Mr. Speaker, as I listened to the comments that

preceded me in the Special Order that dealt with our involvement in

Iraq, certain thoughts came to mind that I think I would like to

present this evening prior to getting involved with the issue of

primary importance right now, or, I should say, not primary importance,

but the issue I had intended to bring forward. I will do that, but I

will do it subsequent to the thoughts I have had listening to our loyal

opposition.

We have heard for approximately an hour that there were a number of

things wrong with the intelligence reports that we received; that there

are problems that we now face in trying to pacify Iraq; and that as a

result of these things, there should be investigations. And a lot of

people's integrity has been called into question, not the least of

which the President of the United States.

There are many issues that I disagree with the President on, and I

have not been hesitant to express my opinions when I do disagree. But

on this issue of Iraq, let me just present a few ideas that may I hope

stimulate some thinking about whether or not we were right to do what

we did in Iraq.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, for all of us to think about what pundits

and political opponents would have said if in some time between, say,

1933, when Hitler took power in Germany, and 1939, when finally the

world decided to go to war against Hitler, or at least a good portion

of the world decided to go to war, what if at any point in time between

1933 and 1939 the United States and Great Britain and as many other

countries as would join us would have taken a very, very bold action?

And that action would have been preemptive. It would have been before

any sort of aggressive action had been taken by Germany and by Hitler

against the West, against the Allies, before Poland had been invaded,

even before Czechoslovakia. Could we imagine what would have happened

on this floor and throughout the world, really, in terms of the

reaction, if America and a group of nations had taken preemptive action

and stopped Hitler, if we had gone into Germany, if we had deposed

Hitler and attempted to bring about a different and truly democratic

regime?

Well, certainly there would have been an awful lot of second

guessing. Certainly there would have been people here on the floor of

the House talking about the fact that we really do not know for sure

whether V-1 and V-2 rockets were being developed. Maybe the hard

evidence would not have been available at the time. And so where were

we? Why were we doing such things and was it not against all rules of

engagement, was it not something that we should be challenging our

administration for and saying you did the wrong thing?

We did not have all of the very specific information that we needed

to make this decision. Could it be that we would have been questioning

whether or not Hitler's intention would have been to, in fact, bring

about the ``final solution'' for the Jews in the world?

All these things would have been speculative, certainly. We could not

have perhaps proven that that was his intent. We would have been

perhaps without all of the hard evidence to bring in front of the world

body to prove that the decision we made to preemptively act was right.

But if we had done so, just think about what would have been the

outcome of that decision and that action. Fifty million people, 50

million people died as a result of our unwillingness to take action.

National treasure, untold national treasure had to be expended; and, of

course, hundreds of thousands of American lives were lost to try and

stop him and stop the Axis powers after they made their intentions

perfectly clear.

Now, I think that there is a lesson to be learned here, and it is

that at some point in time it is imperative that the civilized world

take action and, in fact, take preemptive action to try to prevent an

occurrence similar to World War II. If we could have done that now,

knowing what was the outcome of World War II, knowing what it took to

actually stop him when we chose to finally get involved, who would

suggest that we should not have taken preemptive action?

Does anyone really believe that we should have waited knowing now

what we know? Does anybody believe that we should have waited for

Hitler and the Japanese empire to strike first? Well, we did. That is

history. And we know the outcome. So I will suggest to the body that

there was a great deal of evidence presented not just to the United

States but to many other countries and many other intelligence networks

around the world that would lead us to believe that there was a problem

in the making in Iraq. No one, not a single person has ever denied the

fact that Iraq was in the process of developing nuclear weaponry and

weapons of mass destruction; and, of course, we knew that they had used

similar weapons in the past. So that was not a question.

The question is would he have, would Saddam Hussein have actually

used those weapons had he gotten ahold of them? How long would it have

taken for Iraq to actually obtain those weapons? Those are questions we

do not know the answer to right now, but we can be fairly sure by all

of the empirical evidence that we have in front of us that they have

would have developed the weapons and that either he would have used

them or think of this, what if, what if those weapons became disposable

to the two sons of Saddam Hussein, Uday and Qusay? Does anybody really

believe that they would like to live in a world where those two guys

would have the ability to push the button?

Well, now they are gone. Saddam is in custody. Uday and Qusay are

history. So now we can stand on the floor of the House and we can get

on all of the talk shows and say we really did not have all of that to

worry about. It really was not worth the expenditure of our resources,

both human and financial. Well, maybe not. But I have to say that from

everything we know about history and from everything that we know,

absolutely, unequivocally know, not the if's, not the ``I wonder if,''

but what we know about the regime in Iraq would lead us to believe that

the action we took eventually would end up saving a lot of lives. Not

only that, but we are now engaged in a very difficult process and that

is to impose democracy, to plant the seeds of democracy in an area of

the world in which, of course, it is a very alien idea. And the task is

incredible, it is true, but think of the task we have faced when we

chose to rebuild Germany and Japan and to rebuild those countries on

democratic models. In Japan, of course, where it had never ever existed

before, and in Germany, where it had been bastardized, the concept of

democracy. We undertook that huge, monumental task; and people could

have said in 1946, 1947, 1948, look at the problems we are facing. How

come we have not been able to construct these democratic models over

there by now? Why are American troops still occupying Germany and

Japan? Why are our people still at risk? Why are we spending hundreds

of millions of dollars which would equate in today's terms to hundreds

of billions of dollars in the rebuilding of both Japan and Germany? Why

are we doing it? They would have been there and they may have been here

on the floor saying those things at that time. I know that is true.

I am not saying they are not legitimate questions and that they

should not be raised. All I am saying to you is that we have history on

our side. We know what happens when you do not undertake the task, and

we know what happens when you do in fact persevere, when you say we are

going to rebuild these countries, it is going to take a lot of money, a

lot of time and a lot of effort because they are not used to this

concept; but did it work out to the benefit of humanity that we did

what we did? Of course it did.

Who argues that we should not have rebuilt Western Europe and even

Japan? They became prosperous. They became willing to accept the ideas

and ideals of Western civilization, which will get me into my next area

of discussion here. But we faced all of these things. We did it. We

persevered.

In terms of the time frame that has expired between the ending of

major hostility to today, it is a blink of the eye. Think how long it

took for the United States of America to perfect this concept of a

republic based on democratic ideals. It did not happen overnight. You

may recall at the end of our revolution many people went to George

Washington with a council, figuratively speaking, a council and said,

We want you to be king. And, of course, Washington refused and said

that is not why we fought a war against a king. That is not the kind of

government we were going to establish. Even then, of course, we did not

warm to this concept of a republic very quickly.

The Articles of Confederation were problematic. There were things in

them that did not actually address all of the problems that we had in

this country trying to pull it together. Just as today we are watching

Iraq in this process, and we are saying, gee, whiz, even their

constitution, or the lead up to the constitution, even what we have

developed in Iraq today is problematic because we still do not know

whether or not exactly what the role of religion will be in Iraq.

Well, you may recall that we did not know exactly what the role of

slavery would be in the United States and we refused to address it in

the Constitutional Convention because we could not come to an

agreement. So we put it off and, admittedly, it led to a lot of

violence. But the issue was settled. The republic remained and we now

still present to the world the best possible hope for stable government

and for peace. But it did not come easily. It did not happen when

Cornwallis surrendered at Yorktown. Lots of things, even bloodshed

followed the surrender of the British.

Peace will not come easily in Iraq. Democracy will not come easily in

Iraq. Many trials and tribulations lay ahead, much bloodshed, certainly

true. Should we abandon it because there are these obstacles? Shall we

walk away because the challenge is very, very difficult? Well, that is

the proposition that is put before us. And I suggest to you that

planting democracy and the concept of a republic in a part of the world

where it had not heretofore existed is a worthy endeavor.

I also suggest to my colleagues that our efforts in Iraq up to this

time can be described as noble.

This is an interesting situation that we are in; and this develops

into another discussion that I want to have tonight, and that is the

value of Western Civilization and what it really means, because

tomorrow I am going to introduce a resolution, and I am joined by many

of my colleagues, and the resolution is a simple one.

It says that this body, the Congress of the United States, believes

that all children graduating from schools in this country should be

able to articulate an appreciation for Western Civilization; and it may

seem to some at first to be a heavy topic, some amorphous idea, and one

might wonder what are its practical implications and why I would be

doing that, as I say, and I and my colleagues would be doing this.

I think in a way it is ironic that we are desperately attempting to

implant concepts of Western Civilization in a place called Iraq while

we, in this country, challenge their relevance in our schools and in

our textbooks and certainly in the media in our culture. I believe that

we are in a war that can be described as a clash of civilizations.

There is a great book by an author by the name of Samuel Huntington

called the ``Clash of Civilizations,'' and I remember reading this

book, I do not know, maybe 8 years ago and thinking that it was

interesting; but I remember going back and reading it again after 9/11

and thinking that it was profound and prophetic.

I believe the United States is in a clash and Western Civilization is

in a clash of civilizations. It is a real clash, if you will, a real

war. It is bloody. There are times when the clash becomes even more

violent and times when it subsides, but the clash is real and it will

be here for some time. The clash is with radical Islam. It is with

people who have said openly and repeatedly that their desire is to come

here and kill you and your children, me and my children, to eradicate

us from the planet.

There is an interesting diary, I do not know whether it was on Al

Jazeera, but it was published some time ago, and it is a diary of a

person who became a suicide bomber. He talks about in this diary why he

has to do what he believes he has to do. He says that the ultimate

threat to his view of Islam is the West, is the concept of a republic,

a democratic republic. He said that this is a threat to the heart; this

is a threat to the existence of Islam as he saw it because what the

West provided, through democratic principles and free enterprise, was

the good life essentially, what it sort of boils down to. It provided

the good life. People could achieve more and more; and, yes, they could

achieve in monetary ways, but they could also achieve even from the

standpoint of advancing oneself and one's self-esteem, and this he said

would turn people away from looking to the afterlife as the ultimate

goal or as the ultimate glory.

I can tell my colleagues that certainly there are aspects of Judeo-

Christian tenets that tell us also that it is what comes next that is

important, but Western Civilization has allowed us many things. It has

provided a system and a set of ideas and ideals that have served

humanity well; and, yes, those ideas and ideals are a threat to other

ideas; and, therefore, a clash occurs.

How do we fight this war? How do we deal with this clash? Well, of

course, it will require the force of arms at times, and it will require

the commitment of resources, and it will require something else. It

will require a belief in who we are, which by the way is the title of

Samuel Huntington's new book, which I certainly commend to everyone,

``Who We Are.''

We have to know the answer to that question. We have to know who we

are. We have to understand that this Nation uniquely was created on the

basis of ideas and ideals, all other nations formed for other reasons,

but ours started for a brand new reason, ideas. Those ideas were held

up to the world, and people came from all over the world to embrace

them. Uniquely, we said this old concept that people should be ruled by

individuals is not acceptable; it has not worked out well and it does

not accrue to the benefit of most human beings. So Western Civilization

was based upon a different idea, and it is called the rule of law, not

the rule of man, not one person making arbitrary decisions about

everything that affects our lives, but the law making those decisions

as developed by people who represent all of us, a brand new concept

that we put into effect and that I think serves the world well.

Western Civilization was based on other ideals, the ideal of the

individual being superior to that of the collective; the idea that

humans had inalienable rights. This is a Western concept. No place else

does it show its face but in Western Civilization.

Today, in America, however, there is a movement, a philosophy, I call

it radical multiculturalism. It has taken hold of our society. It is

seeping its way into our public schools and on to our college campuses.

This philosophy may be peculiar to most Americans; but it does seem to

be taking hold among elites, academics, the media, and certain groups

within the political establishment. It is a corrosive movement, and its

purveyors are threatening to accomplish in the classrooms what they

could not get through elections: one, to erase the notion of

citizenship; and, two, to teach young people that there is nothing

positive or unique about America and that Western Civilization

contributed nothing to

world history but imperialism, slavery, and discord.

Let me emphasize something here. I do not for a moment want to tell

the children of America, the citizens of America or the world that we

believe that we have never done anything wrong and that Western

Civilization is nothing but a set of ideas and principles that have

been put into place without problem. Many of those ideals are not yet

reached, by the way. So I am totally and completely supportive of the

thought that we have to teach our children the truth about who we are,

the truth, warts and all; but I have to tell my colleagues I am

becoming extremely concerned, as I think many others are, about the

fact that we concentrate so much of our effort and time on teaching

children and immigrants into this country that there is nothing good

about Western Civilization or about the United States as a

representation of that civilization.

These are some examples that we have taken, by no means exhaustive.

These are just tiny little snippets of some of the things we tell our

children in textbooks and some of the things that, in fact, teachers

and professors have told our children about America, about the West,

all in an attempt to essentially eliminate any concept that there is

something good and special about us and who we are, and I will go

through them in a minute.

I just want to tell my colleagues about something that happened to me

just a short time ago.

I was visiting a high school in my district, and there were probably

150 to 200 students who came into the auditorium to have a discussion

with me; and it went on for, as I say, about 60 minutes or so, and at

the end, some students were sending up written questions. One of them

said, What do you think is the most serious problem facing the country?

I said, well, I am going to answer that question with a question, if

you do not mind, and that is this, How many people in here believe that

we live in the greatest Nation on the Earth or as Michael Medved always

says, on God's green Earth? And I looked around. It was fascinating to

see what happened out there.

This was a suburban district in Douglas County, Colorado, middle- to

higher-income families in the area, predominantly white. If one looked

up suburbs in the dictionary, probably a picture of this particular

area, and when I asked the question how many of you believe that you

live in the best country in the world, about two dozen raised their

hands, most of them very sheepishly I should say, and the rest just sat

there. Some looked uncomfortable, and I must admit that I thought to

myself at the time that some of them looked like they actually wanted

to say yes, but they were afraid to. They looked at the teachers who

were lined up on the sides of the walls. They were kind of looking at

them like, gee, should I actually say this, and more than that I think

that they were thinking, if I say yes, if I say yes I believe I live in

the best country in the world, someone might challenge me, maybe even

he will, and would I be able to defend that principle.

These are high school students; and I said, well, let me ask you

about do you realize that we are a product of Western Civilization and

that how many of you would agree that this is something again about

which you can be proud? Maybe a dozen at that one, and I said, well,

this is what I consider to be one of the biggest problems facing

America, what is happening to you and what has happened to you as a

result of this multiculturalist philosophy that we push in the schools.

This idea that all cultures are at worst the same; at best they are

better than ours; and that we cannot make these kinds of statements

about what is better or best, about which country is better or best,

which civilization is better.

Now, that happened, and I know it is not unique to this little

typical suburban school in my district. I could have asked that

question in any high school in America and the response would have been

similar; tepid, sheepish support, with most people saying, I do not

know, I do not care, and what does it matter?

I wonder how this could have happened. How is it that people living

here in this country, at this time, can look at the rest of the world

and not recognize that every single day millions of people are

struggling to get here, if not to America at least to Western Europe;

that they are struggling to get to Western civilization? And I have to

ask, how many people do you know that are struggling to go the other

way? Is that not empirical evidence of some sort that what we have is

pretty good; that it is worthy of our allegiance, worthy of continuing?

People ask me why I am so involved with the immigration issue; why I

speak on that issue so often. Well, there are a whole bunch of reasons,

and they deal with jobs and the environment, and the cost, and all that

sort of thing. But after all of that is said and done, I worry about

this. I worry about the fact that we are not doing a very good job of

creating a society, a cohesive, homogenous society out of all of the

disparate parts that make up America. I worry that we are working very

hard to divide us, to divide this Nation into camps; into Balkanized

areas that are based on linguistic, cultural, or political differences

while simultaneously trying to erase anything that smacks of an attempt

to bring people together around a set of ideas other than the concept

of diversity, which is the only thing that multiculturalists will say

is worthy of our allegiance.

I worry about what will happen to us in this clash of civilizations

when it is not only the force of arms necessary to win the day but it

is the force of ideas. For us to be successful as a people, as a

civilization, as a country we have to know who we are, where we came

from, and where we are going. We have to believe in who we are, where

we came from, and where we are going. And I worry that too few of us

know who we are, where we came from or where we are going, and that

this in the long run will prove to be our undoing.

So that is why I talk about immigration, and that is why I talk about

issues like this. That is why I worry about the fact that in the

textbook called Across the Centuries, which is used for 7th grade

history, the book defines the word jihad as ``To do one's best to

resist temptation and overcome evil.''

Now, maybe that is somebody's interpretation of jihad. But, remember,

this was not even suggested as someone's idea, this is presented as the

interpretation, the definition of jihad: ``To do one's best to resist

temptation and overcome evil.''

I guess we would not want to tell children, would we, that that word

implied something quite different? It is a call to arms to those people

who believe we should be annihilated, and everything we believe in

should be wiped out because it is a threat to fundamentalist Islam.

Well, we need to say it, because it is true. We may not like it, we may

feel uncomfortable by telling children the truth, but it is imperative

that we do so. That is not the only definition of jihad.

In 2002, the New Guidelines for Teaching History in New Jersey's

public schools failed to even mention America's Founding Fathers, the

pilgrims, or the Mayflower. How do you tell the history of the United

States, I might ask, without mentioning the Founding Fathers, the

pilgrims, or the Mayflower?

Maybe it is a good thing that the book did not, because in many

textbooks, and certainly out of the mouths of many teachers, the

mentioning of these people would be in derogatory terms. The Founding

Fathers, all white men, who were slave owners, who came here to pillage

and rape and whatever. Columbus came here to destroy paradise. I have

seen that.

So maybe it was better that they did not mention it. Do you think at

least some reference to the ideas and ideals upon which this Nation was

founded should have been made, and the fact that people struggled and

died to bring those ideals into fruition? Do you think that was worthy

of mentioning?

In a Prentice Hall textbook used by students in Palm Beach County

High Schools, titled A World Conflict, the first five pages of the

World War II chapter focused almost entirely on topics such as gender

roles in the armed forces, racial segregation in the war, internment

camps, and women and the war effort.

Do you think I make this stuff up? You can go and look, if you do not

believe me, that this is in fact being taught to our children. This is

in the textbooks of the schools in this Nation.

By the way, Madam Speaker, if anyone were to be so inclined, they can

go to our Web site, [www.](http://www./)House.Gov/Tancredo and they can click on a pop-

up that says Our Heritage, Our Hope, and they can see what I am talking

about here, and they can also sign up to help us in this endeavor to

change the situation. And I have some very specific things I would like

them to do.

A Washington State teacher substituted the word ``winter'' for the

word ``Christmas'' in a carol to be sung at school programs so as not

to appear to be favoring one faith over the other. The lyrics in Dale

Wood's carol From an Irish Cabin were changed to read ``the harsh wind

blows down from the mountains and blows a white winter to me.'' Not

``Christmas.''

I was in a school, again in my district, again a typical public

school, and it was right before Christmas. I was talking to a lot of, I

think they were in grades 5 and 6 in an elementary school. When I left

the room, I said Merry Christmas. Again, there was this kind of an

uneasy response, and some kids said okay. And as I was walking out the

lady who had invited us to come and speak, who was an aide at the

school, said, you know, the principal does not like us using the word

``Christmas'' here. I said what is that, as I pointed to a Christmas

tree in the hallway? And she said, that is a seasonal tree. And I said,

are you telling me that we cannot use ``Christmas''? And she said, no,

the teachers do not.

So I went back and I yelled, as I was leaving and all the kids were

coming out, I said, Merry Christmas, and they all said, Merry

Christmas. But this is happening, of course, in schools all over the

United States. I bet if people go to their own schools and check these

things out, they will see what I am saying is not just unique to my

little suburban district in Colorado.

In a school district in New Mexico the introduction to a textbook

called 500 Years of Chicano History in Pictures states that it was

written ``In response to the bicentennial celebration of the 1776

American Revolution and its lies. Its stated purpose is to ``celebrate

our resistance to being colonized and absorbed by racist empire

builders.'' The book describes defenders of the Alamo as ``slave

owners, land speculators, and Indian killers,'' Dave Crockett as a

cannibal, and the 1857 ``War on Mexico'' as an unprovoked U.S.

invasion. The chapter headings include, Death to the Invader, U.S.

Conquest and Betrayal, We Are Now a U.S. Colony, In Occupied America,

and They Stole the Land.

Now, again, I certainly do not say that mistakes were not made, that

manifest destiny as an idea and an ideal did not have inherent in it

problems for other people. I certainly believe that is true, and I

believe we should teach our children about those problems. But this is

what we call objective history text?

I am going to repeat it. This book, it said, was written ``in

response to the bicentennial celebration of the 1776 American

Revolution and its lies.'' Its stated purpose is to ``celebrate our

resistance to being colonized and absorbed by a racist empire

builder.''

Children are often taught only the most negative things about the

United States and about Western civilization. And if these efforts go

unchecked, children will lose any real connection to the goals and

aspirations and ideals of America and the West, the ideals exemplified

in the Constitution and articulated by the people who founded the

country over 200 years ago. If we fail to instill these values in our

children, we risk losing our national identity.

It is not surprising to me that a brand new phenomenon is developing

in the United States with regard to the immigrant community. Since

about 1947, the United States has allowed people to claim a dual

citizenship. Most of this happened in 1947 as a result of the creation

of the State of Israel, and to provide Israelis here with the

opportunity to travel back and forth and to state their allegiance to

Israel by accepting a dual citizenship. But we never had very many

people, to tell you the truth, that actually accepted that offer. It

numbered in the hundreds of thousands, at the most, at any given time

in America.

Today estimates are that there are between, we do not know for sure,

5 and 10 million people in this country who claim a dual citizenship,

mostly with Mexico, after Mexico allowed Mexican nationals to keep

their citizenship once they came to the United States. This happened a

couple of years ago, and the number skyrocketed.

When we tell people that they should keep their political

associations, political allegiances to other countries, that they

should keep their language of origin, that they should not actually

blend into this American mosaic, should we be surprised by the fact

that they do not?

McDougal's ``The Americas,'' another textbook, states that the

Reagan-Bush conservative agenda limits advances in civil rights for

minorities. Again, these are statements of fact by a textbook, not

somebody's opinion, and that the conservatives' bid to dismantle the

Great Society's social programs could be compared to abandoning the

Nation.

It goes on to include a text stating that Communism had potentially

totalitarian underpinnings, and contrasts future Taiwan President

Chiang Kai-Shek's repressive rule with Communist Chinese Dictator Mao

Zedong's benevolence toward peasants in the early 1940s.

Now, if we did not know anything else and read this, why would you

not believe it to be true? If the book and your teacher failed to

mention the deaths of about 65 million Chinese after Mao came to power

in 1949 or Taiwan's peaceful transformation into a thriving,

pluralistic multiparty democracy, no one would know this. They would

never understand it. They would never truly understand world history.

Would we be lying to tell children this was the case? Would it be

chauvinistic of us to suggest that it was not just the possibility of

some totalitarian underpinnings, but a totalitarian regime, and that

Communism could only survive out of terror.

Is it not acceptable for us to tell the truth? That is what I wonder.

Why are we so fearful about telling children about who we are really,

all of the warts but all of the good things, too.

Here is a study by Philip Sadler, director of science education at

the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, which shows that

students who had taken high school physics classes that used textbooks

did substantially worse than high school classrooms that used no

textbooks at all. I would suggest that if these other textbooks, these

history textbooks are an example of what we are doing, it would be

better to not use them at all.

Madam Speaker, tomorrow I am going to ask this Congress to pass a

simple resolution, and that resolution will state, as I said, that all

children graduating from our schools should be able to articulate an

appreciation for Western civilization. That is it. No mandate, no

textbook mandates, no curriculum change, just whatever you do, this

should be an outcome.

Simultaneously we are going to be joined by State representatives all

over the country who will be introducing into their representative

legislatures a similar resolution, and we are going to be joined by

hundreds of Americans, and this is where other people can get involved

because we are going to be joined by I hope eventually hundreds of

thousands, maybe millions of American citizens who will go to their

school board with a resolution that we have on that Website that I

mentioned earlier, [www.house.gov/trancredo](http://www.house.gov/trancredo), and go to Our Heritage, Our

Hope, and there you will see a copy of a resolution that a person could

take to their school board and ask their school board to adopt.

Now, the NEA, the National Education Association, has already

attacked this proposal. And I keep thinking to myself, what is there

about this? And not just the NEA. Tomorrow is when we are going to

actually drop this resolution and announce it, but we have had all

kinds of people responding saying that in fact this is a bad idea. Now,

please, let us really think about this for a second. They are saying it

is a bad idea to teach children facts so that they could articulate an

appreciation for Western civilization. I mean, is that not the

definition of what would be a good history education, a good

civics education? Should children not be able to articulate those

principles?

We can argue whether they are right or wrong, but we should be able

to have children who can articulate them, understand who we are, where

we come from and where we are going.

I know that this is a stretch for a lot of people. It is hard for a

lot of people to get their hands on this because it is not an issue

that you can condense into a bumper sticker, but I encourage people to

think through this and think about the possibility that it is important

for us and for our civilization to actually transmit these goals and

ideas to the next generation. We cannot continue to teach only the

negative. Doing so contributes to the balkanization of the United

States into subgroups, subcategories, and hyphenated Americans.

In Numbers U.S.A., an organization that does a lot of great work and

also has a great Website, Numbers U.S.A. talks about the fact that if

we continue as we are in terms of population growth and the source of

our population growth in this country, being 90 percent from

immigrants, that by the year 2100 two-thirds of the people here in the

United States will be descendants of people not yet here at the present

time. Think about that. In 96 years, two-thirds of the people living in

this country will be descendants of people not yet here. Think about

that and then think about what we are teaching them, the folks that are

coming in and the folks that are here about who we are. How can we

expect this new Nation essentially that will be created by 2100 to be

steeped in the same goals and principles and ideas?

Again, Madam Speaker, I hope that we will be joined by hundreds of

thousands of Americans all over the country who will be willing to say

that it is important for their schools, it is important for our

civilization that we teach children to appreciate the value of Western

civilization and there is something we all can do about it. I am going

to do what I can do here, State legislators will do what they can do in

their respective bodies, and then it is up to the people of this

country to take this on and move it forward. It will determine whether

we are a Nation at all in years to come.