Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said here on the floor by more than one

speaker, or suggested at least, that the war in Iraq is not part of the

war on terror. I disagree. I could not disagree more with that

statement. But if you agree with that statement, and if you are casting

your vote because you think that is a rationale upon which you can

justify your vote, I hope you are sure.

I would say I would hope you are sure because I am in my 23rd year,

and I know how this place works. It is a wonderful system, because we

almost always have a chance to come back and correct our mistakes. A

vote on tax policy? I happen to favor lower taxes. But if we make a tax

vote that is a bad vote, we can come back next year and fix it. Or if

we spend too much money on transportation this year, we can come back

next year and reduce it.

This resolution takes us down a different road. This starts us down a

road where, at some point, we won't be able to come back next year and

just fix it.

You don't have to believe me. But listen to what our enemies say. I

have here the text of a letter that was written on July 9, 2005, from

Ayman al-Zawahiri, the author, the second in command in al Qaeda, to

al-Zarqawi, the person who at that time was the leader of al Qaeda in

Iraq. ``Our intended goal in this age is to establish a caliphate in

the manner of the prophet.''

Now, I don't claim to be an expert in Islam, but I am told that at

one time under this establishment of a caliphate, the caliphate

stretched from Spain through the Middle East and Northern Africa to

Central Asia and to India. That is a vast stretch. If that is the goal,

then we ought to be aware of it, because it becomes a very serious

matter.

The first stage of this process is to expel the Americans from Iraq,

according to al-Zawahiri.

The second stage, establish an Islamic authority or an emirate, to

develop it and support it until it achieves a level of a caliphate over

as much territory as you can spread power in Iraq.

The third stage, he says, is to extend the jihad wave to the secular

countries neighboring Iraq.

The fourth stage, it may coincide with what came before, he says, the

clash with Israel, because Israel was established only to challenge any

new Islamic entity.

So clearly, the al Qaeda leadership believes that Iraq is part of the

global situation that we refer to as the global war on terror, and if

that is right, and I think at least for me I have to assume that that

is their intention, Iraq is certainly part of the global war on terror

from a Western perspective. And so what the President has suggested is

to take advantage of the assets that we have developed, while training

Iraqi soldiers to provide for their own security, and send three

brigades into the Sunni Triangle, mostly in Baghdad, to be supported by

the 21,500 Americans who he has proposed to send. I heard yesterday

that the Iraqi brigades are, in fact, showing up in Baghdad at a 75

percent level, which is better than anyone expected, at least better

than I expected. Maybe others expected better.

So I think if we are going to take on this effort to develop a

caliphate, as one of the previous speakers said before it gets here,

then maybe we ought to do what the commander of the national VFW

suggests.

The commander of the national VFW put out a press release, and I have

the text of it here. ``The national commander of the Nation's largest

organization of combat veterans is very concerned that the ongoing

debate in Congress about the planned troop buildup will be perceived by

those in uniform as a sign that America's lawmakers have given up on

them and their mission in Iraq.

``My generation,'' he said, ``learned the hard way that when military

decisions are second-guessed by opinion polls or overruled by

politicians, it's the common soldier and their families who pay the

price.

``There is no question,'' he said, ``that mistakes have been made in

the prosecution of the war in Iraq,'' but ``there is no playbook to

fight an unconventional war against an unconventional enemy that wears

no uniform and acts without conscience, yet our forces have adapted and

are performing brilliantly,'' and I agree with him.

``We fully respect congressional oversight and the first amendment

rights of all Americans to debate issues of national importance, but

the VFW is very concerned with the tone and timing of it,'' he said.

``We need to send the message to our troops that America wants them to

succeed in Iraq by giving the buildup a chance to succeed.''

Mr. Speaker, I think the commander of the national VFW is absolutely

right, and I thank the gentleman for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

First, let me begin by saying that I have observed several speakers

here during this debate who I am sure in good faith made the

representations that they did, that the short-term redeployment or

surge was not a recommendation of the Iraq Study Group.

This is a copy of the report of the Iraq Study Group. On page 73

there is a discussion of increasing troop levels in Iraq. And the Iraq

Study Group did in fact suggest that a substantial increase of 100,000

or 200,000 troops would likely be not a good idea.

However, they say this, and I quote. ``We could, however, support a

short-term redeployment or surge of American combat forces to stabilize

Baghdad, or to speed up the training and equipping mission if the U.S.

commander in Iraq determines that such steps would be effective.''

And so I would say to my friends that is in fact the case. And so I

hope that that puts that matter to rest. Mr. Speaker, this resolution,

I suspect, has been drawn up as a well-meaning resolution. There have

been some suggestions here today that it is political in nature. I do

not know if that is true. But I would hope that it is a good, well-

meaning resolution.

I have been here now for well over 20 years, I am in my 23rd year. I

have learned a lot about the House. This is a great system. We do great

work here. And we usually do it right. Sometimes we make mistakes.

On many issues we make corrections to those mistakes. When we pass

tax bills, months later or a year later we will make some technical

corrections to the tax bill, because we did not do it quite right. In

many other cases, if we spend too much money in an appropriations bill

this year, we can come back and reduce it in a future year.

But I would suggest to my friends who support this resolution that it

is a start down a road; it is a start down a road that at some point

could have disastrous effects. So we want to make sure, I am sure you

want to make sure, that you get this right. I would like to walk you

through some reasons why I think that this takes us in the wrong

direction.

In fact, there is a bunch of evidence to point to the fact that the

enemy is watching what we are doing, that they have learned from our

past mistakes, and that they are in fact hoping that this resolution

passes, for some fairly obvious reasons. Let me go through four case

studies that we have made about similar situations.

First, a situation in Lebanon. Lebanon was a wonderful country. It

was a democracy. It had a Parliament. Had Christians and Muslims living

together sharing power. In the middle 1970s, things began to change.

The big change was that fundamentalist Islam came to town and Hezbollah

came to town.

And in 1975, a war erupted, which has been called a civil war. There

was the emergence of multi-sided militia groups, sectarian violence and

civilian massacres. Sounds familiar.

In 1982, the U.N. sent in a multi-national force to try to quell the

violence. And on October 23, 1983 the Marine barracks was bombed by

Hezbollah with the support of Iran. The best description of it I have

heard or read comes from a description by some Navy SEALs who were

sleeping in their bunker on the beach, not in the barracks. And the

magnitude of the explosion, to hear them describe it, was something to

behold. And it shocked America. And in 1984 we withdrew our Marines.

The remainder of the peacekeeping force was gone by April of 1984.

There was no serious U.S. retaliation for the Beirut bombing. The civil

war continued until 1990. Hezbollah emerged from a loose coalition of

Shia groups and, with Iranian assistance, quickly grew into a strong

fighting force in Lebanon. That is case number one.

Case Number two. We have got troops today in Afghanistan. If things

had happened somewhat differently a couple of decades earlier, they

might not be there at all. But in the mid-1980s the Afghan resistance

builds momentum with Muslim fighters to recruit a jihad against the

Soviets. And we all have read about that resistance movement. It was

fierce, and we actually helped them. And in 1989 the Soviets had had

enough, just like we had had enough in Lebanon, and the Soviets

withdrew.

From 1989 to 1992, the Afghan civil war continued until the

government of Afghanistan fell. In 1993 and 1994, the Taliban came

along, and they gained power. In 1996, Osama bin Laden moves back to

Afghanistan and forges an alliance between al Qaeda and the Taliban.

Since then, we know the history very well of Afghanistan. A void was

there to be filled, and the fundamentalist Islamists filled it.

Now, I would like to turn to the third case study, the case study

involving Somalia. In 1980, the Somalia Government becomes increasingly

totalitarian and resistance movements emerge across the country, which

leads to a civil war in 1991. Being great big-hearted Americans, in

1992 and 1993, we decided to save the starving Somalis, and we

initiated Operation Restore Hope. In May 1993, the U.N. assumed the

mission from the U.S. as an international mission. In October of 1993

the battle for Mogadishu took place. Eighteen Americans were killed.

The U.S. stops operations against Aidid, and in March, 1995, both U.S.

and U.N. forces withdraw. It was later confirmed that al Qaeda

supported Aidid's militia. There is evidence that the U.S. withdrawal

inspired bin Laden's first bombing of the World Trade Center. The

Islamist fundamentalists filled the void once again.

Let me move to my fourth case study, the Israeli withdrawal, again,

from Lebanon. Preceding the Israeli invasion in 1982 the PLO was

conducting attacks on Israel from south Lebanon. In 1982, Israeli

forces invaded southern Lebanon in response to an assassination attempt

by Abu Nidal against Israel's ambassador to the U.K. After attacking

PLO, Syrian and Muslim Lebanese forces, Israel occupied southern

Lebanon.

If you want to read a great account of this, read the book entitled

``Because They Hate.'' It is a book written by a Christian woman by the

name of Brigitte Gabriel, who is now living in the U.S., and she tells

the story of living in a bunker, living in a bunker until the war was

over, not a nice thing to do.

In 1982 to 1984, the multi-national peacekeeping force came to

Lebanon. The PLO withdrawal in 1982 is replaced by a strengthening of

Hezbollah. In 1985, Israel moves to the security zone in southern

Lebanon. And in 2000, Israel withdraws.

I only need to point to the events of last summer in Lebanon to say,

once again, the fundamentalist Islamists, Hezbollah, filled the void.

We are embarked today on a discussion of another potential road to

withdrawal. And I don't represent that this resolution does that, but

it puts us in that direction. Evidence of our failure to respond to

terrorism has emboldened al Qaeda for years. This withdrawal would be

another one, if it goes that far.

In 1993, the World Trade Center bombing took place. We didn't

respond. In 1996, the Khobar Tower bombings took place and we didn't

respond. In 1998, the U.S. embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania

occurred and we didn't respond. In 2000, the attack on the USS Cole

occurred and we didn't respond. The result, New York City, 9/11.

People ask me why I am so concerned about this. People ask me why,

Saxton, you have been on the floor too much.

Let me show you the next chart. This is why I am concerned. This is

my family.

When I first ran for Congress in 1984 the steering committee asked me

why I wanted to be a Member of Congress. I said, because I have had a

good life. I said, because this is a great country, and because I want

my family to have the same opportunities I have had.

This is my son Marty and his wife and their little gal, my

granddaughter Allie. This is my daughter, Jen, this is Kate, and this

is Jacqueline.

I will admit the artist got a little carried away because they made a

montage out of this picture and they put my grandchildren on here two

or three times each. But I will tell you what, if we go down this road

to the point where we can't correct a mistake, I wonder what the future

is going to be for my family and for your family.

And so this resolution today is an important one. It may be only 97

words or whatever it is, and it may have only two statements in it, but

we are headed down a road, and it is a dangerous one, in my opinion.