Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution

before the House.

We need to send a clear bipartisan message to the White House. There

is little support in this Congress for deepening our open-ended

military commitment in Iraq by sending an additional 21,000 troops into

this conflict.

The debate we are having today is about the future of our Nation's

policy in Iraq, so my main focus will not be to catalog the litany of

the administration's past grave mistakes and misstatements over the

last 4 years. At the same time, as a lesson for the future, it is

important to remember that the war in Iraq was the first application of

the Bush Doctrine. This policy was unveiled by the President in his

commencement speech at West Point in June 2002 and made policy a few

months later in the administration's 2002 National Security Strategy.

The administration's doctrine stressed preemptive attack, U.S.

military superiority, and U.S. unilateral action. This flawed policy

has proven to be disastrous. It has destabilized Iraq, and threatens to

undermine the stability of the entire region. It blinded the

administration to the Pandora's box it was opening when it invaded Iraq

in search of weapons of mass destruction that did not exist and 9/11

terrorists that were not there.

Far from strengthening U.S. security, this misguided doctrine has put

our Nation's vital interests at greater risk. The elevation of

unilateralism has helped erode our Nation's standing in the world. The

released NIE Estimate for Iraq underscores just how flawed the

administration's doctrine has been. Among the key judgment, I quote,

``Iraqi society's growing polarization, the persistent weakening of the

security forces and of the state in general.'' And again I quote,

``Extremists continue to act as a very effective accelerator for what

has become a self-sustaining intersectarian struggle between Shia and

Sunnis.'' And now I quote again. ``The Intelligence Community judges

that the term `civil war' does not adequately capture the complexity of

the conflict in Iraq.''

The judgments of the National Intelligence Estimate reinforce the

view that a military solution in Iraq is not possible. The

administration has attempted troop surges in the past. They haven't

worked. Adding another 21,000 American troops will not put an end to

violence and instability in Iraq. The only chance to do that is for

Iraq's leaders and factions to come together and begin the difficult

process of political compromise and reconciliation.

I believe that announcing the orderly redeployment of U.S. forces is

the best way to put pressure on the factions in Iraq to come together

and make these difficult choices.

This resolution is straightforward. It states clearly and

unambiguously that Congress does not support the President's plan. It

supports our military personnel but not a further military escalation.

Some have said it is not serious because it is nonbinding. Others

have said the resolution emboldens our enemies and hurts the troops.

How does it embolden our enemies or hurt the troops for this Congress

to disapprove continuing a strategy that is not working?

The resolution we are debating today is nonbinding, but is not

nonconsequential. I hope the administration will hear the clear

bipartisan message we are sending and change course.

The question today before the House is whether or not we agree with

the President's plan to send 21,000 additional troops to Iraq to

referee a growing civil war. I do not agree with this escalation. I

urge all my colleagues to join in calling on the President to change

course in Iraq