. This isn't a Republican or a Democrat issue. Massachusetts, Alaska, Mississippi, and Oregon are hardly the same, politically speaking, in their legislature. Politically speaking, they are not the same. But their legislators and their residents all have recognized the same reality, and that is the potential medical benefits of marijuana and marijuana's derivatives, and they believe that these derivatives and the benefits of marijuana should not be denied to their people.

Unfortunately, however, the Federal Government continues to list marijuana and its derivatives as a schedule I substance, putting it in the same category as heroin, LSD, and other hard drugs.

I have long supported rescheduling marijuana so that it can be researched, prescribed, and used by legitimate health care professionals. But multi-administrations, both Republican and Democrat alike, have refused to seriously talk about this topic. Instead, a heavy-handed, emotion-based policy continues.

Evidence suggesting that the Federal Government ought to allow the use of marijuana for medical purposes has never had the serious discussion that it deserves. Many desperate patients have defied the Federal Government's blanket ban on the use of marijuana as a remedy for numerous ailments.

The absurdity of this ban was brought home to me over a decade ago when my mother, depressed after undergoing surgery, lost her appetite and was requiring me to spoon-feed her.

When I learned that medical marijuana might give her the appetite she needed and, yes, raise her spirits, the illegality of this herb was abundantly clear to me as I was there seeing my mother in the hospital bed, seeing how my mother had lost her appetite and seeing how her spirits were so low, knowing that perhaps marijuana, if the doctor had so ordered, would have been something that could have helped her and helped other people's mothers and children who were suffering the same situation.

□ 1345

The significance of changing—or at least altering—this prohibition could no longer be ignored by me when I was confronted by this over a decade ago. Since that time, the public's interest and support for medical marijuana has increased dramatically. As I mentioned, over half the States allow people with serious illnesses to use marijuana and/or its derivatives for medical purposes.

Recent polls show that the vast majority of the American people support the medical efficacy and use of marijuana for medical purposes: 77 percent according to Pew, 81 percent according to the ABC News poll, and a whopping 85 percent according to a FOX News poll last year. Just as interesting, 60 percent of the American people believe that the Federal Government should not prosecute people who are acting in accordance with State medical marijuana laws, and 72 percent think government efforts to enforce marijuana laws cost more than they are worth. Surprise, surprise, almost three-quarters of Americans believe that the cost of enforcing marijuana laws is far heavier than the benefits of having those laws enforced or having those laws on the books. All those numbers include majorities of both Republicans, Democrats, and, yes, it includes a majority of Independents, as well.

What is the driving force behind this surge of support for a change in Federal policy? It is the realization by patients, researchers, and physicians that marijuana and its derivatives may offer enormous relief to numerous patients. For example, last year, the famous physician, Sanjay Gupta, released—who is a very prominent physician—released a documentary film in which he explored many of the benefits of medical marijuana. Like so many Americans, he is a relatively new convert to this position. I quote:

We have been terribly and systematically misled for nearly 70 years in the United States, and I apologize for my own role in that.

This is what the doctor said in his documentary.

His documentary explores a number of cases in which patients who have various environmental neurological disabilities were helped by marijuana. Anyone who watches this documentary will see the positive effect that marijuana and its derivatives can have on ailing patients. Dr. Gupta is not alone