rules and pass the bill, S. 278, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. CARTER, Hamilton, Catoosa, Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

\[1920\]

BRIAN A. TERRY MEMORIAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 2668) to designate the station of the United States Border Patrol located at 2136 South Naco Highway in Bisbee, Arizona, as the “Brian A. Terry Border Patrol Station.”

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the designees of the majority party from California (Mr. DENHAM) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed without amendment.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FORT HOOD SHOOTINGS: WORKPLACE VIOLENCE OR TERRORISM?

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

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, 13 adults and one unborn child were killed and 31 individuals were wounded in a shooting attack at Fort Hood, Texas, on November 5, 2009. Since that time, the Department of Defense has taken no steps to reward combat benefits to the casualties or even officially recognize the attack as a terrorist incident.

The House and Senate have included two reform measures in the NDAA, which we just passed, while additional attacks have been attempted by similar high-profile radical Islamic terrorists. It is past time for the government to deliver on this act.

Mr. Speaker, here we are almost 3 years later, and there’s been a recent report that has come out; and in that report, it references this incident of this slaughter of American troops on Fort Hood soil in Texas. It references that it should be taken up as part of workplace violence.

The Obama regime calls the Fort Hood shooting “workplace violence.”

Sure, it’s workplace violence: it’s where they work and it’s violence. But we have a concept of what workplace violence is. And your normal workplace violence is not preceded by a shout by the shooter, “God is great.”

It’s not in the American language. It’s not in the American culture. It’s not preceded by discussion by the alleged perpetrator. It’s alleged because he hasn’t been convicted yet. And we, in a free American world, take the position that all are innocent until proven guilty. So we will call him the “alleged” shooter.

But there’s a difference in reports by the Defense Department and by reports by the news media, reports by witnesses on the scene, reports by his fellow soldiers, reports by folks from Walter Reed Hospital where this Americanian-trained, military-trained doctor worked that he had advocated that the American soldier was wrong and that he was contrary, and he spoke and preached Islamic terrorism.

So your normal workplace violence, that’s not a part of the factor. Yet this is what happened in this case. Senator COLLINS on Wednesday blasted the Defense Department, and bless her for it, for classifying the Fort Hood massacre as workplace violence and suggested political correctness in placing it above the security of the Nation’s Armed Forces at home.

I’ve been talking about this now since the day after this happened. We can’t have a world where political correctness fails the criminal act. By its very nature, whether we’re talking about military law and the criminal relations in military law, we’re just talking about criminal acts in general, we have to be able to define them. Just to make the system work we have to be able to define them.

But more importantly, we owe a duty and a responsibility to the American soldier to call an event what it is and not try to put a smokescreen over it or spin what it is. I worry about the feelings of groups, because the definition is the definition. This man identified himself that he was committing this act in the name of “God is great” in Arabic. He acknowledged when questioned that it was part of his mission. He acknowledged that he had dealt with terrorist spokesmen in the past and that the concept came from his interaction with Awlaki and others.

So this guy is an Islamic terrorist. There’s no other way you can describe this gentleman.

But now years after the event as he sits in the Bell County Jail in Belton, Texas, we continue to have reports coming down from our Defense Department that the folks that are responsible for our soldiers and responsible for those who died in this incident want to downplay this to be treated as an incident of workplace violence with all the white bread connotation that that has. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

So let’s look at some of the evidence we have that connects this to Islamic terrorism, recognizing the November 5, 2009, attack on Fort Hood, Texas, as an act of radical Islamic terrorism and jihad.

\[1930\]

Anwar Awlaki connection. Now, Mr. Awlaki is no longer with us. We have taken that boy out. Yet the bottom line is, at the time this happened, they were directly connected.

This man preached, taught, and encouraged violence—Islamic terrorist violence: “Hasan’s presentations to the DOD on jihad justification.” He would argue with his fellow soldiers about the justification for jihad against the American military. Mr. Hasan was a member of the United States Army.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the part of Major Hasan; and I believe when this trial is held, the bottom line is, at the time this happened, we will call him the “alleged” shooter.

Mr. Speaker, here we are almost 3 years after the event as he sits in the Bell County Jail in Belton, Texas, we continue to have reports coming down from our Defense Department that the folks that are responsible for our soldiers and responsible for those who died in this incident want to downplay this to be treated as an incident of workplace violence with all the white bread connotation that that has. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

But now years after the event as he sits in the Bell County Jail in Belton, Texas, we continue to have reports coming down from our Defense Department that the folks that are responsible for our soldiers and responsible for those who died in this incident want to downplay this to be treated as an incident of workplace violence with all the white bread connotation that that has. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.

He was a major. He had been serving in the Medical Corps as a psychiatrist. He was trained with American taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, here we are almost 3 years after the event as he sits in the Bell County Jail in Belton, Texas, we continue to have reports coming down from our Defense Department that the folks that are responsible for our soldiers and responsible for those who died in this incident want to downplay this to be treated as an incident of workplace violence with all the white bread connotation that that has. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves.
the connotation is that this is just something that happened. It’s not something that just happened because, quite honestly, since that time, others have been caught who reportedly were trying to imitate this shooter, Mr. Hasan.

We introduced a bill, the Fort Hood Families Benefits Protection Act. It would award both military and civilian casualties of the Fort Hood attack with combat status to ensure full benefits and eligibility for the Purple Heart and Gold Star Families Benefits Protection Act. It would award the civilian award equivalence to the Secretary of Defense’s Defense of Freedom medal.

Now, why did I ask for that? Because there was a precedent for it. When they flew the plane into the Pentagon on 9/11, this is what was the finding of the Department of Defense—that it was an act of terrorism, and therefore they should be treated as combat casualties, and those two medals were awarded. This didn’t just come off the top of my head. It happened with the first terrorist attack in our country and with the second or third or whatever attack this one was.

When this man walked into that room, there were many people in civilian garb, and there were people in uniform. He went out of his way to shoot the people in uniform. The civilians who were injured were injured because of misfire or misdirection. As he walked down that line, his target was all of those soldiers who were doing nothing more than either coming back from being off post and out of the country—or wherever they’d been—or preparing for their next duty stations, wherever they may be going—Iraq or Afghanista. They were being processed and they were in this big room. He walked down the line, shooting everybody in uniform.

Now, when you’re killing our combat soldiers and when you’re crying out slogans of terrorism, you would think it’s a terrorist attack, and why shouldn’t these people who died in the line of duty be treated like those at the Pentagon who died in the line of duty?

In fact, except for what we were able to put together in circumstantial evidence after the fact, at the time of the incident, we had no idea who flew that plane into the Pentagon. We just made an educated guess. In this case, before this shooting started, the guy identified—had identified himself in his uniform. For some reason, in this world of political correctness, someone has the idea that this is good for the morale of our military soldiers or that it’s good for something as, I think, the Chief of Staff, when this happened: Oh, this is sure going to hurt our Islamic outreach program.

Whether it’s good for that or not, I hold nothing against the Islamic people nor does anybody at Fort Hood; but we hold a lot against Islamic people who kill soldiers, and the Department of Defense should have the guts to step up and to stand up for these soldiers.

I see my good friend and colleague from Texas, former Judge LOUIE GOHMERT, has joined me here.

Congressman GOHMERT, I yield such time as you may require.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend, and I appreciate his taking the time to discuss this matter of national security.

I have the quote directly here from Army Chief of Staff General George W. Casey, Jr., who was the Chief of Staff at the time of the Fort Hood attack. He came to me, and he had this prepared quote to give.

Mr. CARTER. He was Chief of Staff of the Army.

Mr. GOHMERT. Chief of Staff of the Army.

Mr. CARTER. Correct.

Mr. GOHMERT. This is a quote that, obviously, he and those helping him had prepared to give in response to 14 people being killed. We know one was an unborn child and that one of the people was a female—a female soldier. So here is the quote that they had prepared after 13 of his soldiers lay either dying or dead at Fort Hood:

‘I’m concerned that this increased speculation could cause a backlash against some of our Muslim soldiers. . . . Our diversity, not only in our Army but in our country, is a strength; and as horrific as this tragedy was, if our diversity becomes a casualty, I think that’s worse.’
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This is a general who is charged with leading soldiers and directing soldiers in war and in battle with an avowed enemy. Well, we have an enemy who has sworn to be at war with us. And one of those enemies was Major Hasan at Fort Hood, who went off on a shooting spree.

Now unfortunately, our leaders did not bother to monitor the security of our own soldiers, such that when Major Hasan made actual pronouncements in advance that he could not be deployed and be a Muslim because, in his interpretation of the Koran—thankfully it’s not all of our Muslim soldiers in the U.S. military that have this interpretation—but his interpretation was that he could not be deployed because that might require him to kill Muslims in a foreign country without cause. And under the belief of some Muslims, like Major Hasan, if he were to kill a Muslim without cause—for example, in his way of thinking, it is appropriate cause, say, if a Muslim were to become a Christian, then that is a cause, in his mind, worthy of killing the individual, if they committed this horrible crime, in his mind, according to the Koran, of becoming a Christian. That’s worth killing them for. But since he couldn’t be sure that in a foreign country in a battle with Muslims that might require him to shoot someone who had not committed apostasy and not committed some act that justified murder under the Koran, then he could not be deployed. And if he were deployed, he would have to kill American soldiers to avoid having to go kill soldiers overseas.

It is interesting because you would think that the military would be concerned about this, but we would try to make sure that this incident that happened at Fort Hood would not happen again. You would think that when this private showed up on al Jazeera in uniform and told al Jazeera basically the same thing, Major Hasan had, that people like General Casey would be concerned. But apparently, he was more concerned about our diversity than he was about the lives of his own soldiers.

So when you see this private on al Jazeera—and it’s not hard. You can go online and find this on YouTube, his interview—he spoke in English. But the story was done actually in the language that al Jazeera prefers, and it’s not in English. He was talking specifically about what Major Hasan did. And this is a line from al Jazeera, “I can’t both deploy and be a Muslim.” And we have the transcript of what he said, the transcript of the story. But basically, he was letting people like General Casey, that would bother to worry about the—weell, not General Casey, because he is worried about diversity, and the safety of his soldiers is secondary to that. But for those who are concerned, number one, about the safety of his soldiers, and making sure that their own soldiers are tantamount, in their minds, they would be concerned when you have another soldier saying the same things Major Hasan did before the killing spree.

So we know that there are people in our special ops, in our military that noted this, that saw this, that said, This is a guy we had better watch. But because the people at the top are more concerned about diversity than they are about their own soldiers, I mean, it’s bad enough that they put their lives on the line. They’re willing to do that in combat. But you would think that there would be more concern for their own safety in their own units.

Nothing was done about this private. And despite this Justice Department trying to vilify gun dealers whom it forced into making sales to criminals who carry guns across the border, and despite the efforts that were made to vilify gun dealers—and in fact, what they did was produce, pictures were produced of gun dealers out of the Fast and the Furious program—despite that, it was not General Casey, not one of his subordinates, not one of our own people in the military that reported this guy. No. Nothing was done, even though they knew he was ready to pull a Major Hasan, he could not be deployed, nothing was done. And it was not until he went to a gun dealer. The gun dealer became suspicious. The gun dealer reported this guy. Thank God we had some gun dealer who realized, We’ve got our own soldiers’ lives at stake here. He reported him.
Then locally he was dealt with and interdiction occurred, and he was not given the chance to kill the soldiers he wanted to, again at Fort Hood. Because if it weren't for the gun dealer and those intervening—not the military, not our intelligence, who surely monitored and could have stopped him—there was a soldier in uniform with the screaming eagle patch on his arm, and that is something we need to worry about.

But because we have become so politically correct, to the detriment and death of our own soldiers, nothing was done from intelligence, from State, from Justice. It took a local gun dealer to protect our soldiers at Fort Hood. And you wonder how many more times this is going to have to happen.

Now, is every Muslim that is involved in the United States military involved in this? Absolutely not. I went to the National Training Center in Fort Hood, a local imam for Fort Hood, a local imam for Fort Hood, those killed at Pearl Harbor, those killed in the Arizona, those killed in the ifritic attack, actually they were at their duty stations. They were at work and someone came and killed them. Therefore, apparently under the reasoning as applied at Fort Hood, those killed at Pearl Harbor may or may not be considered as having been killed in workplace violence. It was violent. It was their workplace. Therefore, our mental geniuses that decided Fort Hood was workplace violence could say that about Pearl Harbor.

Mr. CARTER. Don’t you wonder have we changed so much since the attack on Pearl Harbor that we don’t recognize an enemy attack on us and just want to stick our head in the sand and act like it didn’t happen?

Mr. GOHMERT. Yes. The interest is in the report from Time magazine. They are asking the question, and they state: The U.S. military just released a report—that is the first report—not once mentioning Major Hasan’s name or even discussing whether the killings had anything to do with his Muslim faith. The fort ignores the elephant in the room.

That’s what I said. And it’s true. It does ignore the elephant in the room. If before the first bullet is fired, a man shouts, Allahu Akhbar, that elephant is in the room. And all of the cover-up and all of the writing of the reports with reference to typical workplace violence, or treat it as workplace violence, it doesn’t make sense. It was an attack on American soldiers in uniform.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOHMERT. With regard to that very issue, we know that in the 9/11 Commission there were hundreds of mentions of Islam and of those type things that we know were involved. And again, we thank God that the vast majority of Muslims love this country like we do. They are not about to kill Christians, Jews; but there are those in the radical element that believe otherwise. And we ought to be able to talk about it. We now know that this administration has seen to such a purging of our training material for Defense Department, Intelligence, State, that in the current lexicon from which the FBI, our intelligence folks are trained, there are zero mentions of Islam, zero mentions of jihad, zero mentions of the very things that created the worst attack on American soil in American history.

And one of our own officers told me: We have been blinded in this war with those using terrorism. We’re not allowed to see our enemy. We’re not allowed to describe our enemy. We’re not allowed to talk about the real enemy. We’re just expected to protect America with our eyes closed and our mouths shut. That’s no way to protect America.
Mr. CARTER. This exhibit here is from the San Francisco Chronicle: Political Correctness on Fort Hood at the Pentagon. Political correctness is alive in the Pentagon. Witness the protecting the force lessons from Fort Hood. A Department of Defense report released shock of the November 5 shooting, if the report’s purpose was to craft lessons to prevent future attacks, how could they leave out radical Islam? Ignoring Hasan’s pro-terrorist Web postings, the report instead focuses on violence programs to prevent workplace violence such as the post office’s Going Postal program and the stress imposed on military health care providers.

Mr. GOHMERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. GOHMERT. There is an article dated February 9, 2010, in The Washington Times by Bill Gertz that says, the Army was warned about the jihadist threat in ’08. It says:

Almost 2 years before the deadly Fort Hood shooting by a radicalized Muslim officer, the U.S. Army was explicitly warned that jihadism—Islamic holy war—was a serious problem to personnel in the U.S., according to participants at a major Army-sponsored conference.

It references Patrick Poole, Army Lieutenant Colonel Joseph Myers, and Terri Wonder as individuals that participated. It says:

The shooting at a recruiting center in Little Rock, Arkansas, in June and the November shooting at Fort Hood, Texas, that killed 13 people have exposed the problem of the Army’s failure to recognize the nature of the domestic Islamic terrorist threat, Mr. Poole said.

The incidents have raised questions about whether the Army made any effort to “operationalize” the threat warnings from the 2008 conference and develop policies to counter the threats. “The answer quite clearly is no,” Mr. Poole said.

And then it goes on to discuss this whole problem, and Mr. Poole said:

I noted because of our lack of understanding of Islamic doctrines, Islamic jihad and my view that our counterintelligence function is broken, outdated, being usurped in some cases by public affairs and equal opportunity officials, we were going to get soldiers killed in America on our own bases for that preventative ignorance.

This is the kind of thing that should not be happening. This article was in 2010, before at least two other individuals had gone on Al Jazeera in uniform blasting our military and indicating they could not ever be deployed in a Muslim area.

It’s also worth noting that the term “Islamophobia,” that I’m sure is being generated right now about the two of us here talking about this issue, actually originated with the Organization of Islamic Conference, the OIC. They came up with the terms “Islamophobia” and “Islamophobe,” and there is an ongoing effort to brand anybody with attempts to identify those who have gone on Al Jazeera in uniform about killing Americans, terrorizing Americans as an Islamophobe or as having Islamophobia.

We know that there are places like Harvard where a professor from India who speaks about the attacks that are ongoing on his homeland in India by Muslim extremists and how that should be dealt with, he was fired because Islamic activists at Harvard do not believe we should have free speech anymore. And as I mentioned on this floor earlier this week, one of the 2005 10-year goals of the Muslim Brotherhood here in America is to subvert our Constitution to sharia law by 2015. That effort is ongoing.

And when they continue to brand professors, soldiers, and intelligence officers as Islamophobes and that we need laws to prevent people from describing radical jihadists who want to kill our own American people, as long as they’re not being where or allowed, then our First Amendment rights are being subverted to sharia law, and we’re well on our way to their meeting their 2015 goal as more and more good folks have been won over into this idea, this thought, that, gee, if you’re radical to the jihadists and radical Islamists, you’re the sick one and you need to be stopped.

This is an ongoing effort around the world, and we cannot allow it to overtake America. We should be able to recognize those wonderful, patriotic Muslims in America for who they are, but we should also be able to recognize and talk about those who want to kill and destroy our way of life for who they are. They’re radical Islamic jihadists.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman. You just referenced in your poster and showed us a picture of Mr. Abdo, the man that was saying he couldn’t go to war. That was back on July 28, 2011, after the workplace violence. Another soldier made the same claim, and Abdo was also referenced in this story.

More and more of these folks are stepping up that they can’t be deployed because they are Muslim and can’t kill Muslims, and they reference Hasan, this man who is sitting in the Bell County jail awaiting trial probably this spring and is, I understand it, awaiting trial on a death penalty case, a potential death penalty case. Everybody knew what it was when they attacked the Pentagon.

What happened to us that we decided when, in front of 50 witnesses, somebody shoots a bunch of people and we can’t recognize those that did it? Was it a surprise attack like Pearl Harbor. That was a premeditated murder like you and I have dealt with in the past with more witnesses than you could put on a stand. I mean, this is not going to be a hard case to prove because, fortunately, he didn’t kill everybody in the room. In fact, he left an awful lot of witnesses there to testify.

He is just lucky he didn’t get killed in an active shooter program that our two police officers used to respond effectively to his slaughter.

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, my friend the judge indicates he was lucky, unfortunately, in his perverted way of thinking. That also is a way of thinking that confounded Thomas Jefferson when he was negotiating with the Islamic Barbary pirates.

He actually believed he would have gone to paradise and had dozens of virgins at his disposal if he had been killed, so he doesn’t necessarily think of himself as lucky. Nor would those in Iran, once a nuclear weapon or nuclear weapons are assuredly procured, be any different. They would believe, if they were to go up with the nuclear weapon that they carried into some place where lots of Americans were or Israelis were, then they would be assured of instantly being transported to paradise. Some of us have a different view of what they would find when they meet their Maker after this life, and I think they’re going to be terribly surprised about what they see.

But our job and our oath is to our Constitution. It’s to provide for the common defense against all enemies, foreign and domestic. And when someone presents this kind of danger to our troops, it is just unfathomable that our military leaders would become so politically correct and so militarily neutered that they would not stand up for their own troops, for those whose care has been put under their service and attention.

I thank my friend for yielding.
Arabic while gunning down unarmed military personnel and civilians; Whereas Major Hasan is currently charged with murder of 13 and attempted murder of 32 United States citizens during that attack; And whereas the Department of Defense submitted correspondence to the United States Congress on the Office of Special Counsel’s finding that the failure to act in a timely manner with respect to the Fort Hood incident, and certainly in Iraq and Afghanistan. To have us be willing to soft-pedal what happened to them is an American tragedy, and I’m going to continue to talk about it. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

JOBS FOR AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader, Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, thank you for the opportunity this evening. I’m joined by my colleague from Ohio, MARCY KAPTUR.

I want to thank our colleague from Texas for the explanation he gave about the tragedy at Fort Hood. It was, indeed, an American tragedy, and we mourn their physical loss. No doubt that it is killing, not only Americans, but others around the world. And it is part of our task to find an appropriate way to deal with it. It’s also part of our task to appropriately recognize the tremendous sacrifice made by our soldiers, both here, as in the Fort Hood incident, and certainly in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Today marks a very, very special day in American history. It is the end of one of the great American tragedies, and that is the war in Iraq. No matter how we may think of this today, I think we can be very confident that this war of choice was, indeed, a very bad choice. More than 4,000 Americans have been killed in this war, and perhaps several times that number injured.

Physical injuries, we often see them just off the floor as these men and women return from their medical treatment at the Bethesda hospital, and we mourn their physical loss. The mental problems that our veterans have incurred after multiple deployments in Iraq will go on for years, as will the physical injuries. Post-traumatic stress syndrome is a major,