I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear of the purpose of today. We face a real

test of what this House of Representatives stands for and who we, as

Representatives, really are.

Do any of us really believe that the resolution in front of us today

is a serious piece of legislation? Does it properly recognize all of

America's military and other national security professionals who defend

us day and night? What of the hundreds of folks in the Intelligence

Community that are ignored in this resolution, who each and every day

are working hand in hand with our Armed Forces trying to achieve

success in Iraq?

Does this resolution discuss or force a debate on the really tough

issues of who it is that hates America and others so much that they are

willing to kill innocent men, women and children? Again, this

resolution comes up short.

What is the threat, and how should America respond? That is the

debate that we should be having on this floor. This resolution is all

about staying the course. It says, Support our troops and don't engage

in new tactics; just keep going down the same path. That is not good

enough.

There are people who hate us enough to want to kill. I speak of

militant Islam's hate for America, a hate that extends to others,

including Muslims. And these militant Islamists kill, they kill

violently and indiscriminately, but this resolution is silent on the

threat that we face as a Nation, and it is silent on how we should

respond.

Who are these radical Islamists, and what should America's response

to this threat be? We face this on a global basis. What is America's

response to jihadism? How will America win this war against this

calculating enemy? And how will America lead the world once again in

the face of such a ruthless threat?

The resolution that we are debating today simply asks, Do you support

America's fighting men and women, and do you support or oppose a tactic

in a battle that is only one front in the war with these military

jihadists who are bent on the destruction of the infidel America and

others around the world.

Let me say to my colleagues that I don't believe I am wrong in saying

that this debate is really about whether or not America is a great

Nation that leads in the face of difficulty. Nor do I believe that I am

wrong to question what actually happens when this debate and vote are

over. Have we really helped the American people understand the threat?

What message do we send to our troops in harm's way? And what is it

that the American public needs to understand so that it can better

understand the challenges that we face? My own answer, Mr. Speaker, was

that we need to understand the consequences of failure. We need to

fully understand the nature of the threat that is posed now, and

moreover in the future, if we fail in the larger war against militant

Islam.

Mr. Speaker, let me outline some things about this very real threat

to our very existence that needs to be known by the American public

and, indeed, this body. This is not a global war on terror. I have

never liked that term, I don't know why we keep using it. This is a

global war with jihadists. We are not at war with a tactic, we are at

war with a group of militant Islamists who hate us and who hate much of

the rest of the world. What is a jihadist, other than someone or some

group so full of hate that they are willing to kill?

I have a passion for understanding this threat. And thanks to a great

deal of superb research done by many experts on the subject, in

particular the author Mary Habeck, we have been enlightened as to who

these individuals are, and perhaps also get an insight into the

question of why do they hate, and why do they hate so much that they

are willing to kill.

I can tell you that these militant Islamist jihadists are a fringe

element of Islam who have very specific ideas about how to revive

Islam, return Muslims to world power, and how to deal with their

enemies. They are committed to a violent overthrow of the existing

international system, and to its replacement by an all-encompassing

Islamist state, the Caliphate.

Mr. Speaker, in studying this threat, this militant Islamic jihadist

threat, we must also understand why Iraq is such an important element

of their war against the West. This is where the letter from al Qaeda's

number two leader, Zawahari, to the late al Zarqawi outlining the

Islamic Caliphate that would stretch from Indonesia across the Middle

East and Africa is instructive. In that letter, Zawahari outlines a

four-stage plan to create this religious empire.

Stage one. ``Expel the Americans from Iraq.'' Expel them in defeat. I

fear that this debate may be the first step in that process.

Stage two is to create an Islamic religious government in the old

Mesopotamia, that is, Iraq, developing it and supporting it ``until it

achieves the level of a Caliphate,'' until it fills the void stemming

from the departure of the Americans.

Step three is to extend the jihad way to secular countries

neighboring Iraq. The jihadists will attack heretic Muslims, as they

define them.

And stage four is the clash with Israel, because Israel was

established only to challenge any new Islamic entity.

Let's be clear about this. This jihad is about them. It is about

their god, their religion, before it becomes anything about anyone or

anything else. That's right, it is about them before it is about us.

The militant jihadists believe that Islam worked well for over a

thousand years, spreading a true gospel, a unified society that

followed the Shari'a, a law handed down by God. They believe that the

modern world has forsaken that pure religious life, and they believe

that only in a Caliphate governed by the Shari'a is the way to return

to that pure life.

This is the world that they now want to recreate and force on the

rest of the world. That is why they are fighting and that is why they

are killing. They see today's world as one where unbelievers, the

United States, Japan and others, dominate politically, culturally,

militarily and economically. This directly assaults their religious

beliefs, as in effect, much if not all of the world is controlled by

unbelievers, unbelievers who must be destroyed, including secular

Muslim states in the region.

To illustrate, let me quote from Osama bin Laden's Fatwa. Listen to

what these people tell themselves and each other: ``There is no more

important duty than pushing the American enemy out of the Holy Land, no

other priority, except Belief, could be considered before it. There is

no precondition for this duty, and the enemy should be fought with

one's best abilities. If it is not possible to push back the enemy

except by the collective movement of the Muslim people, then there is a

duty on the Muslims to ignore the minor differences among themselves.

Even the military personnel who are not practicing Islam are not

exempted from the duty of jihad against the enemy.''

It should be clearly understood that a central tenet of jihadists'

beliefs is the belief that God is one; he has no equals, he has no

partners. This is important. If one believes that God is one and all

that matters of rule giving or law making belongs to him, no human

being, no government could make laws or alter the Shari'a laws of God.

This would be, for all intents, setting oneself up to be the equal of

God. Herein lies the problem that these militant Islamists have with

the West and secular Muslim countries. This belief is applied equally

to infidels and Muslim heretics.

The bottom line is that any government or order of law other than

Shari'a is illegitimate. This belief, in their minds, justifies the

killing of heretical

Muslims and non-Muslims alike. This is not recent thinking. A prominent

early 20th century Egyptian Muslim ideologue named Hasan al Banna

professed this point about Muslims and non-Muslim heretics. He stated,

quote, we will not stop at this point, but we will pursue this evil

force to its own land, invade its western heartland, and struggle to

overcome it until all the world shouts the name of the Prophet and the

teachings of Islam are spread throughout the world. All religion will

be exclusively for Allah.

He went on to say that this violence would not be to avenge wrong

suffered, nor to kill the unbelievers, but to save mankind from its

many problems. Are we starting to get a picture of who the enemy may

be? It is also important that jihadists' interpretation of Islam is

they will reject any system of laws not based on Shari'a.

Democracy. Why do they hate us? Democracy, he claimed, is the

ultimate expression of idolatry, giving reason for the hatred of

Western values. This is about them, it is not about us.

Al Banna is not the only studied ideologue. Another name, Sayyid

Qutb, wrote, ``Islam has a mandate to order the whole of human life,

and that the Western idea of separation between religion and the rest

of life is, quote, a hideous schizophrenia that would lead to the

downfall of white civilization and therefore its replacement by

Islam.''

Qutb maintained that political and religious ideology of the jihadist

is derived directly from the Koranic argument that God, unique and

without partner, is the only being of sovereignty. Therefore, the only

role for national leaders is to implement God's laws. This gives the

jihadists their belief that attacking secular or Muslim heretic

societies is justified. Qutb basically justified all-out warfare on all

of these societies.

Where does that leave us today? It leaves us with a discussion that

should be much deeper than the resolution that is in front of us. The

resolution in front of us is a shallow political document.

Let me return to Osama bin Laden's Fatwa against the West. Let me use

his own words. In calling on all Muslims, he says, ``The explosions at

Riyadh and Al-Khobar is a warning of this volcanic eruption emerging.''

To further his murderous goals, bin Laden then went on to outline the

terrorist approach to his holy war to by saying, ``It must be obvious

to you that due to the imbalance of power between our Armed Forces and

the enemy forces, a suitable means of fighting must be adopted, i.e.,

using fast-moving light forces that work under complete secrecy; in

other words, to initiate a guerrilla warfare where the sons of the

nation, and not the military forces, take part in it. And as you know,

it is wise, in the present circumstances, for the armed military forces

not to be engaged in conventional fighting with the forces of the

crusader enemy, unless a big advantage is likely to be achieved and

great losses induced on the enemy side. That will help to expel the

defeated enemy from the country.''

He goes on, ``Therefore, efforts should be concentrated on

destroying, fighting and killing the enemy until, by the grace of

Allah, it is completely defeated. The time will come, by the permission

of Allah, when you will perform your decisive role so that the word of

Allah will be supreme and the word of the infidels will be the

inferior. You will hit with iron fists against the aggressors.''

The modern words of bin Laden alone do not adequately explain the

current militant Islamic threat to the United States and its friends

around the world. Again in their own words, this quote from a senior al

Qaeda leader, quote, Islam became to be the only hope in jihad under

the banner of Islam to become a solution for all of the enemies of

America and of those weakened nations, even to the leftist and peace

groups in the Christian world. Whoever follows the writings of some of

the Western authors will find that some of them started to declare,

through their writings, about the American tyranny, that there is no

hope to face America other than through the armed Muslims. To the

extent that in one of the demonstrations that included hundreds of

thousands against globalization and war in Italy, the demonstrations

carried a picture of bin Laden placing Che Guevara's hat on it, drawing

him to be a Che Guevara look-alike. They wrote under his picture,

``anti-American.'' Through this action they expressed that the symbol

of today's Islamic jihad is the only solution to face America.

Mr. Speaker, here is the true threat to America and the West: this

militant Islamic jihad, a jihad that spans the globe, including attacks

in Bali; in Spain; the United Kingdom; in the Philippines; in Kashmir;

in Kenya; in Jordan; Israel; Nigeria; and, yes, in the United States

and Iraq. What is not being discussed is this global problem, this

threat to peace and stability everywhere in the world. Why, I ask, is

the focus so keenly on Iraq as the problem, the only problem for us to

debate? Iraq is not the problem. It is but one front in this larger

war. The American people are not being well served by our leaders and

the media that are solely focused on the conflict in Iraq. This is but

a single front in a much larger war.

Mr. Speaker, let me close with these final thoughts about the

militant Islamic threat we face not only in the front in Iraq but,

indeed, around the world, including here in America.

There is a fundamental clash of civilizations at work here. There is

a fundamental belief by the jihadis that Islam must expand to fill the

entire world or else falsehood in its many guises will do so. This

belief includes their facts that democracy, liberalism, human rights,

personal freedoms, international law, international institutions are

illegal, illegitimate, and sinful. Democracy, and in particular the

United States democracy, is the focus of their wrath because it is

considered the center of liberalism. This is not an enemy with whom we

can negotiate. We must contain them and defeat them.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us does not address this threat, a

real threat to our very existence. We are at war, and I fear we don't

even know that we are under attack. This myopic resolution does not

recognize or address that threat.

I urge my colleagues and the House to vote ``no'' on this resolution.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may

consume.

Do any of us really believe that the resolution in front of us today

is a serious piece of legislation?

Does it discuss or force a debate on the really tough issue of how

big this conflict is?

Who is it that hates America and others so much that they are willing

to kill innocent men, women and children?

Again, it does not do that. There are people who hate us enough to

want to kill. I speak of militant Islam's hate for America, a hate that

extends to others as well, including Muslims. And these militant

Islamists kill. They kill violently and indiscriminately.

Who are they?

What should America's response to this threat that we and others face

on a global basis be?

What is America's response to jihadism?

How will America win this war against this calculating enemy?

How will America lead the world, once again, in the face of such a

ruthless threat?

What is a jihadist, other than someone or some group so full of hate

that they are willing to kill?

I have a passion for understanding this threat. These Islamic

jihadists are a fringe element of Islam who have very specific ideas

about how to revive Islam, return Muslims to world power, and how to

deal with their enemies. They are committed to a violent overthrow of

the existing international system and to its replacement by an all-

encompassing Islamic state, the caliphate, as it is called.

This is more than just about Iraq. It is a much bigger problem. It is

also clear that this jihad is about them, their god, their religion

before it becomes anything about anyone or anything else. That is

right, it is about them before it is about us. And that is why this

resolution comes up so short because it does not address all of these

issues.

Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank the

gentleman. I think he has made some very good points about what we

don't see in this resolution. We don't see a discussion of what the

global threat is from these jihadists who hate democracy, who hate

other heretic Muslim states, who want to establish this caliphate that

spreads throughout the Middle East, spreads into Europe, across Africa,

into Asia. It lacks the concept of putting it into a bigger picture.

There is no alternative plan. Really, if you vote for this

resolution, what you are voting for is you are voting for stay the

course. Support the troops; don't try a new strategy or tactic. Just

stay the course. And it also does not deal with what the potential

consequences may be of that failed strategy.

Madam Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague from Arizona

Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think the

gentleman from Arizona stated it very well. When we talk about the

jihadists, they believe that the modern world has forsaken that pure

religious life. They believe only in a caliphate governed by shiria law

and that is the way to return to that pure life. That is the world they

now want to recreate. And as they recreate it, they want to force it on

the rest of us.

Madam Speaker, I would like to now yield to my colleague, Mr. Saxton.