

Now, we are subjecting Malaysian exporters to a withering analysis, and their dependence on the U.S. market is now in jeopardy. I would hope that the Government of Egypt would think twice before that same kind of analysis applies to their own exports. For us here, the message should go forth to the Malaysian Government: Your exports are now at risk, and jobs which depend on the U.S. market are in jeopardy. Continue down this road, and you continue down a road of unemployment for Malaysian jobs.

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO).

Ms. BORDALLO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time, and I rise in support of House Resolution 409. I too want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues. We should speak out against anti-Semitic and prejudice comments made by any leader of the world, or anyone for that matter.

Just this past weekend, I met with the Jewish community of Guam and shared with them my wonderful impressions of my recent visit to Israel. Guam is located in the Asia-Pacific area, and I am very concerned, Madam Speaker, with intolerance or any kind of racism in our region of the world.

Ms. BERKLEY. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and before I yield time back to the majority to close, I would like to thank the majority whip, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the minority whip, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CANTOR), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for helping to move this legislation to the floor and helping to ensure its quick passage.

I am pleased this was handled in a bipartisan manner, and I thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for their assistance. I also want to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) as well.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LEACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. In conclusion, let me first thank the gentlewoman from Nevada for her tremendous leadership on this issue. Second, let me, in a broad way, stress that philosophically the three great monotheistic religions of the world, Christianity, Judaism, and Islam are each rooted in the Ten Commandments. They embrace the Ten Commandments. And the Ten Commandments, above anything else, outline how we should live together in society; and they are doctrines of love and compassion, not hatred and revenge.

One of the things we are all going to have to think through in all societies is how we emphasize what brings us together and not what tears us apart. Fundamentally, what is of deep con-

cern to this body is that a leader of a great Muslim country, a country with which we are very close, a leader who is considered one of the most modern leaders in the Muslim world, has uttered words that, from an American perspective, seem out of context with the times, with good judgment, and with decency.

What we have to emphasize to our friends, as well as to ourselves, is that we are going to have to think through differences in the world in such ways that we can reach compromise, based on a set of feelings that bring us together. Unfortunately, these remarks seem to move in the other direction.

It is extremely unusual—not unprecedented but virtually unprecedented—that the Congress of the United States would deal with a resolution about the words of a head of state of another democracy, a country which we admire, yet we are obligated to do just that today because we want to bring the world together.

So we say to Dr. Mahathir, we hope you repent and think through these words. We also say that we are willing to listen to differences of judgment, but we want to listen to differences of judgment that are based on decency in values, not in intolerance of views. It is this decency of values that we want to emphasize at this time.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I rise with great concerns over this legislation—both over its content and what it represents. First, I think it is absurd that the U.S. Congress believes it has the responsibility and authority to rectify the inappropriate statements of individuals in foreign countries. Have we moved beyond meddling in the internal affairs of foreign countries—as bad as that is—to even meddling in the very thoughts and words of foreign leaders and citizens? It is the obligation of the U.S. Congress to correct the “wrong thoughts” of others that have nothing to do with the United States? Additionally, is it our place to demand that other sovereign states, such as the members of the European Union, react as we say they must to certain international events?

More troubling than what is stated in this legislation, however, is the kind of thinking that this approach represents. The purpose of this legislation is to punish inappropriate thoughts and speech—to free debate on difficult topics and issues. In this, it contains a whiff of totalitarian thinking. This legislation advances the disturbing idea that condemnatory speech that does not explicitly incite violence is nevertheless inherently dangerous. It asserts that even debating controversial topics inevitably leads to violence. This is absurd on its face: it is only debate that leads us to come to understandings over controversial topics without violence. That is why nations engage in diplomacy.

Those who feel aggrieved over an issue can either broach the issue through discussion and debate or they can attempt to address the grievance through the barrel of a gun. Which is preferable? I think the answer is self-evident. Once persuasion is taken from the realm of possibility, the only approach left to address grievances is violence.

Is the prime minister of Malaysia wrong in his statements? Debate him. Invite him to one

of the various multilateral gatherings with someone who disagrees with him and have a debate and discussion over the issue. This approach is much more likely to result in a peaceful resolution of the dispute than what we are doing here: a blanket condemnation and a notice that certain difficult issues are not subject to any inappropriate thoughts or statements. This is chilling for a nation that prides itself on its tradition of protecting even the most distasteful of speech.

Dr. Mahathir has long been known for his statements on the Middle East. His views are no secret. Yet even President Bush, who invited Prime Minister Mahathir to Washington in May, 2003, chose the path of debate over blanket condemnation. President Bush said at a joint press conference that, “we’ll also talk about the Middle East, and I look forward to hearing from the Prime Minister on the Middle East. So we’ll have a good discussion.” Abandoning our beliefs and traditions—especially those regarding the right to hold and express even abhorrent thoughts and ideas—when it comes to our foreign relations is hardly the best way to show the rest of the world the strength of our system and way of life.

A careful reading of the prime minister’s speech did not find any explicit calls for violence. Actually, Dr. Mahathir called for Muslims around the world to cease using violence to seek their goals. He stated, “is there no other way than to ask our young people to blow themselves up and kill people and invite the massacre of more of our own people?” Also, he advises against “revenge” attacks and urges Muslims to “win [the] hearts and minds” of non-Muslims including “Jews...who do not approve of what the Israelis are doing.” While we may agree or disagree with the cause that Dr. Mahathir espouses, the fact that he calls for non-violent means to achieve his goals is to be commended rather than condemned. This is not to agree with every aspect of his address—and certainly not to agree with some of the ridiculous statements contained therein—but rather to caution against the kind of blanket condemnation that this legislation represents. Do we not also agree with his words that Muslim violence in the Middle East has been counterproductive? President Bush himself in May invited Dr. Mahathir to the White House to, in the president’s words, “publicly thank the Prime Minister for his strong support in the war against terror.”

I strongly believe that we need to get out of the business of threatening people over what they think and say and instead trust that our own principles, freedom and liberty, can win out in the marketplace of ideas over bigotry and hate. When the possibility of persuasion is abandoned, the only recourse for the aggrieved is violence. Haven’t we seen enough of this already?

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I rise to strongly condemn the hateful anti-Semitic slurs made by Malaysian Prime Minister Mahathir Mohammad in his October 16 address to the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

In his address, Prime Minister Mohammad called Israel, and I quote, “the enemy allied with the most powerful nations.” He also said, and again I quote, that “the Jews rule the world by proxy” and that “the Muslims will forever be oppressed and dominated by the Europeans and the Jews.”