I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I rise to

discuss a part of this debate that relates to the Intelligence

Committee, and I think it is important that I thank them for yielding

me time.

Mr. Speaker, I have argued on this floor that this discussion and

debate ought to be about more than just Iraq, indeed, that it is about

the worldwide jihadist movement to attack us. I have argued and quoted

many jihadist leaders who have said their goal isn't just to win in

Iraq, but to take that fight to Westerners and, in turn,

``unbelievers'' throughout the world.

But I am not alone in that view. This is the language of the National

Intelligence Estimate written last April, and it warns America in very

simple terms. It sets the case forward in two clear sentences, which I

hope all of my colleagues have read and thought through.

The first sentence is, ``We assess that . . . perceived jihadist

success [in Iraq] there would inspire more fighters to continue the

struggle elsewhere.'' What does that tell you? If they are successful,

if the jihadists who hate us in Iraq are successful there, they will

carry that struggle on elsewhere. Ask yourself, where is elsewhere? I

would suggest to you elsewhere is Great Britain. I would suggest to you

elsewhere is Japan. I would suggest to you elsewhere is the United

States of America and the streets of your hometown.

I have challenged my colleagues on the other side of this debate to

name for me a single jihadi or Islamist leader, name one, name me just

one who has said if we withdraw from Iraq, if we pull our troops back,

they will stop. Name me one who has said that if we leave Iraq they

will walk away and not carry their fight to the rest of the world.

But I am not alone in saying this issue is bigger. Let me tell you

what the National Intelligence Estimate, written by our Nation's best

and brightest intelligence experts in every intelligence agency we

have, said next. They said, ``Should jihadists leaving Iraq perceive

themselves, and be perceived, to have failed, we judge fewer fighters

will be inspired to carry on the fight.'' That is the national

intelligence community giving us a simple message. If we prevail in

Iraq, the world will be safer. If we are defeated in Iraq, the world

will be more dangerous.

Now, I would argue that there ought to be some attention given to the

words of the troops in the field, and I want to devote the rest of my

remarks to a column written by First Lieutenant Pete Hegseth last

October.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask to insert this column by First Lieutenant

Hegseth in the Record.

Pete Hegseth served in both Baghdad and Samarra for a

year. He was an infantry platoon leader in Iraq. He fought both on the

streets of Baghdad and Samarra, and here is what First Lieutenant Pete

Hegseth said about the surge. He never heard the term ``surge,'' but he

described the struggle he faced. He said, and I quote, ``America is

fighting with a hand tied behind its back.'' ``We simply do not have

enough troops in Iraq, and we need them now.'' That was last October.

Discussing his situation in Samarra, Lieutenant Hegseth went on.

There in Samarra, he goes on to say, and I quote, ``We had just enough

troops to control Samarra and secure ourselves, but not enough to bring

lasting stability or security.''

He goes on and says, ``Two things are to blame for our predicament.

The first reason is that we did not have enough troops in Samarra,''

and I quote ``the second, because of a lack of troops, American

military leaders,'' those on the ground, those engaged in this fight,

``are forced to make a choice between mission objectives and self-

preservation.'' He goes on to complain that all too often that choice

that they are forced into is protection of our troops, not mission

objectives.

Let me tell you how he concluded, because I think it is pertinent to

this debate, where what we seek to do is to disapprove the surge of

20,000 troops.

I believe that the safety of America depends on the outcome of the

battle in the streets of Baghdad. Pete Hegseth

asks, and I quote, ``Why then do we have just enough troops in Iraq not

to lose?''

To conclude, he says ``Americans understand a defeat in Iraq would

have horrible consequences for America and its allies for decades to

come. America has the capacity to win.'' He wrote, ``Why then are we

pursuing a bare minimum approach?''

I urge my colleagues to vote against this dangerous and ill-advised

resolution.