Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this profound honor to

have the opportunity to address you here on the floor of the United

States House of Representatives, the People's House.

I would reflect that all week long, starting really on Tuesday

morning, we have had a series of marathon debates taking place here,

Mr. Speaker, marathon debates that ranged in the area of 12 hours a

day, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday until after 1 a.m. this morning,

taking up again this morning shortly after 8 o'clock, and then moving

on until mid-afternoon, when we finally had a vote on the resolution,

the resolution that was offered by the majority, the resolution that in

one voice said, we honor the troops, and the

other voice said, but we are opposed to the reinforcements and opposed

to the surge that the President had ordered, the surge that is already

in motion, the troops, many of them have already been deployed, and it

is not possible to back out of this.

So the voice that came, Mr. Speaker, to the people across this world

was answered and was heard in a lot of different ways.

On one side of it, the antiwar movement within the United States, the

activists, liberal left, the protesters that are, at least if not the

people that were in the streets during Vietnam, were descendants of the

people that were in the streets during Vietnam, philosophically, if not

literally, and in many cases it was both. They heard a message, which

is, at every cost, the Speaker's leadership is going to drag our

military and pull our Commander in Chief back of their commitment to

the Iraqi people in the Middle East.

And the other voice, a voice was heard by a number of American

people, stalwart patriots, people who believe in the destiny of America

and understand that there is a price to be paid by each succeeding

generation because of the decisions that are made by the preceding

generations. We are the recipients of the sacrifice of our Founders and

of every generation's sacrifice, starting with the shaping of the

Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, those veterans of the

Revolutionary War, those who supported the effort in the Revolutionary

War, those who shaped the Constitution, Mr. Speaker, those that built

the economy, those that built the churches, those that built the

schools, those that built the communities that link together, which is

this greater American civilization, we are the beneficiaries.

The decisions that they made July 4, 1776, to pick a point we all

understand, we benefitted from that decision. And it was a hard

decision. And it wasn't a decision that was made without great concern

or without great debate. There was. And there was dissension on both

sides.

Some of the people that were opposed to freedom, a free nation, were

identified as the Tories, the people that aligned with the British.

They didn't think it was worth the price. They didn't want to risk the

blood. They didn't want to risk the treasure. They thought that they

could suffer the indignities and the injustices that were being poured

upon them from the crown, and that was more tolerable than the price

that would have to be paid for freedom.

But freedom won out. Freedom was established. And they pledged their

lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor, and they did so knowing

that they might very well lose their lives and their fortunes, but they

would never lose their sacred honor. That was the creed that came from

the Founding Fathers, and that was just the Revolutionary War. Of

course, it was the biggest and most significant.

But, shortly after that, we had another conflict, and one of those

conflicts, Mr. Speaker, was one that started out over in the

Mediterranean. The hostilities between the United States and the

British concluded in 1783. That was when the military victory was won

by George Washington, and that was when, also, the protection of the

Union Jack that flew over the seas and the oceans was removed from the

protection of our Merchant Marine.

So 1783, our Merchant Marine, our ship sailing on the high seas, lost

the Union Jack protection, the intimidation of the British Royal Navy,

1783. 1784, American ships were attacked and boarded and pirated, and

our sailors were forced into slavery, and the cargos were sold, and the

ships were put back into the fleets of the Barbary pirates, the Barbary

pirates being the predecessors of the enemy that we have today.

And it is an interesting study in history, Mr. Speaker, to see what

unfolded here in the history of the United States when we sent our best

diplomats over to the Mediterranean to negotiate with the Barbary

pirates. Those were Thomas Jefferson and John Adams.

Now, I have here a copy, Mr. Speaker, this is of the papers of Thomas

Jefferson, right here, volume nine. This is dated 1785, November 1,

1785 to 1786. This is the report that Thomas Jefferson returned upon

his conclusion of his diplomat mission to the Tripoli pirates.

In a paragraph that he has written to the American commissioners and

John Jay he says, soon after the arrival of Mr. Jay in London, we had a

conference with the ambassador of Tripoli at his house. This ambassador

of Tripoli was a representative of the Islamic Caliphate. And he says,

he writes, ``We took the liberty to make some inquiries concerning the

grounds of their pretensions to make war upon nations who had done them

no injury,'' meaning the United States of America, ``and observed that

we consider all mankind as our friends, who had done us no wrong, nor

had given us any provocation.''

In other words, the statement that came from Thomas Jefferson and

John Adams was, to the ambassador from Tripoli, we consider you

friends. We have had no hostilities toward you. We have not provoked

you in any way. We are simply sailing our ships on the high seas and

providing open commerce and trade like any country would do. Why do you

attack us? Why do you kill us? Why do you press our sailors into

slavery?

Jefferson answered, The ambassador from Tripoli answered us that it

was founded on the laws of their prophet, that it was written in their

Koran that all nations who should not have acknowledged their authority

were sinners, the authority of the Koran. I continue quoting, that it

was their right and duty to make war upon them wherever they could be

found and to make slaves of all they could take as prisoners and that

every Muslim who should be slain in battle was sure to go to paradise.

That is from the negotiations that took place in 1786, and that is

from Jefferson's report to John Jay.

Now, here we are, 2006. We are going through this debate, Mr.

Speaker, and I am hearing over and over again there is a reason why

they hate us. We should understand why they hate us. If we could figure

that out, maybe we could change our ways and we could find a way to

accommodate our disagreements, because surely there are two sides to

every argument.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am here to submit that Thomas Jefferson

understood this thing clearly. He understood a principle that I laid

out this afternoon in debate called nosce hostem, which is a Latin

term. It comes from the Roman legions, and that is Latin for ``know

thine enemy''.

The Romans understood, and they were the most successful long-term

military legions in history all the time up to that point and maybe in

all of history. They had to know their enemy, and they had to

persevere, and that is where that term came, nosce hostem, know thine

enemy.

Thomas Jefferson understood the same thing.

And, in fact, his curiosity and his compulsion to understand and know

the enemy caused him to go out and buy a Koran, and that Koran was part

of his opposition research, if you will. And Jefferson's being one of

the most curious individuals as a figure in our history and maybe the

most learned man of his time, he studied Greek so that he could read

the Greek Bible and do the translation himself. He wasn't quite

satisfied with just King James. He wanted to do that comparison because

he was that much of an intellectual and he had that level of curiosity.

He had the same level of intellectual curiosity in understanding our

enemy the Barbary pirates; so his study of the Koran, I am confident,

concurred with his report back to John Jay that was handed over to

Congress, that report that says they believe their path to salvation is

in killing us.

So Jefferson persevered in his endeavor to understand our enemy. He

studied Koran, understood our enemy, put the report in place, and in

that one simple paragraph is an explanation of our enemy today. And

there is quote after quote after quote that have been brought forward

here by my colleagues on this side of the aisle in the last several

days that support that statement. Statements made by Osama bin Laden,

statements made by Zawahiri, statements made by other leaders of al

Qaeda where they say their religious duty, their responsibility, is to

keep attacking infidels; infidels, being defined as unbelievers in

their Koran; unbelievers, being those who have not sworn allegiance to

Islam.

And you saw that in that quote where he said that they continued to

attack us wherever we might be found until we either converted to Islam

or pay homage or are beheaded. And historically looking back, most of

us recognize when we say ``leathernecks,'' that means the Marine Corps

today. That nickname came from the Barbary pirate wars when they went

to the shores of Tripoli, and our Marine Corps wore heavy thick leather

collars, Mr. Speaker. Those collars were worn to reduce the number of

marines that would be beheaded by the swinging swords of the Barbary

pirates.

The beheadings of today are not anything new. These are beheadings

that go back throughout time, throughout the Crusades, clear back to a

thousand years ago, Mr. Speaker. And our enemy believes they are

fighting that same war. They carry that same grudge. But furthermore,

it is a religious conviction on their part. It is not something that

can be negotiated away. And to believe that we could resolve this

conflict by negotiations is a myopic and naive position. We cannot. If

that were the case, I am going to trust Jefferson would have found a

way, Adams would have found a way, all of our negotiators in the past

would have found a way. Some of them would have found a way at least.

But we fought the Barbary pirates, and it was a herky-jerky, hit-and-

miss, not always successful effort. But we did occupy some land there,

and we did force them into submission, and we did get a kind of an

agreement to resolve the disputes. But the battles between Western

civilization and the Barbary pirates and the radical world of Islam of

that era really didn't end until 1830, and I am going to go on record

here in the Congressional Record, Mr. Speaker, when the French

culminated a military operation and occupied Algiers. When they did

that in 1830, that was essentially, at least for modern times, the end

of the violence. Scattered incidents to be sure, but for the majority

the end of the violence between the radical Islamists who were the

Barbary pirates of that era up until 1830 and then move us forward to

about 1979 when these hostilities started again. They lay dormant. They

were essentially in submission. They didn't have many tools to work

with. Some of them had been colonized. And during that period of time,

they didn't get ahold of governments. They didn't have a place to

start. They didn't have an ability transportation-wise to come out here

and attack the rest of the world.

But things happened and we moved into the modern world. And when the

Cold War was over and there was no longer this titanic struggle between

the world's two Superpowers and that power vacuum, in came al Qaeda. In

came the Taliban. In came the radicals to fill that void. And the

philosophical support became there. The funding was there from oil. The

real oil wealth began to pour into those Islamic states in the 1970s.

And if you remember the oil cartels of that era, the gas lines here,

Jimmy Carter's legacy, the 444 days of 52 American hostages paraded in

front of the television, and the only way they were going to be

released was to elect a President that they were afraid of. So that is

why you saw the split screen of Ronald Reagan taking the oath of office

and those 52 hostages being released at the same time. But that became

the beginning of this constant battle that we have now with the

jihadists of today. And they have been empowered by oil wealth,

families that are wealthy, by the religious network of radical Islam.

Now, to help explain this a little bit, Mr. Speaker, I use an analogy

here that is something that I have not heard from anywhere else. I look

around and I think how do I compare what is going on? How am I to stand

up and say I am opposed to the radical Islam, these jihadists, without

directly attacking Islam itself? Many times the President has made the

statement that Islam is a ``religion of peace.'' I am looking for more

evidence of that before I am going to step up and resoundingly endorse

that statement, but I am not willing to indict them at this point, Mr.

Speaker. I would rather compare it this way: I am going to say the

radical Islam, the jihadists, are a parasite that lives on and within

the host called Islam.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when you think about what that means, a parasite

living on and within a host, a parasite will ride on a host, feed off a

host, reproduce off a host, drop off and attack other species, but also

attack the host species. This goes on over and over again. And I could

take you down through some different species of parasites to make my

case, but it remains a biological fact that that is what a parasite

does.

A parasite doesn't respect its host to the point where it will

refrain from killing the host. Sometimes the parasite will kill the

host. Think in terms of a tapeworm that will draw all of the nutrients

out of the host until the host becomes so scrawny and so disheveled and

so weak that the host actually expires. That will happen. There are

other parasites that will do the same thing, but there are many

parasites that will attack more than one species.

This parasite called radical Islam, these jihadists, attack many

species. They attack every species of Homo sapien, for that matter.

They attack Jews as their preferred target. They attack Christians as a

preferred target. They attack capitalists as a preferred target. And

when they can do a two-fer, a Jewish capitalist, a Christian

capitalist, a Western civilization representative, secular capitalist,

they are all for doing that because they know that that destabilizes

the civilization that they abhor.

This parasite called jihadists also attacks Islam itself. Moderate

Muslims are killed in greater numbers than anybody else historically

over the last 30 or so years because the destabilization that takes

place is where they thrive. This parasite called jihad, the jihadist,

lives and it grows and it thrives in an anarchy.

So they are seeking to create anarchy. They are attacking the host

called Islam, but a host will always provide that food. It will provide

the transportation. It provides a home for the parasite. The parasite

jihadist, radical Islam, lives within Islam. And so radical Islam goes

to the mosques where they preach their hatred and they help sort out

those that are truly convicted on the jihad side. The most radical of

those are identified by their response, their reaction, and they are

connected to and recruited out of the mosques. Many people who go to

the mosques are peaceful people. They all aren't. And that is a center

where the communication comes through.

The language itself is another tool that helps this parasite called

jihadists communicate. So the Arabic language itself is a conduit, Mr.

Speaker; a common conduit through the language, a common conduit

through the mosque system, a common conduit because of common

nationalities and identification with each other. You tie that all

together and then you pick the radicals out, and that is how you sort

out the species of the parasite jihadists.

But the host hasn't done much to eradicate the parasite from its

midst. I haven't seen Islam step up and decide that they are going to

eradicate radical Islam from their midst. No. For a number of reasons.

One, they are afraid to confront them. They don't know what the price

will be. Another one is they are not quite sure they really want to

side with the people that are on our side of this argument. Some of

them are also dancing in the streets with their radical jihadists when

something goes bad for the people on our side, this Western

civilization, which I think encompasses the world that the jihadists

are opposed to. Western civilization including Christians, Jews, the

Judeo Christian ethic, the free market ethic, the liberal democracies

that we have that provide freedom for people and give us this

flexibility to define our own future. They hate freedom, as the

President has said many times, and they attack freedom.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is a difficult nut to crack. And I would like

to charge Islam with eradicating that parasite in their midst. I do

think it is part their responsibility, but I am not hearing them step

up to this task. So I am looking forward to the day that that happens,

Mr. Speaker, but until it does, we have a war to fight.

We have a task ahead of us, and this task that is ahead of us is a

great big, difficult task. And it is far more difficult today, Mr.

Speaker, than it was a week ago because of the message that came out of

this Chamber all week long, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday,

and this morning up until mid-afternoon, and especially because of the

vote; the vote that passed a resolution that said we support our troops

and oppose their mission. I mean a third grader can figure out that

that logic doesn't fit. You have got to do one or the other, and they

are tied together. You don't send your military off and ask them to put

their lives on the line for a mission that you don't believe in. And to

say to them, ``I am all for you, buddy, but if you get shot over there,

if you give your life over there, I can't say that you did it for a

good cause because it is a bad cause.'' That is what got said over

here.

This is a good cause. This is a just cause, Mr. Speaker. And our

troops have been undermined today and yesterday and the day before and

the day before that. And now they have got to carry out a mission, and

it is a lot harder than it has ever been over there.

And our enemy has been encouraged, Mr. Speaker. They have got the

words that have been said over here, these quotes put up. They have got

to be all over al-Jazeera, over the Islamic blogosphere. There have got

to be people dancing in the streets all over the land where they

recruit our enemies because they know what this means. They know what

it means because they study history.

And, Mr. Speaker, I have studied history as well. And part of that

history is, first of all, the United States of America is a Nation

that, up until the conclusion of the Korean War, had never lost a war.

We had been successful in every conflict that we had engaged in. And I

grew up under that. I grew up with a military father and military

uncles on both sides of the family. They sat around a lot and talked.

The United States of America, of all the Nations in the world, has

never lost a war. And the reason we haven't lost a war is because we

believe in freedom.

And you are a lucky young man, Steve King, for being born in the

United States of America. You could have been born anywhere else, but

you were born here. You are a recipient of that freedom that they

fought for and each preceding generation had fought for. And I was

extraordinarily blessed. I am, Mr. Speaker, but I was raised with a

reverence for that freedom and the understanding of the price that was

paid for it. And up until that time we had been successful in every

conflict. They didn't quite define the Korean War except to say, well,

we won that, but nobody talked about that very much.

I bring this up, Mr. Speaker, because I picked up a book a little

while back. I had to do a little searching to find it. And the title of

the book is How We Won the War. By General Vo Nguyen Giap. He was a

Vietnamese general who commanded their troops throughout the entire

period of time that they were in conflict with the United States of

America in Vietnam. And his comment in there that caught my eye first

was ``It all began when the United States failed to win a clear victory

in Korea,'' Mr. Speaker.

If you remember, Korea was resolved in the early 1950s, I think 1952,

but when it was resolved, it ended up being on the 38th parallel. We

had pushed the Chinese back north of the 38th parallel. We had gone

north to the 38th parallel with U.N. troops as well, and pushed back to

the 38th. The resolution came, and we shut down the fight on that 38th

parallel line, which is pretty much back to the same line before the

invasion came from the North Koreans.

So it was fought essentially to a draw, and the line was the same

line that the war began on. My father and their generation didn't

acknowledge that we failed to win that war. They neither acknowledged

or said or even implied that we lost it. I think we fought it to a

draw.

But when General Giap took over in Vietnam, Dien Bien Phu came along

in the mid-fifties and the French had lost, and President Kennedy

ordered our troops into Vietnam in 1963, by my recollection, and the

Vietnamese had to look at what was coming at them. This big industrial

Nation, this sleeping giant, formerly sleeping giant, there was only

about not even two decades after World War II, a huge, powerful

industrial, military and economic force in the world, was coming into

South Vietnam to help support the freedom fighting people in South

Vietnam. He had to come to a conclusion on how they were going to fight

so great a nation.

He had seen the French lose their resolve at Dien Bien Phu. They lost

their resolve along the way. And he knew something Clausewitz had

written about in his book on war years before, when Clausewitz said the

object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct

war. Will and ability, two factors that are the targets of war.

Now, you can destroy the enemy's ability to conduct war. You can wipe

out all their tanks and take all their guns. You can take their swords,

knives and hatchets. They can be totally devoid of arms. But if they

still have the will to fight, they are going to come at with you with

sticks and clubs and fists and boots, if they still have the will. That

is what Clausewitz understood. It is a two-section effort when you go

to fight a war. You are going after the ability to conduct war, the

enemy's ability to conduct war, and you are trying to destroy their

will to conduct war.

So as Giap analyzed that, he realized he could never destroy our

ability to conduct war. We could always pour more and more munitions

into the fight. We could send our ships and planes over and we could

always pour more bombs in there and always could bring more soldiers

in.

So the strategy was how do you then attack, damage, weaken and

destroy the United States' will to conduct war? And the North

Vietnamese, General Giap in particular, recognized that their best ally

in that war wasn't an AK-47 or a ChiCom grenade. What it was was the

anti-war movement in the United States.

So they encouraged that movement, and nurtured it and negotiated with

it. And they brought Jane Fonda over there and put her in a gun

emplacement in Hanoi, and that encouraged the anti-war movement here in

the United States. They sent the photo-op back. There were a number of

photo-ops like that.

You heard from the great Sam Johnson at this very microphone earlier

this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, when he talked about how the voices of the

anti-war leaders in America were transmitted across loud speakers in

the Hanoi Hilton where Sam spent far too many days, 2,500 days in

captivity, and how those voices demoralized our POWs in Vietnam.

But General Giap understood, we are destroying the United States'

will to conduct war. The frontal assault on the will of the American

people was going on relentlessly and persistently, and it says in his

book, their best ally was the anti-war movement here in the United

States.

So here we are today, Mr. Speaker, and the enemy has been encouraged.

There is nothing that came out of that side of the aisle that

discouraged the enemy. I can't think of a single word, maybe one

speaker, and that would have been a little bit qualified, that would

have discouraged the enemy. Over on this side, just hearing Sam

Johnson, if I were the enemy, my feet would tremble in my sandals.

We have to understand that there are two parts to this war, the

ability to conduct war and the will to do so. And we don't conduct wars

here in the United States any longer looking at that as two different

things we need to assault. We are trying to fight a nicy-nice war with

limited targets and rules of engagement that keep our military from

doing the job that they could do.

There isn't a strategy to destroy the enemy's will to conduct war. It

is just a strategy to destroy the enemy's ability, I should say limit

their ability, try to shrink down the arms and funding they have coming

in, and try to limit the transportation routes of the insurgents as

they infiltrate into Iraq.

That is not enough, Mr. Speaker, but at least we are in a position

where we can go forward and win this war if the will of the President

and the will of our military can overcome the encouraged and supported

will of our enemy, which has been encouraged and supported by many,

many voices here on the floor of this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I point out also the legacy of Korea and Vietnam. That

legacy has already been reflected by one of the leaders of our enemy

within Iraq, and this is Muqtada al-Sadr. He is the leader of the Madi

militia, and he has been

a thorn in the side of the United States for a long time. I identified

him as somebody that had to go a long time ago, at least as far back as

early 2004.

I have to say in memory of Charlie Norwood, this man needs a dentist,

and wherever he is going to go, Charlie is going to have no chance at

him.

But this individual, Muqtada al-Sadr, said over Al-Jazeera TV on the

evening of June 11, 2004--I was in Kuwait City waiting to go into Iraq

the next day--Sadr came on Al-Jazeera TV and said in Arabic, with the

English crawler underneath, he said, ``If we keep attacking Americans,

they will leave Iraq the same way they left Vietnam, the same way they

left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu.'' Muqtada al-Sadr, June

11, 2004, and that was Al-Jazeera TV.

That voice out of that man. And when I heard that, I concluded, he

has read General Giap's book. He understands maybe not what happened in

Korea, but he understands what happened in Vietnam. He understands that

he has got to continue to fight, to break the will of the American

people here, here in the United States of America, Mr. Speaker, because

the last battle in this war, if the United States doesn't ultimately

prevail, will be fought right on this blue carpet, right in this place

right here. It won't be fought over there in Iraq, it won't be fought

in the Middle East anywhere. It is here.

Here is where our vulnerability is, Mr. Speaker. Here is where the

battle needs to be fought, and here is where the battle needs to be

won, for our posterity and for the liberty and freedom we have been

passed from our Founding Fathers. Sadr knows it.

I will submit this, Mr. Speaker: If we don't prevail in Iraq, and I

believe that tactically we have every opportunity to do that, if we

don't prevail in Iraq and Jack Murtha gets his way and troops come out

of Iraq before there is a clear victory, then this man comes back into

power. He is probably done talking about how to get Americans to leave

Iraq.

But I can tell you Osama bin Laden will surface, or Zawahri will

surface, and I will bring their picture down here to the floor, Mr.

Speaker, and I will make a statement then. But I make the prediction

now, you will see a picture of either Osama bin Laden or Zawahri or

whoever the leader of al Qaeda is, and underneath it I will put the

quote from them which will go something like this: If we keep attacking

Americans, they will leave Afghanistan the same way they left Vietnam,

the same way they left Lebanon, the same way they left Mogadishu, the

same way they left Iraq.

And every time we lose our resolve and the legacy becomes the legacy

that has been stipulated to us by Muqtada al-Sadr, it gets harder and

harder to win the next war, harder and harder to have the will to

conduct war, harder and harder to destroy their will, when they know

that there is a legacy of us losing our will, us losing our nerve, a

legacy of Members of Congress demonstrating a lack of spine, a lack of

understanding of history, a lack of commitment to the legacy that has

been handed to them and handed to all of us by our founders, Mr.

Speaker.

So, I would reiterate, nosce hostem, know thy enemy. War, according

Clausewitz, the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and

ability to conduct war. No one can destroy our ability, but we don't

have the will to match our ability. And that was proven here today, Mr.

Speaker.

And one of the members of the Democrat party said, and I applaud him

for saying so, it does our military no good for the people on our side

to sit in the corner and boo when they have been ordered into battle.

We need to be on their side.

Who would go into the bleachers and boo their home team and think

somehow the home team was going to perform better? Who would believe,

when you hear the voices that came out of here for the last 4 days, Mr.

Speaker, or I go back to the presidential campaign as it went through

for 2004, where we heard continually ``wrong war, wrong place, wrong

time.'' All we heard from another Senator in Massachusetts, it was all

a war cooked up by oil people in Texas.

Voice after voice after voice of quasi-leaders of the United States

have spoken, and it has undermined our troops and it has weakened their

resolve, and it has empowered and emboldened our enemies. And when they

are sitting in a hovel in Iraq making an IED and watching their Al-

Jazeera TV, Mr. Speaker, and they hear the voices that came out from C-

SPAN from the floor of this Congress, do you think that they make more

bombs or less? Do you think they have more or less courage to plant

them, more or less courage to attack Americans, more or less resolve to

continue the fight, more or less perseverance because of the voices

that came collectively from this side of the aisle and this Congress,

Mr. Speaker?

We all know the answer to that. The answer is they have more resolve,

more persistence; they will make more bombs, they will attack more

Americans, and more Americans will die because the booing from this

section has encouraged our enemy, and I got to bury some of those

soldiers in my district, as do most of us. And that breaks my heart,

because I understand it doesn't have to be. It doesn't have to be, Mr.

Speaker. It didn't have to be and it doesn't have to be. And others

will say, but it is. It is the price of a democratic system and a

democratic process. And they say it is patriotic to speak about our

disagreements.

So, if one yells fire in a crowded theater and 50 people are trampled

to death on the way out and there was no fire, did they abuse their

freedom of speech? And don't we know that there is a Supreme Court

decision that says your freedom of speech doesn't extend to the right

to yell fire in a crowded theater? Verbatim and specifically the answer

to that, Mr. Speaker, is yes.

So how can we give a pass to people whose words cost more lives? And

beyond the lives, people's whose words alter our national destiny and

make us poorer for it and diminish our potential and affect our future

and burden our children and put them at risk, Mr. Speaker? I can't

tolerate that.

As I travel over to the Middle East and settle in and talk to the

soldiers there on the ground, and I like to do that more than anything

else over there, Mr. Speaker. I will walk into a room, maybe a mess

hall, climb aboard a C-130. I will say, anybody over here from Iowa?

There have been a couple of times there hasn't been. Most of the time

there is somebody there from Iowa.

I will sit down, and it is our immediate bond, and I will ask them

what is going on here on the ground? What do I need to know? What do

you want me to know? And please rest assured I will not identify you or

take that information to your officers. This is something for me,

because it is my duty to do this kind of oversight.

And I hear continually, I am proud to fight for freedom, I am proud

to serve my country, Congressman, but why do we have to fight the

United States news media too? Why is there a conflicting message coming

out of Congress? Why do we have to take on that part of this battle? We

are fighting the enemy over here. We need to know that Congress is

behind us.

One of the lieutenant colonels that I travelled over there with made

a statement to me in one of those late evenings as we were talking this

over deeply and profoundly. I will not use his name either because I

have not asked him that I could do so, but I will use the quote.

And he said, Do not save me, pacifists; do not save me. I volunteered

for this. I want to be over here fighting for freedom and liberty

because I know the world will be a safer place. I want to take this

battle on for my children so they do not have to live in fear and they

do not have to carry on this fight.

They are all volunteers, and they say do not save me. I will take my

chances. I volunteered for this war. I want to save my children from

this burden.

Who are we? Who are we to micromanage a war and try to pull our

troops out after all that blood and treasure has been invested in

freeing Iraq and giving them an opportunity for freedom? Who are we?

I had gold star parents, Mr. Speaker, come into my office a week

before I last went to the Middle East. So this would have been the

third week in November, and several families had lost a son or a

daughter in combat over in Iraq or Afghanistan.

We had a lot of profound discussions in there, and I listened to

them. They

had travelled over to Iraq themselves and taken on the risk to go

there. They had met with Iraqis. They had been welcomed into the homes

of the Iraqis, and the Iraqi people showered them with gratitude for

the measure of freedom they have today, even with the insecurities that

are part of that, the gratitude for the sacrifice that Americans have

given, their lives for Iraqi freedom and American safety and world

safety.

And of all the things that were said, one that struck me the most,

Mr. Speaker, was a father who had lost his son from California. His

name is John. I have forgotten his last name, if I actually ever heard

it, and he said, It is different now. You cannot pull out of Iraq. Our

sons died there. They gave their lives for the freedom of the Iraqi

people, and we are going to have more safety in America because of it?

You cannot pull out of there. It is different. That soil is sanctified

with the blood of our children.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge anyone to look that man or a father in the

eye and say I think I know better, I think we ought to concede, I think

we ought to admit and pull out and declare defeat like somebody said

this war cannot be won, cannot be won, cannot be won. If I put a word

search on there, ``cannot be won'' over and over again, hundreds of

times it got said here in the last 4 to 5 days.

Mr. Speaker, I point out that Iraq, 80 percent of the violence is

confined within 30 miles of Baghdad. You just look at the area that is

there, Baghdad standing kind of alone in the middle. I checked this all

out in the World Factbook just because that is where we go for

information. Baghdad represents 1/2500th of the land area of Iraq, and

we are saying we cannot prevail because 1/2500th of the land area has

some people in there that are battling us? 1/2500th, one day of the

life of Sam Johnson when he was in the Hanoi Hilton, one out of his 25

days, 1/2500th of the land area of Iraq, and we want to say we do not

have the will. Every ability in the world, but we want to say we do not

have the will to persevere, even though that soil is sanctified with

the blood of our sons and daughters.

It will be a disgrace here on the floor of this Congress, Mr.

Speaker, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr.

Sali) who I am sure came down here with his heart full and look forward

to whatever he might have to say.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to tip my hat to

the good gentleman for his efforts on the floor and for the compelling

argument that he has made here.

The idea that our young people, young men and women, have gone to

Iraq, gone to Afghanistan, they have spilled their blood there for a

purpose that would become meaningless if we withdraw without finishing

the job over there, that is something that makes the discussion I think

a little different.

All of us are tired of the war. All of us are tired of the casualties

that have been inflicted. What we have to do is keep our eye on the

ultimate goal, what it is. Is it to quell a disturbance, a dispute that

has arisen between different Islamic groups? No, it is not. It can

never be.

It has to be the security of the United States. For those folks who

have died in Iraq and Afghanistan, for their lives to have meaning, we

have to consider what that goal is.

The national security of every person in this country, those

interests have to be paramount to everything else that we consider.

They have to be paramount to our distaste for the fighting that has

gone on. They have to be paramount to every life that has been lost.

Mr. Speaker, for those lives that have been lost to have meaning, it

has to be that we will save more lives by their efforts that have been

there than if we just pull up stakes and quit. If we do not get that

job done, if those radical Islamists are allowed to declare a State, if

they have a home, a base from which to operate, we will repeat the

events that happened when the Taliban had a home base in Afghanistan.

The recipe is before us. We have seen it before. We will have a

repeat of something like 9/11.

The only choice that we have as a Nation is to continue that job over

there, to get it finished as best we can. Is there a perfect

prescription for that? No, there is not. Is it going to be easy? No, it

is not. Will we have more casualties? Unfortunately, we will, and yet

we must continue this fight so we will not dishonor those who have paid

the ultimate sacrifice to this point in the conflict.

I thank the good gentleman.

I thank the gentleman from Idaho, and I appreciate

him coming down here and adding to this dialogue.

I had a chance to collect my thoughts a little bit during that, too,

and a number of points that I did not make here.

First, I would like to say the argument is it is a civil war and we

should not be involved in a civil war. We have been involved in a

number of civil wars, and we will be involved in more civil wars. The

same people who say we cannot be involved in a civil war say go into

Darfur. Well, that is a civil war.

The same people said we should have gone to Rwanda. I am one of them

that thought we should have gone to Rwanda. It was horrible. We could

have done something about it, but it was a civil war.

And that list goes on and on, but let me define a civil war so it is

a little more clear, Mr. Speaker, to the people that care, and that is,

that you will be able to identify a civil war in Iraq when you see the

Iraqi military and the Iraqi police force line up and choose up sides

and decide they are going to start shooting at each other. They are not

doing that. They are keeping order all that they can. They march

forward in uniform. They stay together, and that is one thing that says

it is not a civil war.

Another one seems to me to be the most obvious and that has not been

brought up here, and that is, I know of no entity of the five to eight

competing factions within Baghdad that is trying to unseat the elected

government of Iraq. It is accepted. The people went to the polls and

voted in greater numbers percentage-wise than we do here in the United

States, and they elected their leaders. They ratified their

Constitution. They elected their leaders, seated their prime minister.

So Iraq is a country that is a sovereign country. No one is trying to

unseat the government. It is not a civil war. Yes, there is sectarian

strife, but it is not so much to do with religion as it is so much the

power vacuum that is going on. It is not a civil war.

We cannot constitutionally micromanage a war. The precedents for that

are utterly weak throughout history, even though there was some

struggle with that a number of times. But the precedent that remains

was here in 1973, after Richard Nixon finished the Vietnamization

process, moved our troops out of Vietnam, then a wounded President

during the Watergate era was forced into a situation where this

Congress shut off all funds from going to Vietnam, and that was on the

land of Vietnam, in the skies over Vietnam and the seas offshore

Vietnam.

The bill, and I just looked at it again yesterday and I read it a

number of times, the bill said none of these funds or any funds

heretofore appropriated shall be used on Vietnam, over Vietnam or

offshore in Vietnam, which kept all of our military from supporting the

South Vietnamese Army which was defending itself after the Treaty of

Paris and the resolution of that issue.

Now the North Vietnamese broke the treaty. The South Vietnamese did

not have support. They did not have munitions, which we promised them.

They did not have air cover, which we promised them. We could not even

do a naval bombardment to support them from the seas because this

Congress jerked the rug out from underneath that. And the disgrace lies

yet in our history books.

Sam Johnson also went back to Saigon here just not too long ago,

within the last number of weeks, and laid a wreath at the U.S. embassy

where we lost 10 to 12 Marines as you saw them being air lifted off the

top of the U.S. embassy. Ten to 12 marines does not sound like much.

That was the cry and the agony of a Nation, but those 10 to 12 Marines,

think in terms of the millions of skulls that are piled in southeast

Asia that came in the aftermath of the Vietnam War, the human tragedy.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that none of us could pick up one of those

skulls in The Killing Fields, and say this was

a Cambodian skull or a Vietnamese skull or an American skull. And I can

tell you, God does not draw the distinction, but he understands what

goes on in a conscience of humanity and the conscience of a Nation.

One would think that this Congress, Mr. Speaker, would have learned

from that colossal error and be able to stand and have enough resolve

when we are in a situation where Baghdad is surrounded, and by the way,

Baghdad is not a stronghold. I asked a commanding general at the time

of our ground forces within Baghdad, and I said, What is this about a

stronghold? Are there places you cannot go? He said we go everywhere we

want to go. We go when we want to go there. Sometimes we do not want to

squabble. Sometimes we go in there because we want to pick a fight, but

there is no such thing as a stronghold. So that resolves that.

I wrote an editorial a while back, Mr. Speaker, and released about

December 20 because December 22 was the anniversary of General

McAuliff's retort to the Nazis at the battle of Bastone. History will

record, and you will remember, Mr. Speaker, the 101st Airborne in World

War II was surrounded in Bastone. Bastone, a city that had seven

highways coming to it, it was the confluence of the transportation and

a critical area that had to be held and controlled for whichever side

was going to be successful in the Battle of the Bulge.

When the Nazis surrounded the 101st at Bastone and were mercilessly

shelling them, they sent a message in that demanded our surrender.

General McAuliff's response was, ``Nuts.'' Nuts, Mr. Speaker. Nuts,

Nazis. They had to go all kinds of linguists and ask what does this

mean? How do you translate this into German? It did not translate very

well into German because that was the American spirit that echoed

through that word, ``nuts.'' Nuts, we have got you right where we want

you. We are going to stay and hold our ground.

They did so, and to this day, the 101st will tell you, they did not

really need Patton to relieve them, they would have won anyway. But

Patton did come, history shows. They held their ground. Bastone was

held. The Battle of the Bulge was turned back and the Nazi regime was

destroyed forever because of American courage and American guts and an

America that said ``nuts'' when they were surrounded in Bastone.

Mr. Speaker, today, 2,499 parts of 2,500 parts of Iraq are

essentially pacified, and are there under our control. Parts of Baghdad

essentially are all that is left.

Baghdad surrounded, it is not a stronghold. And if we pull out of

there, history will rule us as nuts. Nuts, a weak nation, a weak nation

that didn't have the resolve, Mr. Speaker.

I will put one more point in here, and hopefully I can get this done

within the time that I have, and that is the straddle that is taking

place with this resolution, Mr. Speaker. The straddle that gives the

majority side of this thing an argument that they are right, no matter

what the results are in Iraq. And that is, the way the resolution

reads, they support the troops but oppose the mission.

Then they go on and say, we are going to do a slow bleed. Jack Murtha

says we are going to do a slow bleed and we are going to eliminate the

President's ability to conduct these operations in Iraq.

Well, all right. So if the President's plan succeeds and Baghdad is

pacified and the government of Iraq grows stronger and more stable, you

will hear from over this side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, over and over

again, ``See,'' they are going to say, ``we were right. It took us to

encourage the Iraqi government and the Iraqi military to step up to the

plate and do the job. If we hadn't done that, the Americans would have

held their hand and been their training wheels forever. They never

would have learned to defend their country.'' That will come out of

that side if history makes it clear that we are successful in Iraq.

And if we deploy out of there and Iraq turns into what I believe will

be a disastrous chaos and cede the Shi'a region of the Iraq to the

Iranians, who essentially have significant influence in there now, that

would be 70 to 80 percent of Iraq's oil as well. It would give Iran

control of the global export quantity of the oil. Iran would then have

control of 42.6 percent of the oil that would go on the market, which

is absolutely enough to control the market and enrich them

fantastically and let them buy their nuclear capability and intimidate

everyone in the Middle East and everyone in Europe and intimidate the

United States as well. They would not be limited.

That is what happens if we pull out and the catastrophe, not to

mention the human catastrophe, not to mention all the skulls that will

be stacked up in Iraq like they were stacked up in Southeast Asia to

the numbers of 3 million. That is the catastrophe there, Mr. Speaker.

But I am going to compare this. There was only one country that was

guaranteed to be on the winning side in World War II, and that was

France, because they were on both sides, Mr. Speaker. They were on both

sides because you had Charles de Gaulle's freedom fighters, and they

had gone into exile into Great Britain and continued their ``Free

France'' battle going on. That was part of the effort, and we supported

and helped them.

But you also remember there was the Vichy French. The Vichy French

jumped right into bed with the Nazis and they staked their claim there,

and that was Marshall Petain. And the French, not much of their country

was destroyed really in World War II. Paris certainly held together

pretty good, and I am glad it did.

But if the Nazis had won and prevailed, the Vichy French would have

emerged to the top. And then the French would have said, see, we got on

the right side of this war, we avoided a lot of conflict, and Marshall

Petain now is our president who is cutting a deal with Hitler. Or, as

it turned out, it turned out to be Charles de Gaulle instead.

Straddle the issue, go right down the middle, prepare yourself to be

on the victorious or at least be right, no matter what the results.

That is what this resolution does, Mr. Speaker. It allows the

majority party and those that voted for this resolution to make the

claim that they are right, no matter what happens. And they brought not

one word of strategic plan to resolve this issue in Iraq. Not one. In 4

days of debates, not a single plan came out of that side of the aisle,

not one.

None came out in the campaigns, either. They never stepped up and

said, ``This is what I would do.'' Except some said, ``I would cut and

run. I just wouldn't call it that.'' Some of that went on. But, beyond

that, there was nothing, except they said we need a strategic plan, we

need a better plan.

And one of them came here to the floor and said, ``I used to command

a carrier task force offshore of Afghanistan,'' which would be by my

look of the map the Arabian Sea. And he says, ``My job now is to come

here and plan a strategy to resolve the issue in Iraq.''

And I reflected, Judge Louie Gohmert found himself wanting to

legislate from the bench in Texas, so he ran for Congress because he

knew constitutionally this was the place to legislate.

But that Member, Mr. Speaker, if he wanted to micromanage a war,

should have kept command of his task force and the Arabian Sea. This is

no place, Mr. Speaker, to micromanage a war. Our job constitutionally

is to fund it, and the Commander in Chief's job is to run it, and we

have endorsed his authority to do that.

As these amendments come and these appropriations bills come, one

after another in this slow bleed that has been promised, we will know

that the constitutional authority doesn't exist to do that. The

President has the authority to take the money that has been

appropriated and to do intradepartmental transfers and I will say

interdepartmental transfers as well to fund the military however he

sees fit to protect this Nation.

And if this party sees fit to starve our military and put them at

risk, then woe are we. But they have also taken responsibility for the

results of this war by this.

So I will say, Mr. Speaker, this resolution that passed here on the

floor today, it assists our enemy. It assists our enemy. It assuages

our enemy. It

encourages our adversaries. It provides benefit for our enemies. It

encourages the bad guys. It provides comfort and charity to the

criminals. It encourages and exhilarates our enemy. It provides favor

and gifts to the enemy, our foe. It is a handout. It is help to the

insurgents. It is relief and reward for the opposition. It is salvation

and succor for terrorists. It emboldens and encourages.

This day on this floor of the United States Congress will live in

infamy, and I pray it may not be a precedent for the future of America

and for our national destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I would make another point, and that is I have decided I

will follow General Petraeus, and you have decided you will follow

General Pelosi.