Madam Speaker, the drums of war are being beaten by

the President who, ironically, won the Nobel Peace Prize. The ``Peace

President'' wants to fire missiles into Syria because tyrant Assad is

violating the rules of war by allegedly using chemical weapons. The

President's goal is not to remove Assad, not to destroy the chemical

weapons, but to send Assad a message.

To be clear, there is no imminent national security threat or

interest for the United States by us starting this war. And make no

mistake, shooting rockets into another country is an act of war.

War has consequences. What if the outlaw Assad chooses then to use

chemical weapons again or chooses to shoot back? He could retaliate

against the United States, one of our embassies, the Navy that fired

the rockets, or other U.S. military installations, or even specific

troops, or retaliate against his neighbor, Turkey, or Israel, using our

aggression as an excuse. In any of these situations, this limited war

escalates with more U.S. response, intervention, and involvement.

Now, who are the players in this war that is taking place already? On

one side you have Syria, tyrant Assad, with the aid of Russia, with the

aid of Iran that news reports say has 10,000 Iranian troops in Syria,

and Hezbollah. Hezbollah, as you remember, Madam Speaker, is a

terrorist group.

Then, on the other side, you have the Free Syrian Army. You have

patriots. You have mercenaries, paid soldiers from other countries. You

have criminals that have come in to just pillage the land and use this

as an opportunity. You also have al Nusra, an al Qaeda affiliate. You

also have al Qaeda from Iraq. Now, last time I recall, the United

States is already at war with al Qaeda. They are the enemy of the

United States.

And it looks like now you've got the terrorist group Hezbollah on one

side and the terrorist group al Qaeda on the other side. And we want to

get involved in this civil religious war to send a message not to use

chemical weapons?

Of course, you not only just have these players, but you've got

Turkey, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Qatar lined up on the side of the

Free Syrian Army. Turkey is a next-door neighbor to Syria. A year ago,

a Turkish F-4 built by the United States was flying along the Syrian

border, and it was shot down. We don't know who shot it down.

Meanwhile, the United States already has, along with its NATO

parties, patriot batteries on the Syrian border facing Syria that are

in Turkey. The Dutch, the Germans, and the Americans have manned those

batteries. Why? To make sure that our NATO ally is protected from

incoming rockets. If we escalate this regional conflict in one country,

it may escalate to other regions, like Turkey. Then we've got real

issues because Turkey is a NATO ally. We are obligated to help them if

they get into a war with Syria.

And then about the terrorists. As I mentioned, they are really on

both sides. And we hear from the administration, with all due respect,

that the minority of fighters on the rebel side are al Qaeda. I

respectfully disagree with the Secretary of State. What seems to be

happening is the Free Syrian Army is going through Syria liberating

Syrians, and al Qaeda is in the background, coming in and occupying the

territory and imposing strict Islamic sharia law. We can see this play

out. If the rebels eventually are successful, then we may have a second

civil war between the Free Syrian Army and al Qaeda.

All of that may be down the road. And why would the United States

want to get involved in this situation?

So today, Madam Speaker, I have filed a resolution stating that no

U.S. funds will be used for this war with Syria. This religious civil

war is not our war. So no money for the ``Peace President's'' war. And

if he starts a war with Syria, I suggest the President return the Nobel

Peace Prize. If he really wants to send a message, he should follow

Samuel Goldwyn's advice:

And that's just the way it is.