Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I recall March 6, 2003. I came to this floor and spent

an hour and outlined the 17 resolutions before the United Nations in

which Saddam Hussein continued his open defiance. That is what was also

discussed. So what is lost from this debate is Saddam Hussein's

recalcitrance unto the world. As a veteran of the Gulf War, that was

ended by a ceasefire, where Saddam Hussein did not uphold his end of

that agreement.

To the last speaker, he spoke about the political and economic, but

in order for an infancy government to be able to survive, you have to

be able to establish its political apparatus, you have to be able to

give it its economic goals and a means to achieve them, but you also

need to establish security.

Therein lies the President's plan. He met with the leaders of Iraq

and he got some concessions from Iraq. ``In fact, you will take the

lead, you will work with your parliament, you will achieve these

political and economic goals as we work together to establish your

security.'' That is the plan.

The Democrats only want to focus on one small portion of the plan,

which is called a surge, which is disrespectful to the plan. But it

makes good politics, and that is what is disheartening to me.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs.

Schmidt).

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I stand before you in opposition to this resolution.

It champions a dismally irresponsible and dangerous course of action.

On its face, the resolution merely addresses the troop surge, ignoring

the President's plan in its totality, as I said earlier.

I will now address our efforts to move forward on the diplomatic and

economic front. With regard to the establishment of government

capacities, the establishment of the rule of law is a necessity, for to

have Iraq address the national plan of reconciliation, to have them

pass enabling legislation for the Constitution and amendment process,

and to set provincial elections, is extremely important.

With regard to the economic piece, the concession whereby the Iraqi

government will seek to have a quasi-Alaskan model with regard to the

revenue sharing of its precious assets is extremely important, because

you do not want the distribution of the oil proceeds to go to regional

leaders. It will only empower them and then weaken the unity Federal

Government.

With regard to the debt relief agreements, much has been negotiated,

but the neighboring Gulf States need to step forward, and upcoming

meetings are at hand.

The debate seems to be on the security piece. There are those saying

well, let's just back out completely. They use words such as ``withdraw

to the United States'' and ``redeploy.'' But is that a plan? I haven't

heard any form of military plan. They say what, we will just turn it

over to them? Wow.

As we listen to the neighboring leaders, they express caution of

cataclysmic consequences. I fear how America will be defined by our

friends. Do you reach out to a child as you are teaching it how to

walk, let go of the hand and let them fall and say it is up to you, and

leave them alone? You are going to have to find your way to the

kitchen. Or do you go back and help them walk?

I am concerned about how cold and callous the new majority is to this

new infant democratic government. But I guess even more disconcerting

to me is the politics behind this resolution. While the majority tells

the American public that change must occur, that we are going on the

wrong course, this amendment basically opts for the status quo, the

same status quo for which they have attacked the administration, which

they campaigned against last fall.

They offer no solution, only acting as the critic, and being a critic

is the easiest role in the world.

Just sit back and just bark at someone, yet offer no plan of

resolution for stability within the region. What is the plan of success

for them? Silence.

Let us also address the undemocratic process under which their

resolution was brought to the floor here. We stand here and debate how

best to bring democratic government to Iraq, yet this majority in

Congress shows the leaders in Iraq how to be undemocratic and deny a

Republican minority a chance to bring a substitute resolution. I find

that quite ironic that this Capitol that is supposed to be the most

democratic process in the world is now undemocratic.

I beg of my colleagues not to play politics with the safety and

security of this Nation. I must remind this body and the American

people the threat we face.

Iraq is a critical front in the larger global war on terror. We are

entrenched in a fight against masters of intimidation, bound together

by an extreme, perverted ideology which they claim is a legitimate

interpretation of Islam.

Our enemies seek to establish regimes that rule according to a

violent and intolerant distortion of the Islamic faith, that is, to

deny all political and religious freedoms and aim to establish

sanctuaries for violence and additional attacks. They have no

centralized command structure or place to call home. Instead, they

exploit local conflicts to build a culture of victimization. They

mobilize resentful, disillusioned, and underemployed young men and

women and have mastered technology to aid them in their bidding.

Abu Masab al-Zarqawi, the former leader of al Qaeda in Iraq,

explicitly warned that the establishment of a democratic Iraq is the

death of al Qaeda there. Think about that. The leader of al Qaeda in

Iraq says to establish a democratic Iraq is the death of al Qaeda. Yet,

what does the new majority want? Pull-out of our troops, weaken the

stability of that country, to be overtaken then by al Qaeda, instead of

strengthening the democratic government, ensuring that they have an

economy political apparatus and have the security to prevail, which is

the death of al Qaeda.

Our resolve should be to succeed in this struggle, and we must be

stronger in our resolve than their resolve to inflict terror. At every

step they are watching our move, waiting for us to falter, fail, drop

our guard, or just walk away.

General John Abizaid, the former commander of U.S. CENTCOM, described

well the ramifications of letting Iraq fall to terrorism in his

testimony before the United States Senate: ``The enemy's vision of the

future would create a region-wide zone that would look like Afghanistan

under the Taliban. Music would be banned, women ostracized, basic

liberties banished, and soccer stadiums used for

public executions. The people of the region do not want the future

these extremists desire. The more we talk about this enemy, the more

its bankrupt ideology will become known.''

This enemy uses suicide bombings, beheadings and other atrocities

against the innocent citizens of the world to pursue its objectives.

They are the enemy of freedom and wanting nothing more than to disrupt

peaceful, civilized people everywhere. No one is safe from this hatred,

and it is not restricted to the Middle East. Just ask those in London

and Italy and other places around the world. This is a global threat.

Iraq is not the limit of this beast's haven.

It is the challenge of our generation to destroy this enemy wherever

it lurks. We cannot do it without the resolve, cunning, and above all

vigilance. The price that we pay for freedom is eternal vigilance from

those who seek to steal it away.

While we have not been attacked on our homeland since September 11,

2001, it is not for the lack of the terrorists' efforts. We have been

fortunate to have spoiled and foiled several plots here in this country

and around the globe. Yet, the fight is far from over. Chances are that

today you feel safe in your neighborhood. You can walk to the store.

You can play with your children at the local park or in your backyard

without having the fear of being blown up by a roadside bomb or being

shot by a sniper. You allow your children to go to the malls without

fear of a suicide bomber.

It is that peace of mind, this feeling of safety that we are endowed

as the elected leaders of this country to preserve at all costs.

I remind you that these extremists want to disrupt and destroy our

every way of life. They are not equipped to do battle on a conventional

battlefield. Instead, they look to disrupt our most basic freedoms, our

securities and our institutions, public and private. The world is their

battlefield. Their hope and their goal is to outlast our resolve.

It is our burden to bear, our generation's great challenge to defeat

their hopes and objectives. We cannot cower and seek the sanctity of

security in this challenge. You are not free when you cower. You have

given in to the designs of the terrorists if you do.

This debate began with the Speaker asking whether or not this

resolution will make our troops safer. The answer I believe is no. This

resolution lacks courage. It lacks leadership and it lacks a forward

way of thought. This resolution, to me, is pure political theater. The

administration has given us a legitimate plan to work with, and the

majority in this House has given us nothing but criticism and a path

for an easy way out that virtually holds the door open for terrorists

to destroy an infant democratic government and to open a way of access

to the U.S. and our allies for terror.

I close with a thought from a past President who faced the trials of

war in his lifetime. President Kennedy said, ``Let us resolve to be the

masters, not the victims, of our history, controlling our own destiny

without giving way to blind suspicions and emotions.''

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Thinking about this debate, I reflected back to when this House voted

on the resolution to go to war and so thought I would better look up

what I said, because I remembered something that was very serious to me

and what was very curious was the years before 2001.

I had watched a lot of people vote against the defense bill. Yet

coming off of September 11, there was this bravado about going to war,

and I felt a sense of unease. So I thought I would go back and see what

I said when I came to the floor on that day, and I would like to share

it with everyone.

I said: ``I have seen great resolve uttered in this Chamber and the

swaggering display of courage.

``I can share with my colleagues, as a veteran of the gulf war, that

war may be glorious in verse or prose, but in reality it is not. We are

about to send America's finest, and that means men and women will die.

It will be a noble cause, but we must remember the resolve of this

moment, because in war it is chaotic. Not everything is going to go

right. We cannot be 400 and 500 generals between the House and the

Senate.''

Now, I said that back on September 14, 2001, trying to caution all of

my colleagues, many of whom had voted against defense bills, now

rattling sabers, feeling this bravado of let us go to war.

Now I have to ask, was that a false bravado because now, as war has

gotten chaotic and has gotten hard and difficult, now they cower, and I

have great concern.

So I ended with: ``We cannot have the bravado of today and then run

at the first sound of the guns.''

Please remember this day when it gets hard.

The gentleman I am about to yield to, the gentleman from California

(Mr. Lewis), was chairman of the Defense Appropriations Committee, and

I remember him well because I had served as the chairman on the House

Armed Services Committee at the time and served with Mr. Smith, and

when we came out after Oklahoma City, then-President Clinton, very

concerned about terrorism, and we passed our first anti-terrorism bill

here in the House and many people were like, wait a minute, that was a

domestic act of terror.

No, President Clinton began to focus abroad, not only upon the

Russian Mafia, but he was also focusing on Osama bin Laden and other

terror. It can be debated whether or not he took great vigilance on

that front or not, but let me post a real compliment to Mr. Clinton

because he turned to Hugh Shelton.

General Shelton was at the time the commander of Special Operations.

I was very upset coming out of the House conference on the anti-

terrorism bill because Joe Biden and I were trying to bring the country

to roving wiretaps, but the country was not ready for it. So then it

was defeated.

I then get on the phone and call General Shelton and bring him up to

Washington, D.C., and I asked him a simple question: What are the top

ten unfunded requirements that you have given Special Operations, the

missions that you have to do in the dark world to secure America but

you don't have the resources to accomplish them?

He sat down and he detailed them. More importantly, as President

Clinton then named him, appropriately and wisely, the Chairman of the

Joint Chiefs, he worked then with Jerry Lewis and prepared the force.

So when America was hit on September 11 and we immediately sent those

special operators into Afghanistan, they were prepared, they were

equipped, they were trained to fight in the dark world and special

operations, and Jerry Lewis, his leadership, was responsible for that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California such time as he

may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The mission here is to develop a country that can govern, sustain and

defend itself, govern, sustain and defend. So under that, under govern,

you have political. Under sustain, you have economic. And under defend,

you have security.

So as I listened to my colleagues come to the floor and say it only

requires a political solution, really? These are not inextricable. I

also appeal for consistency. I just heard the last speaker talk about

the necessity for national interests, so he said it is not in our

national interests to be in Iraq.

Let's stop and think about that for a second. Let's be consistent. In

the 1990s, Republicans operated under what was called the Weinberg

Doctrine, that only commit U.S. ground troops if there is a national

vital security interest. And that is how we kind of were guiding

ourselves based off the Weinberg Doctrine. Then what happens? We have

got Bosnia. We said oh, that is a European problem. Then the U.N. came

in, the U.N. was ineffective.

President Clinton made a judgment, and he upset Republicans. He made

a judgment that because of the atrocities in Bosnia, the ethnic

cleansing that was occurring, that it took U.S. ground troops, a

presence of them. Republicans at the time said there are not vital

national interests at stake. Democrats then said, oh, that doesn't

matter, this is a humanitarian cause.

Democrats said, it is okay to take U.S. troops, put them on the

ground to stop the fighting for a humanitarian purpose. That is what

Democrats said in the 1990s. Republicans were curious about all of this

because it was against the Weinberg Doctrine. As a matter of fact,

there were 315 votes. I brought a resolution to the floor, 315

Republicans; Democrats then said, oh, no, no, no, no. Don't put U.S.

ground troops on the floor, and that was in the middle of the Dayton

Peace Accords.

Bill Clinton was very upset with me. So the President brings me down

to the White House and says, hey, work with me. So I said, I will, and

we drafted benchmarks for the success of the civil implementation of

the Dayton Accords. I worked with President Clinton.

Where do I hear you working for a solution in Iraq? Don't just be the

critic. I ask of my colleagues, where is your consistency and your

policies? If you are as consistent as you were for a Democratic

President, it was a humanitarian cause in Bosnia, I don't hear you

talking at all about the atrocities that occurred under Saddam Hussein.

The murders, the ethnic cleansing, a humanitarian cause, the effect

it has not only upon the neighbors, the stability of the Middle East,

but what about Israel? Do you want to turn your back on Israel?

Mr. Speaker, do you want to turn your back on Israel? If

that is what you are asking me, Mr. Speaker, do you want to turn your

back on Israel?

I am stunned. I just ask for people to remain consistent, or if you

change your beliefs, say that you change your beliefs, or if you don't

want to say that you changed your beliefs, then we must assume that you

changed your beliefs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr.

Boozman).

Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, this past fall I had an

opportunity to meet with 18 representatives of the European Union. The

European Union is quick to say that we are not necessarily with you on

Iraq. But boy, we are with you in Syria and standing tough on Iran.

Do you know what the message is? It is inextricable. You cannot pick

and choose. The Middle East is so complex. So, Mr. Speaker, when you

begged of me to address you the question, it is this: If we were to

follow the Pelosi-Murtha plan, what happens to Israel if we leave a

vacuum that is quickly filled by Islamic extremists in Iraq? Therein

lies the question.

I believe we jeopardize the safety and security of a lone democracy

called Israel, and we leave them to defend against a region filled with

vipers who seek their annihilation.

Now, our friends who are also of Arab nations, they are partners in

our coalition to help on the political and economic success of Iraq,

and they are eager for us to also help Israel and the Palestinians

resolve those differences. It is all inextricable.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would ask the last speaker if he could remain for a moment. I have

such great respect for my colleague, Mr. Michaud of Maine. We have

worked together on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. We deal with the

consequences of war. And so out of my respect for Mr. Michaud, I would

like for us to clarify what may be a potential contradiction.

The gentleman said that, and correct me if I am wrong here,

unanimously commanders did not ask for an increase in troops. According

to General Peter Pace, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, and this was

in his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee on January

11, 2007: ``So, collectively, the military commanders, both U.S. and

Iraqi, have asked for this increase. And those of us in advisory

positions agree with their request.

``General Casey and his Iraqi counterparts have determined that there

are more forces needed . . .

``To do this, we're going to need additional U.S. forces. General

Casey and General Abizaid have asked for those additional forces, as

have the commanders below them.

``In addition, to reinforce success at Anbar province, the Marine

commander out there has asked for, and General Casey and General

Abizaid have asked for, an increase of about 4,000 troops out there

``So, collectively, the military commanders, both U.S. and Iraqi,

have asked for this increase.''

That was our testimony of our Chairman of the Joints Chiefs before

the Armed Services Committee. So I will yield to the gentleman and ask

if he was aware of General Pace's comments before the Armed Services

Committee because it appears contradictory to the gentleman's

statement.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure our record is clear

because we have got the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs quoting General

Abizaid. So I want to work with the gentleman.

Thank you.

I would say to the gentleman that just spoke, that in 3

years Iraq has gone from a repressive dictatorship who enslaved his

people to an inclusive government chosen by a freely elected Parliament

under a popular ratified constitution. That is a fact.

I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina

(Mr. Inglis).

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

As a good listener of the gentlelady's remarks, I would think she

would be in support of the President's plan. I agree with her when she

was talking about what is necessary for Iraq to govern itself, but in

order for this country to begin to govern itself, it also needs to have

security, and the Iraqi people themselves must have a belief in the

support of that new unity government.

Now, with regard to the Iraqis themselves, whom we have been

training, that is, the Iraqi Army and the Iraqi police force, that is

exactly what the plan is. The plan is for the Iraqis to take the lead.

So the gentlelady's remarks confuse me, because as she says, I want

the political apparatus to do this, but I define Petraeus' need for

additional troops as an escalation. Therefore, she advocates for the

status quo, and everybody knows the status quo is for failure. The

remarks confuse me.

The commander on the ground of our forces in Baghdad just said on

January 26, that this is about Iraqis taking charge of their own

security. In order for them to do that, we have to buy them time to

continue to train and for the government to become more legitimate in

the eyes of the Iraqi people. Earlier what I said, the mission is to

govern, sustain and defend. You have the political, economic and

security necessities to accomplish that mission. I think everybody in

this body is going to agree.

When I met with President Talabani in August, we talked about the

establishment of the rule of law, we talked about the implementation of

the national plan of reconciliation, the distribution of the oil

revenue, the modernization of their electrical grid. Promoting Iraqi

unity was really deep on the President's mind.

I wrote a note here after I met with him. The note I wrote was I

believe the unity federal government has a real challenge. Their

challenge is to convince the Iraqi political, religious and civil

society leaders to compromise for a sustainable settlement to support

the new federalism. That is the challenge.

So I am challenged when I hear individuals say, well, on the security

apparatus, let's just get U.S. forces out of there, we'll let the

Iraqis take care of this. The question is, are the Iraqis prepared to

do it alone? I haven't heard anybody say they are, that they can do it

alone.

The Iraqis in turn said we still need coalition assistance, and so

the commanders on the ground say we need these more troops to do this.

We are sending General Petraeus, our best commander, to the field.

Mr. Speaker, a father-in-law of a soldier wrote this 10 days ago:

``From where I am sitting, it seems that threatening loss of funding

for operations in Iraq, tying the hands of senior officers, to say

nothing of the Commander in Chief, and proposing to legislate the

conduct of this war, looks worse than cut and run. It feels like

betrayal of the families who bear the burdens.''

I can remember being in the desert in the first gulf war while this

body debated a resolution on the utilization of force. I know what it

was like to lose a friend in war. I shed the tears of my father when he

lost buddies for his Army service in Korea.

Challenged by my own Member of Congress who voted against that

resolution, I felt betrayed. While I was in the desert, I felt

betrayed, so much so that I vowed while I stood at that cemetery in

Lafayette, Indiana, the funeral of my friend, that I felt I still had a

mission left, and it was to come help the country again.

So I ran against that incumbent Member of Congress who I felt

betrayed me while I was in the desert in the gulf war. I had never run

for any political office in my life. I was elected in this body at the

age of 32 with so much to learn.

But I have never forgotten about the soldier, the sailor, the airman,

the marine and the coast guardsman. I am so proud of them and what they

do.

The world of an American soldier is more complex today than ever

before, with technology, intricate rules of engagement designed to

eliminate the loss of noncombatant life and a tough, innovative and

savvy enemy. Our soldiers who are in the fight are watching and

listening.

One wrote from Iraq 2 weeks ago: ``Until victory or until the

perseverance and the spirit of the American will arose, victory in Iraq

is achievable by our amazingly capable and determined Armed Forces.

Their effort will only be undercut by self-serving politicking and

pointless impatience. If we decide we want victory, we will have it. If

we quit on our effort, we will have defeat.''

Contending with the complexity of today's battlefield and the ripple

effects of politics 6,000 miles away, our soldiers live and measure

value by simple enduring imperatives. They place a lot of value in

loyalty. They count on each other, loyal to each other, to their

commanders and to their oath to defend the Constitution, and their love

of country helps them do their duty. A warrior bears true faith and

allegiance.

Members of our Armed Forces live and die by the readiness of their

buddies to express their loyalty in the conduct of faithful duty. They

expect no less of their leaders up the chain, whether they wear the

stripes and diamond of a first sergeant, the eagles of a colonel, or

the stars of an admiral or general, or their leaders in government,

both executive and legislative branches.

Yet, in response, what do we offer? The fortitude of contradiction I

say. The Senate unanimously confirms a new multinational force

commander, General David Petraeus, whose most compelling value is

perhaps his reputation for unrivaled understanding for his clear grasp

of counterinsurgencies.

Yet the authors of the resolution before us seek to deny our best

commander the manpower assets he has asked for to prevail. What a

disturbing contradiction. The Senate unanimously says, this is our best

commander. Before they vote and say we are going to send you, he says,

I need these five brigades. Then this body drafts a resolution that

says, we do not think he should have the five brigades.

I suppose we have the Senate and the House now in complete

contradiction. General Petraeus is a decisive man who has a decisive

strategy, and he intends to reinforce our troops and root out the

enemy. Aside from the gratuitous gloom that is smothering the debate on

Iraq, moving in reinforced strength to destroy an enemy is a time-

honored and frequently successful course of military action.

It is so especially when conducted by a capable commander. We have

already agreed that General Petraeus is such a commander. Many of us

know that this is what our troops yearn to do. It is what Americans

yearn for us to do, prevail.

Now, lest one of my colleagues is tempted to try some contextual

mischief, we all know that military victory with the right strategy is

only part of the equation of success in Iraq. Real success is not a

quick, easy affair. I might offer success as defined by the

establishment of a stable, popularly elected government, the rise of

the rule of law, and the stability necessary to foster the growth of a

strong middle class.

That will take a combined and continued effort using diplomatic,

informational and economic levers. But those levers cannot fully

operate without security. And that is the challenge I have in listening

to this debate. We in Congress have confirmed General Petraeus and sent

him now into battle.

And what now do some want to do with him? They seek to turn the House

floor into a cockpit of battlefield wisdom to disavow his strategy.

Some may say, go to Iraq, Commander. Disregard the strategy that you

talked about in the Senate. Instead use your brilliance to conduct a

feckless campaign of status quo.

The resolution before us disavows the human assets our commander

needs to accomplish his mission. But then it says, we support the

troops. How can you say we support the troops but you don't give the

commander that which he says he needs? I do not understand.

I am a colonel in the Army Reserve. I have served for 26 years this

Nation. How can you say to me, Steve, I support you. I will give you

the beams, the bullets, the ammo, the water. I will

give you anything you need, but do not ask me for any troops and good

luck on your mission. Because you do not get to ask for reinforcements.

You do not even get to ask for anybody else.

As we know the Pelosi-Murtha real strategy is to slowly bleed our

battlefield commander dry. They know he cannot prevail waging a

campaign of the status quo. So some will slowly reduce funding for his

Army in an effort for it to wither on the vine. And it to me is

disgraceful.

Ladies and gentlemen, does this fit the definition of loyalty and

support of members of the United States Armed Forces serving bravely in

Iraq?

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Sometimes in the middle of debate when one gentleman refuses to yield

to another gentleman, it can be for a variety of reasons perhaps, but

sometimes it is because the argument is pretty weak.

So I have listened to this debate. I have not heard anybody on this

side of the aisle call any of my Democratic colleagues unpatriotic. So

the gentleman who just spoke protests too much. Maybe he has some deep

feeling inside, has some guilt inside perhaps. I don't know. I can't

speak to that. Only he can. I would be more than pleased to yield to

him. I would extend the courtesy to him. But I just don't recall that

at all.

As a matter of fact, I had to turn here to some staff that is with me

because they are just as sensitive about this as I am and the

seriousness of this debate.

The gentleman to my left is an Air Force Academy grad and he is the

Air Force Reserves, and he flies C-5As right into Baghdad. He knows

what that is like.

The two gentlemen right behind me, this gentleman right here, Jeff

Phillips, served in the first gulf war, in the second gulf war, and has

two Bronze Stars. This other gentleman over here, Jim Lariviere, served

in Afghanistan and wears the Bronze Star.

So I turned to all three of these guys and I asked them, Have you

heard anybody say or make someone feel as though they were unpatriotic?

And the answer was ``no'' from these three men.

So please don't come and pollute the debate because it only makes you

look silly.

Mr. Speaker, it only makes Members look silly if they

pollute the debate.

One thing about war is that you have to improvise, adapt, and

overcome. Right? You hear that a lot. We do it and our enemies do it,

and it is extremely important.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to, on my time, yield to the gentlewoman. I would like

to yield to the gentlewoman on my time, since she would not yield on

her time. Would the gentlewoman please identify by name a Republican

who has called a Democrat in this debate unpatriotic?

I thank the Speaker. I am thankful that the gentlewoman

gave the answer to her question, and the answer was that it was

implicit.

It is very easy in debate to come down and to create a straw person

and then attack the straw person. If the gentlewoman has felt that way,

that is completely unfortunate. But please don't say you have been

called unpatriotic. That is the exchange I had with an earlier speaker.

Don't accuse Republicans of such things. I am disturbed by that and

very bothered.

I am more than pleased to yield to the gentlewoman.

I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks.

I am more than pleased to yield to the gentleman from

Ohio.

Now I seek to reclaim my time, because that is a

legitimate question.

As the commander in the field, if you say to the commander, ``I

support

you.'' All right? What is the commander going to say? The commander

says, ``All right, I have a mission, and you say I support you.'' That

means, I suppose, that I support you by making sure that you have been

properly trained, that you have your uniform, that you have your

ammunition, you have your helmet, you have your body Kevlar. You have

what is necessary to accomplish your mission. But do you? If the

commander says, ``I need more troops to accomplish that mission,'' you

say, ``But you can't have those.'' Is that then supporting the

commander?

That is why I pointed out the contradiction in that the Senate says

to General Petraeus, ``We agree, you are our best commander to go over

there.'' And before they took that vote, he said, ``I need those five

brigades.'' So they passed the vote and they sent General Petraeus

over.

Now we are faced with a vote that says I support the troops, I

support the members of the Armed Forces.

How can we say, ``I support you, but, Mr. Commander, we are not going

to give you the troops''? That is the point of the question.

So please don't try to spin it into something that says, oh, you are

calling me unpatriotic. That is what I think is rather peculiar.

Mr. Speaker, does the gentlewoman have any other speakers?

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There was a peculiar comment a bit ago from the gentleman from Ohio

when he said, well, I didn't call you unpatriotic when you sent troops

into battle and they didn't have their up-armored Humvees. What a weird

statement to say.

You see, we prepare our force. So, for example, when myself and

Colonel Phillips in the first Gulf War, those Hummers that we took in,

they didn't even have doors on them. We didn't have doors on the side

of those. We didn't go in with all the side plates and front plates,

groin plates, neck plates, shoulder plates. We didn't do all that. Most

of that, the body armor, was reserved for special ops. When you move in

to counterinsurgency and then the enemy begins to use roadside bombs to

attack our Hummers, what do we have to do? We respond. That is why I

made the comment of what does our military do? They improvise, they

adapt and they overcome, and that is exactly the same thing which our

enemies do. So it was a very peculiar comment to say, well, we didn't

attack you because. I don't know. It's so peculiar, I don't even want

to comment anymore on it.

What I would like to comment on is the nature of the enemy and the

significance of Iraq and the global war against militant Islamists.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to turn our attention to the

nature of the enemy we face and the significance of Iraq in the global

war against militant Islam. We often use the term ``global war on

terrorism'' to describe our efforts since the September 11 attacks. I

believe this is a misnomer. In reality, we are engaged in a campaign to

counter a global, radical Islamist insurgency, a global jihad. This

global insurgency is, in fact, a diverse confederation of Islamic

movements that uses terrorism as only one of its many tactics in their

war against the West.

On February 23, 1998, Osama bin Laden, leader of al Qaeda, declared

war on the United States, Israel and the West in his statement ``World

Islamic Front Declaration of War against Jews and Crusaders.''

Subsequently, bin Laden's deputy, Ayman al-Zawahiri, issued a statement

after September 11 announcing a two-phase strategy for al Qaeda's war.

First, reestablish the Islamic Caliphate, the historical and temporal

authority of all Muslims that existed from 632 A.D. until 1924 A.D,

and, second, use the Caliphate as a launch pad for a jihad against the

West.

No one believes that Osama bin Laden directly controls this worldwide

insurgency. Rather than a single monolithic movement, al Qaeda is but

one movement that symbolizes a broad and diverse confederation of

militant Islamic movements that operate around the world. This

insurgency includes such wide-ranging organizations as the Egyptian

Islamic Jihad, the Libyan Islamic Fighting Group, the Islamic Army of

Aden, al Qaeda in Iraq, the Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan, the Abu

Sayyaf Group in Malaysia and the Philippines. In addition, Iran, a

majority Shia country, backs numerous radical Islamic groups, including

Hezbollah and Palestine rejectionist groups such as Hamas and the

Palestinian Islamic Jihad. These wide-ranging and disparate groups are

loosely linked ideologically, linguistically and culturally. They use

family ties, personal relationships and financial links to coordinate

their efforts. Thus, the global jihad plays out in a variety of

theaters around the world. These include:

The Americas, where in North America we saw the September 11 attacks

and as a House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence report

stated, Federal authorities have shut down at least 25 charities

contributing to terrorist activities since September 11. That is here

in our own country.

In South America there is a strong al Qaeda presence in the tri-

border area of Argentina, Paragiau and Brazil.

In Western Europe, where there have been recently uncovered plans for

attacks against Great Britain and the United States and where insurgent

financial networks and planning cells flourish throughout Europe

supporting insurgent activities.

In the Southern Pacific, where the Bali bombings in October 2002 were

attributed to an al Qaeda-linked cell.

In the Ibernian Peninsula and North Africa where North Africans were

blamed for the May 2004 Madrid bombings and where there have been

bombings in Casablanca, Morocco and Tunisia.

In the greater Middle East, where there are ongoing Islamic

insurgencies in Iraq, Jordan, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Turkey,

Lebanon and Israel/Palestine.

In East Africa, where simultaneous bombings in October 1998 in Kenya

and Tanzania were coordinated from the Sudan.

The Caucuses and European Russia, where nationalist insurgencies in

Chechnya, Georgia, and Azerbaijan have been co-opted by Islamic

militants.

South and Central Asia, where the Taliban and al Qaeda continue to

operate in Afghanistan and in Pakistan's federally administered tribal

areas.

And in Southeast Asia, where Islamic insurgencies continue in

Indonesa, the Philippines and southern Thailand.

These Islamic insurgencies share a common goal. They are oriented

toward the overthrow of the current world order and its replacement

with a pan-Islamic Caliphate. They wish to change the status quo using

violence and subversion in order to initiate a clash between Islam and

the West. They use terrorism, subversion and propaganda to further

their goals and initiate open warfare.

It will come as no surprise that most of the active Islamic

insurgencies take place either within the historical bounds of the

Caliphate, meaning North Africa, Spain, Turkey and the Middle East, or

in areas claimed by the new broader pan-Islamic Caliphate, South Asia,

Southeast Asia and Indonesia. These insurgencies contribute to what is

called an arc of instability that reaches from Indonesia across South

Asia and the Middle East to North Africa.

Where does Iraq fit into this global jihad? Iraq has become the front

line in the open warfare of the global insurgency. In many ways, Iraq

is a microcosm of the complex worldwide Islamic

insurgency. The centrality of Iraq to the insurgency became clear in a

July 2005 letter to the late Abu Musab al-Zarqawi from al Qaeda's

deputy Ayman al-Zawahiri. In discussing Iraq, Zawahiri stated:

``I want to be the first to congratulate you for what God has blessed

you with in terms of fighting battle in the heart of the Islamic world,

which was formerly the field for major battles in Islam's history, and

what is now the place for the greatest battle of Islam in this era.''

Zawahiri went on to outline the larger strategy for Iraq. First,

expel the Americans from Iraq. Second, establish an Islamic authority

and reestablish the Caliphate. Third, extend the jihad neighboring

secular Islamic countries. Fourth, eliminate Israel. Thus we see a

clear statement from the number two man in al Qaeda that Iraq is

centrally important to the global jihad.

Al Qaeda is not alone in operating in Iraq. There have been extensive

Iranian involvement that has been alleged recently. On March 14, 2006,

General John Abizaid told the Senate Armed Services Committee that

``Iran is pursuing a multitrack policy in Iraq, consisting of covertly

supporting the formation of a stable, Shia Islamist-led central

government while covertly working to diminish popular and military

support for U.S. and Coalition operations there.''

While the full extent of Iranian support is unknown, it appears that

at a minimum Iran is supporting the 20,000-man Badr Brigade as well as

the 2,000-man Wolf Brigade which is an offshoot. Just this week,

administration officials announced that Iran was the source of deadly

explosive form projectiles being used in Iraq.

Iraqis also grasp that Iraq is central in this global struggle. Iraqi

Prime Minister Maliki told us here in a joint session of Congress, ``I

know that some of you here question whether Iraq is part of that war on

terror, but let me be very clear. This is a battle between true Islam,

for which a person's liberty and rights constitute essential

cornerstones, and that of terrorism, which wraps itself in a fake

Islamic cloak.''

The centrality of Iraq in the larger global Islamic insurgency cannot

be disputed. Our enemies and our friends in the region grasp its

significance. To fail in Iraq is to fail in the larger struggle. And

our enemies are watching. They remember what America did not grasp the

scope of the threat posed by radical Islam. Yet the signals were there:

In 1979, 66 American diplomats taken hostage, held in Iran for 444

days.

In 1983, a truck bomb kills 241 Marines at their barracks in Beirut.

In 1988, Pan Am flight 103 bombing kills 270, including 189

Americans, over Lockerbie, Scotland.

In 1993, six killed at the first World Trade Center bombing by

militant Islamic terrorists.

In 1996, 19 U.S. service members were killed at Khobar Towers.

In 1998, 225 people killed in bombings at our U.S. embassies in

Tanzania and Kenya.

In 2000, al Qaeda's attack on the destroyer USS Cole kills 17

American sailors.

In 2001, September 11, killed 2,973.

Until 2001, we failed to properly react to this threat. The enemy

perceived us as weak and believed that we lacked the will to fight.

This resolution before us, if approved, will signal our lack of

resolve and I am troubled. It will be interpreted, I believe, by the

forces of the global jihad that the United States lacks the will to

persevere against the forces of radical Islam. It will give comfort to

their thoughts, for they will know that we in Congress are uncertain

and irresolute. In a war where information and willpower are more

important than firepower, we must continue to send the signal that we

cannot and will not cease to fight the enemy's vision of the world. You

see, even if you have your way and you say we are going to withdraw the

troops, whether they come back to the United States or whether they go

to an over-the-horizon position and this new infancy government fails,

we cannot cower to the security of America. This front continues.

The Bible states, ``If the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who

shall prepare himself to the battle?'' If the trumpet is uncertain, who

will follow? This resolution, I think, sends the wrong signal to our

friends and to our enemies and I urge my colleagues to support those

troops, sound the certain trumpet, and defeat the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, I just want to

compliment her for her civility and the way she led the debate. It was

a good discussion, and it is exactly what the American people are

looking for from this body. I congratulate the gentlewoman.