Mr. Speaker, the last 2

weeks have been tough for all Americans.

The best we can say is that the

events have rallied the American spirit

of shared love and generosity. Partisanship

was put on hold as it well

should have been. We now, as a free

people, must deal with this tragedy in

the best way possible. Punishment and

prevention is mandatory.

We must not, however, sacrifice our

liberties at the hand of an irrational

urgency. Calm deliberation in our effort

to restore normalcy is crucial.

Cries for dropping nuclear bombs on an

enemy not yet identified cannot possibly

help in achieving this goal.

Mr. Speaker, I returned to Congress 5

years ago out of deep concern about

our foreign policy of international

interventionism and a monetary and

fiscal policy, I believe, would lead to a

financial and dollar crisis.

Over the past 5 years, I have frequently

expressed my views on these

issues and why I believe our policies

should be changed. This deep concern

prompted me to seek and receive seats

on the Committee on Financial Services

and the Committee on International

Relations.

I sought to thwart some of the dangers

I saw coming, but as the horrific

attacks shows, these efforts were to no

avail. As concerned as I was, the enormity

of the two-pronged crisis that we

now face came with a ferocity no one

ever wanted to imagine. Now we must

deal with what we have and do our best

to restore our country to a more normal

status.

I do not believe this can happen if we

ignore the truth. We cannot close our

eyes to the recent history that has

brought us to this international crisis.

We should guard against emotionally

driven demands to kill many bystanders

in an effort to liquidate our enemy.

These efforts could well fail to punish

the perpetrators while only expanding

the war and making things worse by

killing innocent noncombatants and

further radicalizing Muslim people.

It is obviously no easy task to destroy

an almost invisible ubiquitous

enemy spread throughout the world

without expanding the war or infringing

on our liberties here at home.

Above all else that is our mandate and

our key constitutional responsibility,

protecting liberty and providing for national

security.

My strong belief is that in the past

efforts in the U.S. Congress to do much

more than this has diverted our attention

and, hence, led to our neglect of

these responsibilities. Following the

September 11 disasters, a militant Islamic

group in Pakistan held up a sign

for all the world to see. It said: ‘‘Americans,

think! Why you are hated all

over the world.’’ We abhor the messenger,

but we should not ignore the

message.

Here at home we are told that the

only reason for the suicidal mass killing

we experienced on September 11 is

that we are hated because we are free

and prosperous. If these two conflicting

views are not reconciled we cannot

wisely fight nor win the war in which

we now find ourselves. We must understand

why the hatred is directed toward

Americans and not any other

Western country.

In studying history, I, as many others,

have come to the conclusion that

war is most often fought for economic

reasons, but economic wars are driven

by moral and emotional overtones. Our

own revolution was fought to escape

from the excessive taxation but was inspired

and driven by our desire to protect

our God-given right to liberty.

The War Between the States, fought

primarily over tariffs, was nonetheless

inspired by the abhorrence of slavery.

It is this moral inspiration that drives

people to suicidally fight to the death

as so many Americans did between 1861

and 1865.

Both economic and moral causes of

war must be understood. Ignoring the

importance of each is dangerous. We

should not casually ignore the root

causes of our current fight nor pursue

this fight by merely accepting the explanation

that they terrorize us out of

jealousy.

It has already been written that Islamic

militants are fighting a holy

war, a jihad. This drives them to commit

acts that to us are beyond comprehension.

It seems that they have no

concern for economic issues since they

have no regard even for their own lives,

but an economic issue does exist in this

war. It is oil.

When the conflict broke out between

Iraq and Iran in the early 1980s, we

helped to finance and arm Iraq and

Saddam Hussein. At that time, Anwar

Sadat of Egypt profoundly stated,

‘‘This is the beginning of the war for

oil.’’ Our crisis today is part of this

long-lasting war over oil.

Osama bin Laden, a wealthy man,

left Saudi Arabia in 1979 to join American-

sponsored so-called freedom fighters

in Afghanistan. He received financial

assistance, weapons and training

from our CIA, just as his allies in

Kosovo continue to receive the same

from us today.

Unbelievably, to this day our foreign

aid continues to flow into Afghanistan,

even as we prepare to go to war against

her. My suggestion is, not only should

we stop this aid immediately, but we

should never have started it in the first

place.

It is during this time, bin Laden

learned to practice terror tragically

with money from the U.S. taxpayer,

but it was not until 1991 during what

we referred to as the Persian Gulf War

that he turned fully against the United

States. It was this war, said to protect

our oil, that brought out the worst in

him. Of course, it is not our oil. The

oil, in fact, belongs to the Arabs and

other Muslim Nations on the Persian

gulf.

Our military presence in Saudi Arabia

is what most Muslims believe to be

a sacred violation of holy land. The

continuous bombing and embargo of

Iraq has intensified the hatred and contributed

to more than a million deaths

in Iraq. It is clear that protecting certain

oil interests and our presence in

the Persian Gulf helps drive this holy

war.

Muslims see this as an invasion and

domination by a foreign enemy which

inspires radicalism. This is not new.

This war, from their viewpoint, has

been going on since the Crusades 1,000

years ago. We ignore this history at

our own peril.

The radicals react as some Americans

might react if China dominated

the Gulf of Mexico and had air bases in

Texas and Florida. Dominating the

Persian Gulf is not a benign activity. It

has consequences. The attack on the

U.S.S. *Cole* was a warning we ignored.

Furthermore, our support for secular

governments in the moderate Arab

country is interpreted by the radicals

as more American control over their

region that they want.

There is no doubt that our policies

that are seen by the radicals as favoring

one faction over another in the

long-lasting Middle East conflict adds

to the distrust and hatred of America.

The hatred has been suppressed because

we are a powerful economic and

military force and wield a lot of influence.

But this suppressed hatred is now

becoming more visible. And we, as

Americans, for the most part, are not

even aware of how this could be. Americans

have no animosity toward a people

they hardly even know. Instead,

our policies have been driven by the

commercial interests of a few, and now

the innocent suffer.

I am hopeful that shedding a light on

the truth will be helpful in resolving

this conflict in the very dangerous period

that lies ahead. Without some understanding

of the recent and past history

of the Middle East and the Persian

Gulf, we cannot expect to punish the

evildoers without expanding the nightmare

of hatred that is now sweeping

the world. Punishing the evildoers is

crucial. Restoring safety and security

to our country is critical. Providing for

a strong defense is essential. But extricating

ourselves from a holy war that

we do not understand is also necessary

if we expect to achieve the above-mentioned

goals.

Let us all hope and pray for guidance

in our effort to restore the peace and

tranquility we all desire. We did a poor

job in providing the security that all

Americans should expect, and this is

our foremost responsibility. Some

Members have been quick to point out

the shortcomings of the FBI, the CIA,

and the FAA, and to claim more money

will rectify the situation. I am not so

sure. Bureaucracies, by nature, are inefficient.

The FBI and CIA records

come up short. The FBI loses computers

and guns and is careless with

records. The CIA rarely provides timely

intelligence. The FAA’s idea of security

against hijackers is asking all passengers

who packed their bags.

The clamor now is to give more authority

and money to these agencies.

But remember, important industries

like our chemical plants and refineries

do not depend on government agencies

for security. They build fences and hire

guards with guns. The airlines have not

been allowed to do the same thing.

There was a time when airline pilots

were allowed and did carry guns, and

yet this has been prohibited by government

regulations. If this responsibility

had been left with the airlines to provide

safety, they may well have had

armed guards and pilots on the planes,

just as our industrial sites have.

Privatizing the FAA, as other countries

have, would also give airlines

more leeway in providing security. My

bill, H.R. 2896, should be passed immediately

to clarify that the Federal Government

will never place a prohibition

on pilots being armed. We do not need

more laws restricting our civil liberties,

we need more freedom to defend

ourselves.

We face an enormous task to restore

the sense of security we have taken for

granted for so long, but it can be done.

Destroying the evildoers while extricating

ourselves from this unholiest of

wars is no small challenge. The job is

somewhat like getting out of a pit

filled with venomous snakes. The sooner

we shoot the snakes that immediately

threaten us, the sooner we can

get safely away. If we are not careful,

though, we will breed more snakes; and

they will come out of every nook and

cranny from around the world and little

will be resolved.

It is no easy task, but before we

fight, we had better be precise about

whom we are fighting and how many

there are and where they are hiding; or

we will never know when the war is

over and our goals are achieved. Without

this knowledge, the war can go on

for a long, long time. And the war for

oil has already been going on for more

than 20 years. To this point, our President

and his administration has displayed

the necessary deliberation. This

is a positive change from unauthorized

and ineffective retaliatory bombings in

past years that only worsened various

conflicts. If we cannot or will not define

the enemy, the cost to fight such

a war will be endless.

How many American troops are we

prepared to lose? How much money are

we prepared to spend? How many innocent

civilians in our Nation and others

are we willing to see killed? How many

American civilians will be jeopardized?

How much of our civil liberties are we

prepared to give up? How much prosperity

will we sacrifice?

The founders and authors of our Constitution

provided an answer for the

difficult task that we now face. When a

precise declaration of war was impossible

due to the vagueness of our

enemy, the Congress was expected to

take it upon themselves to direct the

reprisal against an enemy not recognized

as a government. In the early

days, the concern was piracy on the

high seas. Piracy was one of only three

Federal crimes named in the original

Constitution. Today, we have a new

type of deadly piracy in the high sky

over our country.

The solution the founders came up

with under these circumstances was for

Congress to grant letters of marque

and reprisal. This puts the responsibility

in the hands of Congress to direct

the President to perform the task,

with permission to use and reward private

sources to carry out the task,

such as the elimination of Osama bin

Laden and his key supporters. This

narrows targeting the enemy.

This effort would not preclude the

President’s other efforts to resolve the

crisis but, if successful, would preclude

a foolish invasion of a remote country

with a forbidding terrain like Afghanistan,

a country that no foreign power

has ever successfully conquered

throughout all of history. Lives could

be saved, billions of dollars could be

saved, and escalation due to needless

and senseless killing could be prevented.

Mr. Speaker, we must seriously consider

this option. This answer is a

world apart from the potential disaster

of launching nuclear weapons or endless

bombing of an unseen enemy.

Marque and reprisal demands the

enemy be seen and precisely targeted

with minimal danger to others. It

should be considered, and for various

reasons, is far superior to any effort

that could be carried out by the CIA.

We must not sacrifice the civil liberties

that generations of Americans

have enjoyed and fought for over the

past 225 years. Unwise decisions in response

to the terror inflicted on us

may well fail to destroy our enemy,

while undermining our liberties here at

home. That will not be a victory worth

celebrating.

The wise use of marque and reprisal

could negate the need to undermine the

privacy and rights of our citizens. As

we work through this civil task, let us

resist the temptation to invoke the

most authoritarian of all notions that

not too many years ago tore this Nation

apart, the military draft.

The country is now unified against

the enemy. The military draft does

nothing to contribute to unity, nor as

the Pentagon again has confirmed,

does it promote an efficient military.

Precise identification of all travelers

on our air flights is a desired goal. A

national ID issued by the Federal Government

would prove to be disastrous

to our civil liberties and should not be

considered. This type of surveillance

power should never be given to an intrusive,

overbearing government no

matter how well intentioned the motives.

The same result can be better

achieved by the marketplace. Passenger

IDs voluntarily issued by the

airlines could be counterfeit-proof, and

loss or theft of an ID could be immediately

reported to the proper authorities.

An ID, fingerprints, birth certificates,

or any other information can be

required without any violations of anyone’s

personal liberty.

This delicate information would not

be placed in the hands of the Government

agents, but could be made available

to law enforcement officers, like

any other information obtained with

probable cause in a search warrant.

The heat of the moment has prompted

calls by some of our officials for

great sacrifice of our liberties and privacy.

This poses great danger to our

way of life and will provide little help

in dealing with our enemies.

Efforts of this sort will only punish

the innocent and have no effect on a

would-be terrorist. We should be careful

not to do something just to do

something, even something harmful.

Mr. Speaker, I fear that some big

mistakes could be made in pursuit of

our enemies if we do not proceed with

great caution, wisdom, and deliberation.

Action is necessary. Inaction is

unacceptable.

No doubt others recognize the difficulties

in targeting such an elusive

enemy. This is why the principle behind

the marque and reprisal must be

given serious consideration. In retaliation,

an unintended consequence of a

policy of wanton destruction without

benefit to our cause could result in the

overthrow of moderate Arab nations by

the radicals that support bin Laden.

This will not serve our interests and

will surely exacerbate the threat to all

Americans.

As we search for a solution to the

mess we are in, it behooves us to look

at how John F. Kennedy handled the

Cuban crisis in 1962. Personally, that

crisis led to a 5-year tour in the U.S.

Air Force for me. As horrible and dangerous

as the present crisis is, those of

us that held our breath during some

very tense moments that October realized

we were on the brink of a worldwide

nuclear holocaust.

That crisis represented the greatest

potential danger to the world in all of

human history. President Kennedy

held firm and stood up to the Soviets

as he should have and the confrontation

was resolved. What was not known

at the time was the reassessment of

our foreign policy that placed nuclear

missiles in the Soviet’s back yard in

Turkey. These missiles were quietly removed

a few months later, and the

world became a safer place in which to

live. Eventually we won the Cold War

without starting World War III.

Our enemy today, as formidable as he

is, cannot compare to the armed might

of the Soviet Union in the fall of 1962.

Wisdom and caution on Kennedy’s part

in dealing with the crisis was indeed a

profile in courage. But his courage was

not only in his standing up to the Soviets,

but his willingness to reexamine

our nuclear missile presence in Turkey

which, if it had been known at the

time, would have been condemned as

an act of cowardice.

President Bush now has the challenge

to do something equally courageous

and wise. This is necessary if we

expect to avert a catastrophic World

War III. When the President asks for

patience as he and his advisors

deliberate seek a course of action, all

Americans should surely heed this request.

Mr. Speaker, I support President

Bush and voted for the authority and

the money to carry out his responsibilities

to defend this country. But the

degree of death and destruction and

chances of escalation must be carefully

taken into consideration.

It is, though, only with sadness that

I reflect on the support, the dollars,

the troops, the weapons and training

provided by U.S. taxpayers that are

now being used against us. Logic

should tell us that intervening in all

the wars of the world has been detrimental

to our own self-interest and

should be reconsidered.

The efforts of a small minority in

Congress to avoid this confrontation by

voting for the foreign policy of George

Washington, John Adams, and Thomas

Jefferson and all the 19th century

Presidents went unheeded.

The unwise policy of supporting so

many militants who later became our

armed enemies makes little sense,

whether it is bin Laden or Saddam

Hussein. A policy designed to protect

America is wise and frugal, and hopefully

it will once again be considered.

George Washington, as we all know,

advised strongly, as he departed his

Presidency, that we should avoid all

entangling alliances with foreign nations.

The call for a noninterventionist policy

over the past year has fallen on

deaf ears. My suggestions made here

today will probably meet the same

fate. Yet, if truth is spoken, ignoring it

will not negate it. In that case, something

will be lost. But if something is

said to be true and it is not and it is ignored,

nothing is lost. My goal is to

contribute to the truth and to the security

of this Nation.

What I have said today is different

from what is said and accepted in

Washington as conventional wisdom,

but it is not in conflict with our history

and our Constitution. It is a policy

that has, whenever tried, generated

more peace and prosperity than any

other policy for dealing with foreign

affairs. The authors of the Constitution

clearly understood this. Since the light

of truth shines brightest in the darkness

of evil and ignorance, we should

all strive to shine that light.