Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And just to follow up, I was going to actually begin my remarks

tonight by noting the tremendous speech I thought that was given by my

colleague Mr. McHugh, I believe it was the night before last, in the

midst of this important debate. And I think this is an extremely

important debate. Indeed, I think this is the most important debate in

my 12 years in the United States Congress and I would assert the most

important debate this Congress may, indeed, ever have.

But with regard to being unpatriotic, I want to make my position

clear and I want to reference what Mr. McHugh said.

First, I respect every Member on the other side of the aisle, and I

respect

their right to express their views. And, quite frankly, the other

evening when I spoke in this debate, I said I respect and share their

frustration, both at where we are in this war and how we got there.

But the gentleman pointed out that he hadn't heard anybody labeled

unpatriotic. I think Mr. McHugh's comments were quite in tone with what

I have heard in the portion of this debate that I have watched, and I

have watched a lot. And he said, ``I have listened today with great

interest, and I have enormous respect for Members on both sides of the

aisle.'' I have that respect. I have the respect for the sincerity of

my colleagues on both sides of this aisle. We have, however, an

important disagreement which deserves to be aired.

I think there is an important question that needs to be asked. That

question is, if we do not defeat radical jihadists in Iraq, the radical

Islamists with whom we are at war there now, if we do not defeat them

in Iraq, then where? And if we do not defeat them now, then when?

Let me first start by making a few points about the record and

setting the record straight. My colleague from Texas pointed out a few

moments ago that we are each entitled to our own opinion, but not to

our own facts. I would suggest that there is a fact across this Nation,

an accepted fact, which is flat untrue. And it was referred to in the

debate here just a few moments ago. And that is the notion that Shia

and Sunni have been at war with each other for hundreds of years and

killing each other for hundreds of years.

Today, the bipartisan Antiterrorism Caucus met, and we heard from an

expert from Brookings, and he said that is simply not true. The notion

that we are in the midst of a civil war that has gone on for hundreds

of years simply is not true. It is not a fact.

What is a fact is that we face an extraordinary enemy, an enemy that

hates us, an enemy that has been taught a set of beliefs that requires

them to kill us; that requires them to kill all Americans, all

Westerners, all unbelievers; indeed, a radical jihadist sect that calls

for them to kill many Muslims and to do so without excuse. To break all

law in doing so. To ignore international law in doing so.

I would call my colleagues to read this book, ``Knowing the Enemy''

by Mary Habeck. I read it after she spoke to the bipartisan

Antiterrorism Caucus. I want to read a few paragraphs out of this book

because I believe it is important to understand: ``Jihadist ideologues

use this generally accepted belief to argue that their interpretation

of Islam is also intended for the entire world, which must be brought

to recognize this fact peacefully if possible and through violence if

not.''

We have been told over and over and over and over again that these

jihadists, the radical jihadists, hate us. In the debate earlier on

this floor I asked my colleagues, I asked anyone on either side of the

aisle, if you can name for me a single radical jihadi leader who has

said that if America leaves Iraq, if America will pull back from Iraq,

the war will end? I have asked that question on this floor at least

twice, maybe three times, and nobody has taken it up. And the answer is

because that is not what they want.

I listened to the debate here tonight and I respect it. As I said, I

share the frustration over where we are in this war. But if you listen

carefully to this debate, what you hear is: well, if we will stop, the

war will end. I am afraid it is not that true. I am afraid it is not

that easy. I am afraid it is not that simple. If we were to stop, the

war would not end.

Listen to the words of al Qaeda, the words of Osama bin Laden, the

words of Ayman al Zawahiri. Over and over and over again, they have

told us that that would not be the end of the war. Indeed, it would not

end their war against us.

Let me talk first about Ayman al Zawahiri. Here is his quote: ``It is

jihad for the sake of God and will last until our religion prevails . .

. The entire world is an open battlefield for us. We will attack

everywhere until Islam reigns.''

Osama bin Laden: ``The whole world is watching this war and the two

adversaries; the Islamic Nation on the one hand and the United States

and its allies on the other. It is either victory and glory or misery

and humiliation.''

Ayman al-Zawahiri again: ``The jihad in Iraq requires several

incremental goals; expel the Americans from Iraq, establish an Islamic

authority or amarat, extend the jihad to secular countries neighboring

Iraq, and then the clash with Israel.''

And last, Osama bin Laden: ``Hostility toward America is a religious

duty. We hope to be rewarded by God for it. I am confident that Muslims

will be able to end the legend of the so-called superpower that is

America.''

There is no end to this war simply because we choose to stop

fighting. It will not go away.

Let me refer again to Mary Habeck and ``Knowing the Enemy,'' which,

Mr. Speaker, I hope you have read and all others who participate in

this debate will read.

``The three main jihadist ideologues make clear a central point of

the ongoing war with falsehood: That it will continue until Islam has

liberated the entire world from darkness, tyranny and servitude.

Jihadists thus neither recognize national boundaries within the Islamic

lands, nor do they believe that the coming Islamic state when it is

created should have permanent borders with unbelievers. The recognition

of such boundaries would end the expansion of Islam and stop offensive

jihad, both of which are transgressions against the laws of God that

command jihad to last until judgment day or until the entire Earth is

under the rule of Islamic law.''

It would be nice if we could ask this war to go away, but it won't.

So I ask again, if you do not want to confront radical jihadists in

Iraq, then where? And if not now, then when?

This war did not begin in 2003. It began not in 2001 with the attack

on the World Trade Center. No. We have been at war with these radical

jihadists for decades. In 1979, radical jihadists seized the American

embassy in Tehran and held American hostages for 444 days. In 1983,

radical jihadists attacked the Marine barracks in Beirut; 241 were

murdered. In 1988, they brought down Pan Am Flight 103, known as the

Lockerbie bombing; 270 were murdered. In 1993, Islamic terrorists

attacked the World Trade Center for the first time; six were murdered.

In 1996, they attacked the Khobar Towers. I have been to Khobar Towers

before it was brought down. I saw where they killed 19 U.S. servicemen.

1998, al Qaeda attacked the U.S. embassies in Tanzania and Kenya. They

killed 212 in Tanzania and 11 were murdered in Kenya. In 2000, the

Islamic terrorists attacked the USS Cole and 17 are murdered there.

2001, they attacked New York, Washington and Pennsylvania and they

killed 3,000.

This war is the heart of the war on terror, and if we do not confront

them now, then when? If we do not confront them in Iraq, then where?

There have been parallels to prior wars. I would suggest that this

debate is similar, very similar, to the debate that led up to our

involvement both in the World War I and World War II. Men of goodwill

do like not to engage in war. It would be nice to have been able to

believe that Hitler would go away, and well-meaning Americans argued

that we should stay out of that war. But ultimately we couldn't,

because ultimately the Japanese empire attacked us at Pearl Harbor and

we recognized that we had to be involved in that war.

I would suggest to you that that is where we are now, and I would

suggest to you that there is no such thing when you are at war as a

nonbinding resolution, and there is no such thing as a resolution that

does not do damage to the morale our troops.

Let me conclude, if I might, just by pointing out that this

resolution may send a message to the White House, and I understand and

sympathize with the desire to do that. But the more important message

it will send is to our allies around the world that America cannot be

trusted, that America cannot be relied upon, that America is an ally

that will leave.

Osama bin Laden has said it over and over and over again: Attack

them, fight them. Ultimately they will grow weak and they will back

down.