

bargaining provisions which I have committed to drop, as has the Speaker.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, finally, again, I want the record spread with how much I appreciate this. I know the families of 9/11 appreciate Democrats and Republicans coming together and agreeing to complete this legislation, which we will complete very quickly.

The bill (H.R. 1), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

#### WAR ON TERROR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. KYL. Mr. President, most of the activity with regard to the terrorist plot in Great Britain occurred while we were on our breaks back home. I wanted to briefly discuss that today.

It seems to me that the terror plots in Great Britain must serve as a wake-up call to those of us in the United States who perhaps have been too complacent about the terrorist threat. These plots remind us of the dangers we really face each and every day, and we need to employ all possible intelligence and follow-up action in order to stop the attacks and roll back these terrorist groups.

The war against terrorists and on the radical ideologies that drive terrorism will go on and is going to go on for a long time, and attacks will not occur every day. So we have to remain resolute in the face of this long-term threat, never allowing temporary respites from violence to tempt us into thinking the terrorists have stopped recruiting and plotting.

Abroad we must confront the challenges not just of terrorist networks but of states like Iran and Syria that provide funds and equipment for the terrorists. At home we have to have adequate intelligence to find, monitor, and disrupt terrorist cells that could strike at any time. It requires vigilance and cooperation among many enforcement entities and, importantly, the support of the American people. Against this threat, to say "out of sight, out of mind" can have no place.

Now, the first point I would like to make today is that as the plot in Great Britain revealed, this is not about grievances. This is about ideology.

There are those at home who are members of what is called the Blame America First crowd, which was a term coined by my friend, the late Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick, who say the Islamists hate us because of what we do. They allegedly hate us because we don't do enough to fight poverty, because of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, because of Iraq, or because of the latest Danish cartoon, or whatever. Of course, this is nonsense.

The radical ideology that spawns this terrorism has nothing to do with such grievances or poverty. The perpetra-

tors of the plots in Great Britain were doctors, not individuals radicalized by unemployment or poverty-stricken slums. These plots certainly were not the result of British policy. They unfolded on the very day that Gordon Brown, a critic of Britain's roles in the 2003 invasion of Iraq, took office. Nor did they have anything to do with American policy. From what we know of the individuals involved, it appears the motivation was the same as all of the other acts of terrorism in the name of militant Islam.

This radical doctrine had its roots in the early 20th century and gained momentum through the writings of radical Islamists such as Sayyid Qutb in the 1950s and 1960s, long before the Iraq war. It has everything to do with the hatred of our values, our freedoms, all that we stand for, and we see the hatred in attacks that go back several decades.

Review them: The 1979 takeover of our Embassy in Tehran; the 1983 Hezbollah bombing of the Marine barracks in Beirut; the 1993 bombing of the World Trade Center; the 1996 bombing of Khobar Towers; the 1998 Embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania; the 2000 attack on the USS *Cole*; September 11, 2001, and all of the attacks since then, including Beslan, Madrid, London, and elsewhere. In every case, the rationale was the same—advancement of the radical ideology of militant Islam; a perversion of the faith, to be sure, but based on their concept of the faith nonetheless.

The sheer evil of the acts and the perpetrators shocks our souls, especially because it is allegedly grounded in religion. People trained as doctors—those who are supposed to value and preserve life—were at the center of the plot in Great Britain to destroy innocent life.

We in the West, who believe in reason and rationality, have trouble comprehending the mentality of radical Islam and those who subscribe to it. But we need to understand it, to call it what it is, and not too shrink from this honesty because the terrorists and their sympathizers hide behind a great religion. Importantly, we must not seek to rationalize and explain the views and the behavior of our enemies through our values and experiences. Militant Islam seeks not to change our policies but to destroy our very way of life and replace it with a Taliban-like society ruled by Sharia law and its enforcers. Militant Islam has declared war on the West—be very clear about it. It is fundamentally at odds with freedom, with democracy, with the inherent humanity of the individual, with critical thinking, and rational decisionmaking, not to mention all other religious beliefs.

While it might be fueled by grievances, it is not caused by the West but, rather, by the very backwardness and ideological rigidity that they would impose on others.

The second point is this: We should be clear that militant Islam, though

bound together by common ideology, comes in various stripes, including al-Qaida, responsible for 9/11 and which may have inspired the recent terror plots in Great Britain; Iran's radical regime, whose leader promises to "wipe Israel off the map" and envisions a "world without America," and which is speeding toward the development of nuclear weapons; the Wahabbism of Saudi Arabia, which is funding radical ideology in mosques and madrassas all over the world, including here at home; groups like the Muslim Brotherhood, which cloaks its radical ideology in a new veneer of tolerance while its activities support terrorist groups like Hamas and many others.

But state-sponsored testing of the United States and the West is also in full force. Iran is testing our resolve in Iraq where it is using its Revolutionary Guard and its terrorist client, Hezbollah, to train and arm those who are fighting our soldiers. Iran is testing the resolve of U.S. and NATO forces in Afghanistan where it is providing support to al-Qaida. Syria is testing our resolve in Lebanon, where it is assassinating anti-Syrian officeholders while serving as a conduit for the weapons that are rearming Hezbollah. Hamas is testing our resolve in Gaza where it launched a successful coup against the Palestinian Authority of Mahmoud Abbas.

Third, successful American response depends on resolve and support of the American people. We must understand the nature of our enemy and its ideology, confronting them head-on, with full confidence in the rightness of our cause. This is not a matter of moral relativism. We must not allow ourselves to be gagged by faux political correctness. We can say that these terrorists were bound together and motivated by a hateful ideology grounded in their interpretation of Islam without condemning any other Muslims. We must not embrace groups who tell us they stand for peace without renouncing violence in the name of Islam. We must not reward evil with retreat from any of the battlefields where the fight is raging, including Iraq and Afghanistan. And we must be willing to support intelligence and enforcement activities, including incarcerating those who have plotted against or attacked us.

As we celebrate the success of protecting our homeland since 9/11 and preventing loss of life from the attempted attacks in Great Britain, let our words and actions prove that we have not forgotten the resolve that we displayed six years ago today, and let us not fall into the temptation of blaming ourselves for the actions of those who, inspired by hatred, have declared war on us. It is not grievances which have spawned this hatred and these attacks but, rather, the hateful ideology of militant Islam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the record a New York Post op-ed by Irshad Manji, dated July 9, 2007.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Post, July 8, 2007]

ISLAM'S PROBLEM

(By Irshad Manji)

Last week, two very different Brits had their say about the latest terrorist plots in their country. Prime Minister Gordon Brown told the nation that "we have got to separate those great moderate members of our community from a few extremists who wish to practice violence and inflict maximum loss of life in the interests of a perversion of their religion." By contrast, a former jihadist from Manchester wrote that the "real engine of our violence" is "Islamic theology."

Months ago, this young man informed me that as a militant he raised most of his war chest not from obscenely rich Saudis, but from middle-class Muslim dentists living in the United Kingdom. There's sobering lesson here for the new prime minister.

So far, those arrested in connection to the car bombs are, by and large, medical professionals. The seeming paradox of the privileged seeking to avenge grievance has many champions of compassion scratching their heads. Aren't Muslim martyrs supposed to be poor, disenfranchised, and resentful about both?

We should have been stripped of that breezy simplification by now. The 9/11 hijackers came from means. Mohamed Atta, their ringleader, earned an engineering degree. He then moved to the West, pursuing his post-graduate studies in Germany. No servile goat-herder, that one.

In 2003, I interviewed Mohammad Al Hindi, the political leader of Islamic Jihad in Gaza. A physician himself, Dr. Al Hindi explained the difference between suicide and martyrdom. "Suicide is done out of despair," the good doctor diagnosed. "But most of our martyrs today were very successful in their earthly lives."

In short, it's not what the material world fails to deliver that drives suicide bombers. It's something else. And, time and again, the very people committing these acts have articulated what that something else is: their religion.

Consider Mohammad Sidique Khan, the teaching assistant who master minded the July 7, 2005 transit bombings in London.

In a taped testimony, Khan railed against British foreign policy. But before bringing up Western imperialism, he emphasized that "Islam is our religion" and "the Prophet is our role model." Khan gave priority to God, not to Iraq.

Now take Mohammed Bouyeri, the Dutch-born Moroccan Muslim who murdered Amsterdam film director Theo van Gogh. Bouyeri pumped several bullets into van Gogh's body. Knowing that multiple shots would finish off his victim, why didn't Bouyeri stop there? Why did he pull out a blade to decapitate van Gogh?

Again, we must confront religious symbolism. The blade is an implement associated with 7th-century tribal conflict. Wielding it as a sword becomes a tribute to the founding moment of Islam. Even the note stabbed into van Gogh's corpse, although written in Dutch, had the unmistakable rhythms of Arabic poetry.

Let's credit Bouyeri with honesty: At his trial he proudly acknowledged acting from "religious conviction."

Despite integrating Muslims far more adroitly than most of Europe, North America isn't immune. Last year in Toronto, police nabbed 17 young Muslim men allegedly plotting to blow up Canada's parliament

buildings and behead the prime minister. They called their campaign "Operation Badr," a reference to the Battle of Badr, the first decisive military triumph achieved by the Prophet Mohammed. Clearly, the Toronto 17 drew inspiration from religious history.

For people with big hearts and good will, this has to be uncomfortable to hear. But they can take solace that the law-and-order types have a hard time with it, too. After rounding up the Toronto suspects, police held a press conference and didn't once mention Islam or Muslims. At their second press conference, police boasted about avoiding those words.

If the guardians of public safety intended their silence to be a form of sensitivity, they instead accomplished a form of artistry, airbrushing the role that religion plays in the violence carried out under its banner.

They're in fine company: Moderate Muslims do the same.

While the vast majority of Muslims aren't extremists, a more important distinction must start being made—the distinction between moderate Muslims and reform-minded ones. Moderate Muslims denounce violence in the name of Islam—but deny that Islam has anything to do with it.

By their denial, moderates abandon the ground of theological interpretation to those with malignant intentions—effectively telling would-be terrorists that they can get away with abuses of power because mainstream Muslims won't challenge the fanatics with bold, competing interpretations.

To do so would be to admit that religion is a factor. Moderate Muslims can't go there.

Reform-minded Muslims say it's time to admit that Islam's scripture and history are being exploited. They argue for re-interpretation precisely to put the would-be terrorists on notice that their monopoly is over. Re-interpreting doesn't mean re-writing. It means re-thinking words and practices that already exist—removing them from a seventh-century tribal time warp and introducing them to a twenty first-century pluralistic context.

Un-Islamic? God no. The Koran contains three times as many verses calling on Muslims to think, analyze, and reflect than passages that dictate what's absolutely right or wrong. In that sense, reform minded Muslims are as authentic as moderates, and quite possibly more constructive.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

#### HEALTH CARE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, like all of us in the Senate, I have just come back from a great week in Oregon. We own the summer. It is just wonderful to be home during these warm days and cool nights. Other parts of the country may have beautiful months other times in the year, but nobody can beat an Oregon summer.

I want to talk a little bit about what I heard as I moved around the State. What I heard again and again is that folks at home want the Senate to change course in Iraq, and they want us to fix health care. We are going to start on the first item today in a few minutes when we go to the Defense authorization bill. I believe very strongly that we don't support our courageous troops in Iraq by forcing them to referee a civil war there. I think it will

become clear this week that there is growing and bipartisan interest in the Senate to set a specific deadline to force the Iraqis to make the decisions for themselves about how they will govern their Nation.

So what I want to do is talk for a few minutes about health care—something I know the President pro tempore of the Senate has a great passion about as well, and certainly folks are talking about today—because the need to fix health care is so great. Of course, many have flocked to the Michael Moore movie as well, generating additional debate about this issue.

The first matter on the health care agenda to come up is going to be the Children's Health Insurance Program. In my view, passing a strong program for kids is about erasing a moral blot on our Nation. It is unconscionable that millions of kids, youngsters in Rhode Island and Oregon and across the country, go to bed at night without good, quality, affordable health care. In a country as rich and strong as ours, as the majority leader, Senator REID, noted earlier this afternoon, clearly we can do this, and we can do it in a bipartisan way.

The Senate Finance Committee is not going to pass a children's health program that becomes a Trojan horse for government-run health care. That is not going to happen in the Senate Finance Committee. The Senate Finance Committee is going to work in a bipartisan way under the leadership of Senator BAUCUS, working with Senator GRASSLEY and Senator ROCKEFELLER and Senator HATCH, and I am very hopeful that there will be bipartisan agreement over the next few days that targets the desperately needy youngsters in our country and is responsibly funded. I am hopeful that will come together this week, and members of the Senate Finance Committee will be working throughout the week on a bipartisan basis to bring that about.

But it is also very clear, in my view, that the State Children's Health Insurance Program was not created to solve our Nation's health care crisis. In fact, I think when we get on the floor debating the children's health program, the Senate will see and the country will see that this debate illustrates how broken our health care system is. We are clearly spending enough money; we are just not spending it in the right places.

For example, for the amount of money we are spending this year, our country could go out and hire a doctor for every seven families in the United States and pay that doctor \$200,000 a year to care for seven families. Whenever I bring this up with the physicians, they always say: Ron, where do I go to get my seven families? So, clearly, we are spending enough money, and we are going to use the dollars even more efficiently, as the Senator from Rhode Island brings us his very constructive proposals as they relate to better use of health information technology.