Mr. President, one thing I can say for the distinguished

Senator from Massachusetts is that he has been against this war from

the beginning. He has taken what he considers to be a principled

position, that we should never have gone into Iraq to begin with.

However, much of what he said does not resolve the problems that we are

confronting in the War on Terrorism. We hear lots of comments about

pulling out of Iraq but not very much in the way of how to defeat the

terrorists who are dedicated to destroying almost everything we hold

dear and sacred.

The fact of the matter is this resolution is an illustration of

wishful thinking. No matter what you call it: pulling our troops out, a

phased withdrawal, or redeployment, those who support this seem to

think everything is going to be hunky-dory and by taking this course we

can resolve all our difficulties. Of course, they provide the usual

language of diplomacy and some of the other things.

Look at what this resolution says. It says: Whereas, U.S. troops

should not be policing a civil war; and the current conflict in Iraq

requires principally a political solution.

The fact of the matter is we have three distinct areas in Iraq: The

Kurds in the north, the Sunnis in the center, and the Shias everywhere

else, including in the center.

There is a long history of animosity between these groups. But look

at the progress that has been made: women now have the right to vote;

young girls are able to go to school.

Eighty percent of the people voted for the representative form of

government that they enjoy today. Remember, it took us 10 years to

implement our Constitution.

What I have not heard from those who oppose the war is, how do we

solve the problem of terrorism?

Let's be honest. Terrorism is something we have confronted

sporadically throughout the years, though not at the same level of

intensity as the last couple of years. When the Bader-Meinhof gang

paralyzed Europe, a lot of people felt we should back away. But we

supported our allies and, today, you don't hear about them. Similar

things can be said about the fate of the Red Brigade. However, I fully

recognize that these groups were minor compared to the terrorists in

the Islamic world.

The fact is we are in a different war than we have ever been in

before. We are fighting terrorists who don't wear uniforms, who don't

represent a country; they represent an ideology. They are Salafi

jihadists who, going back to the seventh century, when the Islamic

people controlled much of the Mediterranean world, used force freely to

achieve their objectives and, if you disagreed with them, they killed

you.

We lost 3,000 people in 1 day in this country. As the author of the

1996-1997 Antiterrorism Effective Death Penalty Act, I recognized that

we did not give law enforcement the tools to be able to prevent

terrorism in this country. One reason was we naively thought that we

would never suffer from the type of terrorism that occurred on 9/11/

2001. The PATRIOT Act brought the antiterrorism laws that were

deficient up to the level of the anti-Mafia laws.

Can you imagine what will happen if we don't take these people on and

do what we can to stop them. What happens if one of them--and they are

dedicated to doing this--gets a weapon of mass destruction and comes to

New York, Washington, DC, Boston, Los Angeles, Chicago, Miami, or any

number of other cities, and blows up the city and causes the deaths of

hundreds of thousands of people?

They are dedicated to this. They don't value human life as we do.

They believe they are going to be blessed for having killed the

infidels.

The fact of the matter is that is what we are faced with--radical

extremists who would harm our country if they could. The reason they

cannot is because we have been taking it to them in Afghanistan and

Iraq. It is not pleasant, there is no question. There are sacrifices

being made--our soldiers are being deployed and redeployed. There is no

question there are mistakes that have been made--everything from

throwing the Baathists out of the military, many of whom were not

Saddam Hussein loyalists, to thinking this operation would initially be

treated by the Iraqi as a liberation.

There were lots of mistakes, but there are a lot of things that are

good too.

The fact of the matter is, there are hospitals up and running, girls

are going to school, women have some rights in Iraq--more than ever

before--and upward of 80 percent of the people voted for a

representative form of government. We should never lose track of that.

None of this would have happened had it not been for our soldiers and

others in the coalition who were willing to fight, the fact is that

When we get into documents such as this, basically what we are doing is

making it very difficult for our young men and women serving in combat.

Many of whom are risking their lives for us that they might be able to

prevent terrorism from taking over the world and especially the USA.

We know there are terrorist supporters in our country. If we didn't

have a PATRIOT Act, we would not be able to monitor them.

This resolution says:

I like that word ``essential.''

My gosh, can you imagine if we pull out? The terrorists will come in

and try to capture that oil wealth to use against the rest of the

world, especially us.

How are we going to do that if we redeploy our forces out? We know

that by training and equipping them, we may be able to help them

bolster their representative form of government. Keep in mind, I made

the point earlier, it took us 10 years to develop our Constitution and

their's is functioning after 2 years. It took us years to solidify the

strength of our country so we have this great representative form of

government that we have in America today.

If we leave who is going to train and equip those Iraqi forces? Are

we going to leave a small contingent of our people there to be murdered

or are we going to be able to protect them and train and equip the

Iraqi forces? Will anyone have any confidence in us if we leave?

It is interesting to me that as we have started this so-called surge,

al-Sadr and others have left their bases. True, they are probably going

away and hoping to come back; but if we can establish--and General

Petraeus says we can--ourselves and the Iraqi Government in Baghdad so

that they know they can take care of it themselves, it is going to

be much more difficult for al-Sadr and the other brigades to come back

and cause the havoc they have been causing.

Who is going to train and equip these forces? Oddly enough, it is

interesting to me that this body voted 100 to 0 to back General

Petraeus, and ever since we have done that, some here have done nothing

but undermine the very thing he said we have to do. It should also be

noted that this new strategy appears to be working.

We ought to give General Petraeus the opportunity to do it. He has

said he will shoot straight with us. If he finds that the strategy is

not working, he said he will let us know. He has been a straight

shooter from the beginning. He was been a breath of fresh air. He

understands counterinsurgency warfare. He has written the Army's Manual

on this subject. We ought to give him a chance to do what he says he

can do.

How does this small, ``limited number,'' to use the terms of this

particular S.J. Res. 9, target counterterrorism operations? I guess we

will have to do it through intelligence gathering. I happen to be on

the Intelligence Committee, and I know all too well it is very

difficult to establish human intelligence networks.

Think about that. Bring them all out, redeploy them by March 31,

2008--all U.S. combat forces from Iraq, except for a limited number

that are, again, essential for the following purposes:

My gosh, every one of them would be murdered on the spot if we didn't

have enough people there to provide security.

This is ridiculous.

This is to make it look good, like they are trying to do something

good. Here is what it says:

In other words, pulling out all our people except for this ``limited

number,'' to use their language--

Diplomatic? I know one thing. If you want to make sure diplomacy

works, make sure it is backed up by force. We are not backing it up by

pulling all of our troops out, except for that ``limited number.''

OK. How is that diplomacy going to work if they don't realize we are

there to accomplish our mission? OK. Again, it says:

What do you think we are trying to do? Maliki, is pulling out the

stops to help us.

What happens if we pull our troops out of there and, all of a sudden,

we have a renewed effort by terrorists to assault us on our mainland

because we are not keeping them at bay over there? Can you imagine the

cost to our society? Can you imagine if we pull out of there and there

is widespread civil war and genocide that will occur, just like in

Southeast Asia when we pulled out there? Millions of people died. I am

not so sure we should have been in Southeast Asia, but I feel confident

we should be here. It says:

Those are nice, high-flying words. If our diplomacy is not backed up

by our willingness to take these people on, I suspect we are going to

have more than a 9/11, 3,000-person loss in this country. When we have

many more people killed as a result of terrorism in our country because

they will be emboldened by this type of resolution, then it seems to me

that we are going to pay a price that will be much higher than what we

are paying now. We have to take these people on. We cannot walk away.

There are too many people who have relied on us.

Admittedly, we at least need to give General Petraeus and the current

forces there a chance to make this work. He says he believes he can do

it. But he also is a straight shooter and has said: If we cannot do it,

I will tell you we cannot. That may be the time when we will have to

say there is not much more we can do there. I know one thing. The

moderate Arabs are very concerned about what is going on over there.

They know that if the United States doesn't have its full influence in

the Middle East, there is going to be chaos. They know that these

Wahhabi, Salafi jihadists will make mincemeat of the Middle East, and

they will be emboldened if we walk out of there and act like we can

work diplomatically on some of these problems. I think diplomacy is

very important. But it needs

to be backed up by a strong military plan, so they know we are not

going to put up with a lot of foolery.

Look, I think there are sincere people on both sides of this debate.

But I challenge the other side, who believes in this type of a

resolution, to show us how you prevent the terrorists from coming here.

Show us how you are going to win this war against terrorism. Show us

how you are going to make a difference in the lives of all those who

have lost loved ones thus far, not only on 9/11 but those who have

given their lives for us over in Iraq.

Show us how pulling the troops out is going to defeat the terrorists.

Tell us what happens after this resolution becomes law. Their plan

offers only one option: making the United States look like it lost to

the terrorists in the Middle East. That would be one of the worst

things that could happen to our Nation and one of the worst messages we

could send to the world.

I don't find fault with anybody who sincerely believes in a

resolution such as this, but I question whether they have thought it

through. Have they looked at the intelligence? Have they listened to

our Armed Forces, who know they are fighting for something worthwhile,

who know they are fighting for freedom, and who know they are fighting

for the Iraqi people. Our military fully realizes they are not only

fighting, as they had to, to overturn a vicious, cruel dictator, but to

create stability in a place that needs stability almost more than

anything else. Our service members also know that we have moderate Arab

friends who are pulling for us. Allies, in the region, who hope we will

succeed because they know they will be next. And if we fail, we will

pay a price like nothing we have paid before.

As I said, everyone in this body is a friend of mine. However, I

strongly disagree with those who think this is a good resolution. I do

not question their integrity or their desire to try and find some

solution. But this certainly is no solution. This is a walk away that

will cause us greater problems in the future. If that happens, we are

all going to reap the whirlwind.

I have no doubt, as a member of the Intelligence Committee, that

there are terrorists who would love to destroy our country. There are

some, who if set free, would do everything in their power to destroy

our nation.

Frankly, we cannot walk away until we give General Petraeus and our

Service members an opportunity to win this war.

We have never fought a war such as this. I do not blame anybody who

is concerned that we are paying too high a price. But I ask people to

think about the higher price we will pay if we don't win this war. I

ask my fellow citizens to understand that we are fighting people who

are dedicated to destroying those who disagree with them and there will

be a heavy price to be paid if we walk away from our responsibilities.

There is a good reason why we have not had a major terrorist incident

since 9/11/2001. We have shown the will to take these people on, and to

disrupt their plans. We have captured or killed a large number of these

terrorists, including members of al-Qaida leadership. We have bottled

up Osama bin Laden and Zawahiri.

If we walk away because of this resolution, it seems to me we will

pay a much heavier price later, and I am very concerned about that.

My family lost my only living brother in World War II. He flew on one

of the air raids that helped destroy Hitler's oilfields. It was a price

our family paid. I am very proud of my brother Jesse. He was fighting

for freedom, and he did not walk away from the threat Hitler posed.

Today, we once again live in dangerous times, possibly even more

dangerous. We cannot leave Iraq until we give General Petraeus and our

troops the opportunity to accomplish their mission. We should not

undermine their efforts with this resolution.

Though I respect my colleagues differing opinions I believe this

resolution undermines their efforts--the efforts of those young men and

women who are sacrificing for us overseas.

We should not decide these matters based on polls. Unfortunately, I

think we have far too many people who are paying attention to the

polls. I look at some of the candidates for President today, how they

have changed their positions gradually because they think the polls

require it. We are not here to respond to polls. We are here to do what

we believe is in the best interest of our country. Some sincerely

disagree with me and I understand that. But I believe it is their

solemn duty to explain what we are going to do if we pull out of Iraq.

Will we not create a myriad of other problems? Will not the entire

Middle East become a war zone? Under such conditions, Israel itself

will be threatened as well as moderate Arab countries. We cannot walk

away, and we cannot allow the whole Middle East to descend into the

Salafis jihadist arms.

I hope our colleagues will think these matters through. I certainly

hope they will vote against this joint resolution.

Many of my colleagues voted to bring forth this debate. I understand

their reasoning. However, I could not vote for this debate because the

resolution is faulty on its face.

I don't know anybody who worries more about our young men and women

who are sacrificing over there than I do because our family has lived

through it. Not only did we lose a brother in the Second World War, but

we lost a brother-in-law in Vietnam. Just a few years ago, my family

buried another brother-in-law who served with the Marines in Vietnam

and rose to the rank of First Sergeant. I feel deeply about these

matters, but if we don't stand up and do what is right, we will reap

the whirlwind. It will cost us more than it is costing us right now,

and today's cost is significant.

Mr. President, I wanted to say these few words. I hope we will defeat

this resolution. I think it will be in the best interest of the country

and in the best interest of the world.

I yield the floor.