Mr. Speaker, I must

begin by thanking the staff of the

House of Representatives for enduring

these long nights so we have a chance

to speak our minds about the important

subjects of the day. We certainly

appreciate the Speaker and the staff

who stay here into the wee hours.

I also extend my appreciation to the

gentleman from Colorado (Mr.

TANCREDO) for the intense causes in

which he believes and for his patriotism.

I must say, one of the reasons I

love my country so much is we have

the academic freedom that decisions

about what we teach and how we teach

it are made by educators and teachers

and not by those of us in this Chamber,

and I hope that is always the case.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a

challenge to the values that I just

made reference to, probably the most

important challenge to these values

that we have faced in many generations

in this country.

In the 1970s a young man named

Ghollam Nikbin came to the United

States from Iran. He came here to

study at an American university. While

he was here, the fundamentalist revolution

in Iran took place and in 1979 his

country changed dramatically and he

chose not to return to Iran. At the

time he came to the United States he

was a person who practiced the Islamic

faith. While he was in the United

States, he met an American citizen

who was a member of the Mormon faith

and he married this American citizen

and he converted. Mr. Nikbin converted

to the Mormon faith himself. That

marriage subsequently ended in divorce

and in 1991, Mr. Nikbin returned

to his native Iran to live his life. While

there, he met another woman and they

decided to get married and he had a

wedding. During his wedding, members

of the police force in Iran raided the

wedding because the men and women

at the wedding were engaged in dancing.

Men were dancing with women.

For this hideous offense, Mr. Nikbin

was publicly lashed 40 times with a

whip to punish him for his transgression

against the prevailing culture.

Things grew worse for Mr. Nikbin in

Iran. He was a suspicious person because

he had converted to the Mormon

faith and then attempted to convert

back to his native Islamic faith. So in

1995 he tried to leave the country. As

he was at the airport, he was intercepted

by Iranian authorities who refused

to let him leave the country. He

was beaten with an electric cable and

he was hung upside down by his ankles

for extended periods of time. Today he

is 56 years old. He has returned to the

United States. His family says he was

able to return to the United States because

they were able to bribe the appropriate

officials in Iran to get him

released from the country. His crime

was that he converted to a faith other

than radical Islam.

A woman named Zahara Kazemi, a

woman of both Iranian and Canadian

descent, a 54-year-old woman, last June

23 took an assignment. She was a photo

journalist. She took an assignment to

go to Iran to do her work as a photo

journalist. On the 23rd of June of last

year, she was taking photographs of a

student demonstration outside of the

Evin prison in Iran. She was apprehended

by authorities for the hideous

crime of taking a photograph of a demonstration.

After 77 hours of interrogation

in an Iranian prison, she took

sick. On the 11th of July of last year, 18

days after she arrived in Iran, she died

in an Iranian hospital while in the custody

of the Iranian authorities. At

first, their report is that she had suffered

a stroke and died of natural

causes. Many in our sister nation of

Canada expressed outrage as to the

conditions around Ms. Kazemi’s death

and the Canadian government was persistent

and, finally, 5 days after she

died, authorities of the Iranian government

indicated that it was not a stroke

at all, that she had died from beatings

that led to a cerebral hemorrhage, a 54-

year-old woman beaten to death in an

Iranian prison because she dared to

take photographs of a peaceful demonstration.

What kind of monstrous spirit would

give rise to these atrocities? It is a

spirit we have seen before. It is the

spirit, the horrible spirit, the horrible

poisonous spirit that led 6 million Jews

to the gas chambers during the Holocaust.

It is the horrifying spirit that

sees people strap C4 to their waists and

walk into hotels and onto buses and

near schools in the Middle East every

day. It is the awful animus that led to

the bombings in Riyadh, in Ankara

within the last year. The victims are of

all faiths, Christian, Jew, Muslim, Buddhist,

agnostic. They are of all races

and all nationalities. What these horrific

acts have in common is they are

rooted in the poisonous well of an intolerant

hatred of anyone who is not

like those who practice that intolerant

hatred.

This poisonous attitude is contrary

to everything that we are as Americans.

It is against inclusion of people of

other races and cultures. It is an attitude

that despises the equal treatment

of men and women under the law. It is

an attitude that looks at other faiths

not as an opportunity to learn how

other people might live but as a threat

to one’s own twisted faith. By no

means is this poisonous attitude representative

of the Islamic faith. I believe

the Islamic faith is a faith of

peace, of humanity, of inclusion. By no

means is this twisted attitude wholly

representative of the Arab culture or

the Arab ethnicity. I believe that the

vast majority of men and women of

Arab descent love peace, respect others

and wish that their children would

grow up in a world where others share

those values. But make no mistake

about it, the poisonous well from which

these acts spring is an attitude that

identifies everything Western, everything

modern, everything progressive,

everything that America loves and everything

that Americans are. It is an

attitude that identifies all those things

as a threat to be detested, defeated and

destroyed. It is an attitude that we saw

in the rubble of the World Trade Center

on September 11 of 2001. It is an attitude

that literally blew a hole in the

Pentagon. It is an attitude that led

dozens of brave Americans to their

death in a field in Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

Many of us believe that September

11, 2001, was not an isolated criminal

act. It was an act of war that shocked

Americans into a realization that we

are in the midst of a great global struggle

between those who love and tolerate

diversity and those who deplore

it and try to destroy it. So the reason

we should care about the stories I told

you about Ghollam Nikbin, Zahara

Kazemi, the stories that I could have

told about hundreds of Iranian students

who are in Iranian prisons tonight,

the reason we should care is that

the hateful attitude from which the attacks

on them sprung is an attitude

that targets us next, an attitude that

seeks to destroy us and our way of life.

By no means is it fair or accurate to

say that such an attitude is common or

characteristic of the Iranian people, by

no means is it fair or accurate to say

that it is characteristic of the history

of their nation, and by no means is it

accurate to say that this hatred will

mar and define the future of the people

of Iran. I aspire to a future where the

people of the United States and the

people of Iran are partners in peace and

freedom, where we celebrate each other’s

differences and respect each other’s

values. But that is not the case

today.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we in

this House and we in this country could

focus on the very grave and real threat

posed to the peace that we enjoy tonight

by the presence of the terrorist

incubator in Iran. When we consider

what our policy should be toward Iran,

we should not think about September

11 of 2001 because there frankly is no

evidence that I have seen that would

suggest that the Iranian government

was in any way a sponsor of the atrocious

attacks on our country on September

11. In fact, the evidence is rather

replete with examples that Osama

bin Laden and his al Qaeda organization

have been at odds with the radical

fundamentalist Iranian leadership.

But the question is not who allied to

attack us on September 11. The issue is

who wishes to attack us in the future,

where the threats exist for our future.

To understand why we want to prevent

the next 9/11, why we want to limit the

next attack on this country so it does

not succeed and so we can defeat such

an attack, we need to understand

where the first 9/11 came from. In order

for terrorists to succeed, they need personnel,

they need leadership, they need

financial and logistical support, and

their leaders need sanctuary. Their

leaders need a place where they can

plan, plot and eventually execute attacks

against the people of the United

States of America. September 11 happened

because Osama bin Laden and his

al Qaeda organization had all four of

those elements to attack us. They had

the personnel, the 19 twisted individuals

who hated us more than they

loved life to the point that they were

able to turn civilian airliners into

weapons of mass destruction. They had

the leadership, the odious cadre of dark

men who surround Osama bin Laden,

who conceived of such a horrific plot.

They had the finances and the logistics,

passing through international financial

organizations, in many cases

laundered through Saudi Arabia,

laundered through other institutions,

many of which to this day refuse to

disclose their banking records to us.

The terrorists were able to gather the

logistics they needed to place the hijackers

in America, buy their plane

tickets, acquire their training, keep

their cover and let them prepare to do

their horrible deeds.

And, finally, and I think crucially,

the September 11 attackers flourished

in the terrorist sanctuary of Afghanistan.

At the time Afghanistan was run

by the Taliban regime, a group that

not only tolerated the presence of al

Qaeda but actively facilitated the presence

of al Qaeda. I think the argument

is rather clear. Without a sanctuary in

Afghanistan, there would have been no

place for Osama bin Laden to plot this

attack. Without a place to plot this attack

and gather his resources, there

would not have been an opportunity to

carry out the attack. Without the opportunity

to carry out the attack,

there certainly would not have been

the carnage and pain this country felt

and still feels emanating from September

11.

What is the lesson of September 11?

There are two lessons. The first is if

you give terrorists sanctuary, they will

exploit that sanctuary and, like a

snake that is coiled in the corner, they

will wait till precisely the right moment

to strike. And the second lesson

of September 11 is if you wait for the

snake to strike, it always will. If our

strategy in the face of this global

struggle is to wait and see if terrorists

who enjoy sanctuary will attack us, I

do not think, Mr. Speaker, that is a

question. I think history is conclusive

on this point. If you wait for terrorists

to attack you, they will. This is the

context in which we must understand

what is happening in Iran today and

why it is important to the United

States of America to rethink the way

we approach this problem.

Iran is a place where terrorist organizations

who disrupt the Palestinian-

Israeli negotiations find refuge, find

weaponry, find cash. It is a place where

admittedly significant al Qaeda elements

are present tonight. There is an

argument as to exactly what they are

doing. The Iranian authorities would

tell us that they are in the custody of

the Iranian government. Some would

suggest that the Iranian government

are using these al Qaeda leaders as

pawns to try to facilitate the release of

terrorists held by the Israelis and other

law-abiding nations of the world. But

irrespective of the purpose for which

the Iranian government holds al Qaeda

terrorists tonight, the fact is they are

present in Iran tonight.

They found Iran to be a place that

was a willing sanctuary for their activities.

There can be no good inured to

America’s benefit from that sanctuary

continuing.

What do terrorists need? They need

leadership. They need people who are

willing to conceive of these terrible

plans that spring from this awful

wellspring of intolerance and hatred.

They need personnel. They need to recruit

young men and young women

and, in some cases, children who are

willing to put their own lives at stake

to manifest that hatred by killing

thousands of others. They need money

and logistics to carry out their attack.

They need weaponry, and they need

sanctuary. I think it is indisputable

that Iran is such a sanctuary. It is indisputable

that if tonight the CIA, the

National Security Agency, other U.S.

intelligence operatives had information

that there were terrorists at loose

in Iran and they asked for the cooperation

of the Iranian government, I think

it is indisputable that at best, at best,

we would get noninterference; at worst

we would get active resistance.

Mr. Speaker, if those same terrorists

were loose in Jordan, the Jordanian

government would help us. If those terrorists

were loose in Kuwait, the Kuwaiti

government would help us. If

they were loose in Israel, the Israeli

government would not need our help.

They would just find them and take

care of the problem. If they were loose

in the countries of our European allies,

I am quite confident that we would

have the assistance of those allies, in

South America, in the Philippines. Iran

is a place where terrorists will find the

medium in which their peculiar form of

bacteria need to grow.

What logistics might Iran supply to a

terrorist who wants to attack the

United States of America? Today for

every 100 containers that enter the

ports of the United States in these

huge containers we see out by the

ports, for every 100 of those containers

that enter the United States, two of

them were inspected, 98 were not. It is

commonly known that one of the ways

that we are at risk is that as the huge

influx of trade comes and goes from our

country in container ships, that the

planting of a small nuclear weapon on

a container ship could cause catastrophic

results in this country that

would dwarf the pain of September 11.

Where might terrorists find such a

nuclear bomb? Sadly, there are a number

of places. One of those places is

from hungry former Soviet scientists

who were living relatively well under

the old regime in the USSR and then

found themselves driving cabs and

waiting on tables and very hungry and

very anxious in the years that follow.

It is one of the great bipartisan failures

of this country for which we all should

take responsibility, myself included,

that we have not been sufficiently vigilant

since the waning days of the Soviet

Empire in identifying, corralling,

and destroying weapons of mass destruction

that were held by the Soviet

Union. There are too many of them in

too many places. They are too cheap

and too portable. We owe thanks to the

great work of former Senator Nunn and

present Senator LUGAR for giving us

the legal authority to solve this problem.

We are sadly negligent in not

using that legal authority to its greatest

extent.

Where else might a terrorist find a

small nuclear bomb that could be

transported in a container ship to the

United States? Mr. Speaker, if we

would have asked the Iranian government

that question 2 years ago, they

would have said not here; we are not in

the business of trying to make nuclear

bombs, not us. For years, for 23 years,

since the installation of the present regime

in Tehran, the official party line

was that the Iranian government was

not interested in the manufacture of a

nuclear weapon.

In December of 2002, that all changed.

Iranian dissidents who were fortunate

to escape the country began talking to

intelligence leaders around the world,

and they talked with specificity. They

talked about centrifuges, fissile materials.

They talked about the enrichment

of uranium. They talked about a

program of plutonium separation that

could lead to the manufacture of a nuclear

bomb. And enough of them talked

to enough people, and enough enlightened

people paid attention, that in December

of 2002, while our country was

fixated upon the very grave question of

what to do about Saddam Hussein in

Iraq, while we were grappling with

many other problems in our own country,

in December of 2002, the government

of Iran acknowledged that reports

that it was building facilities capable

of producing the fissile materials

that would lead to a nuclear weapon

were true. The Iranian government admitted

this. After 23 years of deception,

the Iranian government admitted

that facilities at Iraq and Natanz in

Iran were, in fact, facilities which were

capable of producing the fissile materials

necessary to make a nuclear

bomb.

On February 21 of last year, 2003, the

leader of the International Atomic Energy

Agency, Mr. ElBaradei, visited

Iran after extreme international pressure

following the Iranian disclosure.

On June 6 of 2003, Mr. ElBaradei issued

a report saying that the facilities that

I mentioned, in particular the Natanz

facility, was an advanced uranium enrichment

facility capable of performing

the steps necessary and essential to the

creation of a nuclear bomb. On September

12 of 2003, the International

Atomic Energy Agency issued an ultimatum

to the Iranians which said by

October 31 of last year, Iranians were

to prove to the world that they were

not working on building nuclear

bombs. The clock ticked. The world

was not very specific as to what we

would do if the Iranians failed to provide

that proof, reminiscent of how the

world was similarly negligent in dealing

with Saddam Hussein for 12 long

years.

Finally, on October 21 of 2003, the

Iranians invited representatives of the

French, German, and British governments

to Tehran. They began to negotiate

and they worked out a joint communique

with the governments of

France and Germany and the United

Kingdom, which said that the Iranians

would permit full inspections, they

would suspend their uranium enrichment

program, that they would sign

international agreements that civilized

nations follow with respect to the production

of nuclear weapons, and that

essentially they would stop trying to

build a nuclear weapon. The world reacted

with cautious optimism.

The Iranians handed over files and

files of documents that described what

they had been doing over the course of

more than 2 decades in the past. Those

documents showed that the Iranians

had engaged in a secretive uranium enrichment

program over at least a 19-

year period for which there could be no

plausible explanation other than it was

leading to the production of a nuclear

bomb. The world was divided as to

what to do about this, and the consensus

on the International Atomic Energy

Agency was that we should criticize

the Iranians for what they had

done and lied about in the past and

then warn them not to do it again.

Warnings like the ones we gave to the

Taliban repeatedly throughout the

1990s not to cooperate with Osama bin

Laden, warnings like we gave to Saddam

Hussein repeatedly throughout

the 1990s that he was to disengage his

weapons programs and to leave his

neighbors alone. Warnings.

The warnings have not had the intended

effect. Two weeks ago, the latest

report from the International

Atomic Energy Agency released on

February 24 of 2004 found some curious

evidence, and that is that the Iranians

had agreed to stop their program of

uranium enrichment, which is one path

to build a nuclear bomb; but another

path to build a nuclear bomb is called

plutonium separation. Obviously, the

Iranians who signed this agreement got

very good legal advice because they

learned how to define their way out of

the problem because the Iranians did

not breach apparently in the last few

months their responsibility not to

carry out uranium enrichment programs,

but they did evidently step up a

program that is involved in the separation

of plutonium, yet another path to

reach the same horrible result. Mr.

ElBaradei said Iran is moving in the

right direction with respect to this

weapons program, that there is reason

for optimism, that there are moderate

influences beginning to influence the

Iranian government. Well, can we afford

to take the chance that he is

wrong?

International experts suspected for 2

decades that Iran was pursuing the development

of a nuclear bomb, but they

never knew for sure; and I know that

the annals of intelligence estimates are

filled with conclusions that the best

judgment was that Iran was not marching

toward the creation of a nuclear

bomb. Those assessments were wrong.

If this new set of assessments is wrong,

we will find out to our peril what the

consequences of that error are.

Is the present leadership of Iran capable

of placing a small nuclear bomb

on a cargo ship in a container and

floating it into the harbor of a major

American city? Some would say, no,

they are not capable. It would not be in

their interest to do so. There would be

massive retaliation against them by

the United States. Others would say

they are imminently capable of such

atrocities. The family of Zahara

Kazemi I would assume would agree

with that proposition. Mr. Ghollam

Nikbin I assume would agree with that

proposition. Those who sit tonight in

Iranian prisons and those who have

been executed in Iranian prisons in recent

days and weeks, if they were alive,

would agree with that proposition.

Should we wait and see? Should it be

our policy to take an educated guess

and find out? Many intelligence analysts

took an educated guess about the

Taliban in Afghanistan 10 years ago, 5

years ago, 3 years ago, and here is what

their assessment was: the Taliban are

terrible people. Osama bin Laden is an

awful force in the world. He was behind

the bombing of the World Trade Center

in 1993. He was behind the attack of the

USS *Cole* in the year 2000. He was involved

in the Khobar Towers bombing.

Something needs to be done. But the

assessment about the Taliban’s role in

this was that it was ludicrous to think

that the Taliban government was a

threat to the United States.

It is certainly not an imminent

threat to the United States. A government

that could barely manage its own

affairs, a government that was not a

threat to its own neighbors militarily,

was certainly not a threat to the

United States of America.

There would have been those who

would stand on this floor 3 years ago

and argue passionately that for us to

aggressively pursue a policy of regime

change in Afghanistan would be a gross

overreaction. Why should we worry

about a regime as weak as that one? On

September 11, 2001, we got our answer.

Regimes that harbor terrorists, regimes

that have the capability of arming

terrorists with nuclear, biological

or chemical weapons, regimes that finance

and facilitate terrorism, are a

threat to the people of the United

States of America. These regimes

should not be negotiated with, they

should not be heeded, they should not

be abided. They should be replaced.

Which American tonight would not

agree that we would have prospered

from regime change in Afghanistan 3

years ago? There is lots of dispute tonight

as to whether we are prospering

from regime change in Baghdad tonight.

I certainly think we are. I think

it is one of the reasons that Mu’ammar

Qadhafi voluntarily surrendered his nuclear

weapons, so he will not wind up

living in a spider hole at the end of this

year.

I think it is one of the reasons that

President Assad in Syria for the first

time in his tenure as president is furtively

working behind the scenes to

open negotiations with the Israelis, so

that maybe some day he will expel

Hamas and Hizbollah from his countries.

I think it is one of the reasons

why the Saudi Arabians, after years of

culpability in terrorism, years of a

‘‘deal with the devil’’ in which they

looked the other way when terrorists

operated within their country, are now

more actively cooperating in the

crackdown on those terrorists. And I

think it is one of the reasons why the

Iranians in December of 2002, on the

verge of the United States action

against Iraq, decided to come clean

about 23 years of lying about the development

of a nuclear weapon.

Regime change in Iran should be the

policy of the United States of America;

not negotiation, not cooperation, regime

change. Regime change does not

mean military action. Military action

is the final step. Military action is the

last, and, if necessary, essential step, if

necessary, to regime change.

Far more effective to the pursuit of

this goal are the diplomatic, economic

and moral assets of the United States

of America. I am not calling for the use

of military force against Iran; I am

calling for the concerted, coordinated

use of this country’s diplomatic, economic

force to achieve a regime change

in Tehran. I believe it is not only in

the interests of human rights, of persecuted

citizens of that country, it is

in the interests of the national security

of the United States of America.

What does regime change mean in

Iran? Who is the regime? The answer to

this question is not self-evident. Iran is

a schizophrenic state. On the surface,

it is conducting what appears to be a

parliamentary government with what

appear to be reasonably free elections

with what appears to be something resembling

democracy.

These appearances are lethally deceptive.

The President of Iran got 77

percent of the vote in the popular election,

but I think realistically he has

zero percent of the power in that country.

Instead, a council of elders, 12

men, 12, have effective control over the

military, over the economic institutions

of that country, over the meaningful

ebb and flow of life in Iran. Even

though those 12 have such control, they

are wary, they are reluctant to even let

the appearance of that control stray

too far.

In the last month or so in Iran there

were elections scheduled for the national

legislative body of that country,

and most outside analysts saw those

elections as a struggle between the socalled

more moderate liberalizing

forces of the country and the more conservative

cultural forces of that country.

3,600 candidates of the moderate

persuasion were removed from the ballot

by the council of elders. Twelve

people, none of whom were elected,

each of whom was appointed through

the religious oligarchy of Iran, 12 people

used their power to remove 3,600

people from the ballot. 1,000 or so were

restored after huge public protests.

But I believe that the only conclusion

one can draw from this is that the

feeble images of democracy in Iran are

only a deceptive image, and not a

meaningful reality for that country.

These are foreboding and difficult

thoughts, but there is great reason to

be optimistic that the regime change

that would benefit America is very

much on the minds of young men and

women, and older men and women, who

live under the oppressive yoke of the

medieval government of Iran.

So many Iranian Americans are engaged

in conversations with their

brothers and sisters and mothers and

fathers back home. Iranian Americans

make a magnificent contribution to

this country every day, in our hospitals,

in our universities, in our corporations,

in our governments, in our

military, and these loyal and patriotic

Americans, who have had a taste of

freedom, a taste of what it means to be

respected for your religious differences

and not reviled, they have spread the

word of this intoxicating freedom to

their loved ones back in Iran.

Even though Iran is a place where

you can be whipped for dancing at a

wedding, even though it is a place

where you can be beaten to death in

prison for taking a photograph of a

peaceful demonstration, it is a place

where the rulers still cannot stop the

flow of technology. The Internet, the

fax machine, the cellular phone, these

are the most powerful weapons against

tyranny in the history of mankind.

And even in a place like Iran, the leaders

cannot make themselves impervious

to the rush of truth that comes

into their country in greater torrents

with each passing day.

I think that people in Iran are looking

for a signal from the United States

of America. They are not looking for

weakness or ambiguity or vacillation.

We are students of our own history,

and we know that at the time the colonies

rebelled against the British, there

were many naysayers in America.

There were many who said that this

was a foolish experiment; that it was

reckless for people to pledge their lives

and their fortunes and their sacred

honor to try to do something better. It

was suicidal, it was crazy.

Some were active opponents of the

revolution. Others, and these others

may have been more dangerous, sat on

the fence. They were not sure what signal

they should send. They were not

sure whether they were ready to fight

for their freedom or not.

The United States has sent a powerful

signal I think to the world by saying

that we are willing to take on, with

our allies, the difficult work of introducing

that sacred gift of freedom to

the people of Iraq. We should not be

ambiguous in offering that same gift to

the people of Iran.

We should not, we should not, be engaged

in any overt military acts, unless

intelligence would warrant action

to the contrary, specific intelligence. I

repeat, I am not calling for a policy of

military engagement against the Iranian

government. But I am absolutely

calling for an expression as clear as a

bell that the freedom that we enjoy

here, the freedom that we aspire to see

the people of Iraq enjoy, is the freedom

that we wish to see the people of Iran

enjoy, and we will not be fooled or deceived

by the false front of a faux

democratic government. We will not

relent in our opposition to that government’s

effort to build a nuclear bomb.

We will not back down in the face of

any international criticism as to the

purity and import of this evil.

It would be horribly wrong and horribly

prejudicial to leave anyone with

the impression that any significant

portion of the 1 billion Muslims in this

world are dedicated to the eradication

of us and our way of life. They are not.

It would be horribly wrong and horribly

false to leave anyone with the impression

that people of the Arab culture

and descent or the Persian culture

and descent are dedicated to the destruction

of our way of life. They are

most emphatically not.

I believe that the vast majority of

people of the Islamic faith, of the Arab

and Persian ethnicities, wish to live in

freedom and to celebrate diversity and

to join the future, rather than wallowing

in the past.

But it is irrefutable that there is a

force present in the world, a small but

malignant force present in the world,

that wishes to do us grave harm, that

wishes to destroy our way of life and

destroy the chance to spread our way

of life to those in all corners of the

world who would wish to enjoy it, and

that force calls itself radical Islam.

It is a perversion of the Islamic faith.

It is a hijacking of that faith of peace.

But it is what those who practice this

poisonous attitude call themselves.

And where they find sanctuary and

where they find money and where they

find weaponry and where they find personnel

and where they find leadership,

these are the places that will incubate

the next September 11.

There are really two views about terrorism

in America, and they are not

liberal and conservative, or Republican

and Democrat, or military and diplomatic.

The two views are these:

Some people view terrorism as a series

of essentially unrelated crimes;

horrible crimes, but crimes that spring

from independent criminals. With the

exception of the link between the USS

*Cole* bombing and the first World Trade

Center and the second one, all of which

can be attributed to al Qaeda, proponents

of this view would argue that

we need to react to each one of these

isolated incidents by prosecuting those

who committed the offense, shoring up

our defenses so it cannot happen again.

The other view of terrorism, which I

hold and I believe that history teaches

us is the correct view, is that these are

not a series of isolated incidents; that

we are engaged in a struggle between

those who would destroy our way of

life and those who would stand by us

and protect our way of life.

The most horrific example of that

struggle was the one that he experienced

in September of 2001. Shame on

us if we do not learn from that example.

If we draw the lesson that September

11 was about one terrorist organization

operating out of one country

that on one occasion was able to succeed

in a massive terrorist attack

against this country, we are

misreading history to our great peril.

If instead we understand what happened

then differently, if instead we

say that the lesson that we learn is

that when you give terrorists leadership

and personnel and money and

weaponry and sanctuary, they will attack.

It is not in our interest to make

lists of countries that we want to attack.

It diminishes our strength. It

lessens our standing in the world, and

we should not do it. But it is most emphatically

in our interest to categorize

and understand where the next sanctuary

might be.

Everyone in this Chamber wishes

that he or she had the foresight to

know that Afghanistan was such a

sanctuary 3 years ago. We could have

avoided a calamity of unspeakable proportions

in this country. The issue tonight,

Mr. Speaker, is where is the next

sanctuary.

I believe that the heroic actions accomplished

by American troops and allied

troops in Iraq has gone a long way

toward removing Iraq as such a sanctuary.

I am certain that the heroic efforts

of our troops in Afghanistan have

essentially removed Afghanistan as

such a potential sanctuary.

Tonight our attention should very

much be focused on Iran as such a

sanctuary. It is a state that is capable

of imprisoning and beating innocent

people for dancing and taking photographs.

It is a state that for 23 years

lied about its development of nuclear

bombs. It is a state that is either trying

to put a good-faith effort forward

to stop its weapons program or trying

to put the best face on an effort that

really is not taking place as the weapons

program continues.

The lesson of September 11 is do not

take chances on estimates. Act and

make sure others cannot act against

you.

I believe that this country should engage

in three steps immediately. First,

we should unambiguously announce

that the policy of the United States of

America is to encourage regime change

in Iran, by which I mean the Council of

Elders that runs the country; and by

which I mean the replacement of that

Council of Elders with a truly representative

group of people chosen by

the Iranian people.

The second thing we should do is

fully enforce the Iran Sanctions Act

passed by this Congress a few years

ago. We should inventory every trade,

aid, economic and regulatory tool at

our disposal and use those tools. We

should broadcast freedom into Iran

more aggressively. We should break

down the information barriers and tell

young Iranians that we will be on their

side if they rise up and fight for freedom.

We should encourage the patriotic,

law abiding citizens of this country

who are of Iranian descent to become

actively engaged in encouraging

their brothers and sisters in their native

land to make the regime change

that will benefit them and us.

The third step is that we should seek

international cooperation on every

level for this effort. It will not be easy.

There will be those who will say this is

yet another American overreaction,

that this is a further policy of American

unilateralism. We should never be

unilateral. We should always seek the

cooperation of allies.

We should also understand the attacks

that are launched by terrorists

will be unilateral. They will have one

target. They will start with the

Israelis. They always do. But they will

eventually get to the United States of

America. We should ask for and actively

seek the cooperation of our European

and Asian friends in meeting

these efforts. Frankly, the actions of

the International Atomic Energy Agency

have been very helpful in this regard.

We should continue those efforts,

but we should not make the mistake of

assuming that their security risk here

is the same as our security risk.

When there is a demonstration sponsored

by the medieval elements in a

country like Iran, it is not the German

flag that they burn. They do not shout

death to Germany. They do not destroy

likenesses of the Eiffel Tower or Big

Ben. They burn the American flag.

They smash likenesses of the American

Capitol, and they clearly let us know

that we are the ones who are in their

sights. So be it.

If we understand that we are the targets,

then we must understand we have

a special responsibility to act. I believe

that this is a program for peace. I

think the best way to achieve peace is

to show those who would disrupt peace

that you will not tolerate it. It is peace

through strength, and after we have

been lied to for 23 years about the creation

of a nuclear bomb, a nuclear

bomb which could be floated into the

harbors of this country and used as a

weapon of awful destruction against

the people of America, after we have

seen the torture against innocent people

that takes place in Iran every day

and is taking place tonight, I think the

stakes are clear. If we are true to our

conviction of peace through strength,

we will make regime change the policy

of the United States of America. Not

through violence, not through attack,

not through aggression, not through

war. We should always reserve the

right to act in our defense. But we

should always understand that the best

way to project our power is through

our freedom, our economic might, our

diplomatic credibility which sadly

needs to be rebuilt in many ways.

It is my objective as a Member of the

United States Congress that I will

never again have another day like September

12, 2001, when I came to this

building not sure whether it was safe

to be in, after a sleepless night, and

asked myself what I had failed to do to

prevent the mayhem that had occurred

in my country the day before. I asked

myself whether any of the $3 trillion of

the taxpayers’ money I had voted to

spend on intelligence and defense of

this country had done us any good the

previous day. I never want to live another

September 12. I never again want

to have to think what we could have

done to learn the lessons of terrorism

and stop another terrorist attack.

If we take decisive action and, among

other things, if we pursue the policy of

regime change in Iran, I believe that

the likelihood of having another September

12, 2001, will diminish; and more

importantly, the likelihood of a catastrophic

repeat of September 11, 2001,

using a nuclear weapon will diminish

greatly.

We owe our country nothing less. We

owe the decent people of Iran nothing

less; and we owe it to our sense of history

to get this very important job

done.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank

Mr. Paul Bauer of my staff who was

very instrumental in getting the research

done for this effort. And, again,

I would like to thank the staff of the

House of Representatives for being

with us so I would have this opportunity

to speak.