Madam Speaker, I thank Mr. Hoekstra for yielding.

I would just like to build on something that Mr. Shadegg said. He

said, in essence, that this subject is so important because it goes so

much further than Iraq. And as a member of the Armed Services

Committee, I try to keep close tabs on where our soldiers and sailors

and marines and airmen are deployed. And it may surprise some on the

other side of the aisle, but perhaps not, to know that we have troops

deployed in Southwest Asia in five countries; we have troops deployed

in Europe in quite a few countries, several countries; in Central Asia

we have troops in Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan; in

Southeast Asia we have troops deployed in the Philippines, Thailand,

and Indonesia; in South America in Colombia, Brazil, Argentina,

Paraguay, and Guantanamo Bay; and in 19 countries in Africa, all in

support of the war on terror.

And as Mr. Shadegg mentioned a few minutes ago, it has been clearly

stated that Iraq is the first battleground chosen to make their stand

and clearly stated that all of these other places where we have sent

troops, not because we have extra troops to send somewhere, not because

we have extra taxpayer dollars that we are trying to get rid of or

spend, but because every one of those countries exhibits a piece of

geography where there is a threat related to the global war on terror.

So a vote for this resolution is a vote, perhaps, of goodwill on the

part of those who will eventually in a few days vote for it, but it

won't end this war. It won't end the desire of the Islamists to take

advantage of various situations and, as Mr. Hoekstra mentioned, achieve

their goals.

And so this is a broad war. This is a war where it will be years and

perhaps decades to bring to a conclusion. And the worst thing we can do

is to send messages that we are not serious about carrying out our

duties in defense of this generation and, as I will point out later,

future generations of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for

yielding me this time.

I rise in opposition to the resolution that will be voted on Friday.

And my statement, as clearly as I can, says why.

Mr. Speaker, I recently attended the funeral of an old friend who

passed away after a wonderful, productive 90 years of life. His family

and friends gathered at the church to celebrate his life and to

remember his accomplishments. During World War II, he served as a

member of the Army Air Corps.

Near the end of the service, two Air Force sergeants unfolded and

refolded an American flag, and then caringly presented it to my

friend's widow saying, ``On behalf of the President of the United

States, the United States Air Force, and a grateful American people, I

present this flag in honor of your husband's service to his country.''

Mr. Speaker, we survive as a nation today in large part because of

the selfless service to our country by a great many Americans just like

my friend. Soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, members of the Coast

Guard, and members of the foreign service organizations have been

supported by the American people and by American resources and funding.

Because we are once again involved in a war which threatens our

country, we find American military personnel are again deployed to many

parts of the world. Last week, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

Peter Pace listed the long list of countries where our forces are

deployed and are present to help protect us as part of the global war

on terror. Earlier tonight, I read from that list. There are 70

countries where Americans serve abroad in support of the global war on

terror. We don't send them there because we want to send them off to

some far off part of the world for no good reason. There are threats

there, threats like al Qaeda, threats like Hezbollah, threats like the

Quad groups that are funded by Iran.

This is a unique and historic struggle for a number of reasons. Chief

among them is that our enemies are both state and nonstate actors. They

are lethal and deadly. Fortunately, the great citizens of this country

have responded. Americans have volunteered in large numbers to work,

defend, and fight to protect our way of life. Yet,

today some among us would question whether we are on the right track.

And I think they are on the wrong track.

As many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know, I have

devoted much of my career in Congress to studying and understanding

this enemy. I must say that I believe I have developed some

understanding of them, and so I would like to take a few minutes here

tonight to share some thoughts and some facts about them. You simply

cannot discuss or understand our situation in Iraq without first

addressing some of the fundamental and important questions about the

enemy.

Who is he, or who are they? How do they work to achieve their goals

on the battlefield? How do they work to achieve their international

objectives? What is our record against them? And what is at stake?

First of all, who are they? Members of al Qaeda and Hezbollah, the

Quads forces, and other similar terrorist groups' view of the world is

based on an extreme ideology, an ideology that is far more extreme than

most Middle Eastern people want or support. I certainly can't speak for

the citizens of the Middle East, but it seems clear to me that in the

opinion of the great majority of citizens and residents of the Middle

East, both Muslim and non-Muslim, that this is an extreme ideology

which they feel they should reject. And they do.

The extremists are groups of individuals who do not believe in any

form of secular government, and will go to seemingly any lengths to

sabotage others who try to establish secular or representative free

types of governments. Their tactics run the gamut from sermonizing to

mistreatment to capture, torture, and death, often by beheading. Their

leaders are male and assign subservient roles to females. Their

ideology holds that members of society, both Middle Eastern society and

otherwise, who do not share their same radical beliefs are assigned to

a subservient role or simply eliminated. They are members of

organizations who state openly and repeatedly, ``Death to the non-

believers, death to America.'' They say it every day. This, in short,

is what they are about.

Perhaps there are some of us here in Congress who don't take these

people seriously. I do. And I am glad Franklin Roosevelt took Hitler

and his people seriously as well. It is much the same.

Twenty years ago, while on my second trip to Israel, it was 1987 to

be exact, I came across an article about Hamas. In 1987, I had never

heard of them before; they were a brand-new group. So while I was

there, I asked about them. And I learned much about Hamas, but also

about other groups that we hear about today, groups like Hezbollah and

the Islamic Jihad, other groups that existed at the time. And I will

always remember getting back on that airplane to come home. I thought,

``Today these people are a huge problem in the Middle East, and I bet

it won't be long until they are a huge problem in the U.S.'' They are

today.

The second thing I would like to talk a little bit about is how they

work to achieve their goals on the battlefield. It is kind of unique,

certainly unique in history. Their radical ideology breeds an

unconventional strategy of violence, and they are not to be

underestimated. This is the method to their violence:

They have recognized that it is difficult or impossible for them to

achieve their goals through conventional warfare strategies and

techniques. They have instituted as a substitute a four-stage process

that replaces traditional warfare, at least traditional warfare as we

know it in the West. Their strategy is well laid out and planned; it is

called insurgency. Four steps.

First, they work quietly to gain the support of the population

through social, charitable, and ideological groups and organizations,

schools, hospitals, charities. They gain the support of the people.

Second, now that they have developed some strength in organization,

they begin to develop strength in unconventional warfare capabilities.

Unconventional warfare capabilities, terrorism, if you will, until

their ability exists to severely harass their enemy, usually the

superior legitimate force, the government of whatever country they

happen to be operating in. This is often the traditional or newly

created government, just like the one that we are dealing with in Iraq.

And in this way, they build popular support through unconventional

warfare successes as well as through charities.

Step three. They develop the ability to reconsider the danger of

counterattack posed by the stronger legitimate force or government, and

the ability to fade away temporarily into the population until the

pressure is off so they can come back and fight again, all the time

getting stronger, all the time carrying out their work through the

charities and the schools and the hospitals, and the terrorist acts

against their enemy.

Finally, the fourth step, they develop it over time, the conventional

capabilities that are necessary to be used against the stronger

traditional force with the objective of defeating the legitimate

government.

If that sounds familiar, it should, because it is exactly what is

happening in Iraq. This is the traditional four-step insurgency process

first used in China by Mao in the 1920s, and in Vietnam during the

1960s and 1970s.

Studying this concept, one can apply it to various theaters around

the world in the global war on terror and identify various stages in

various theaters in many places in the world. I believe, for example,

Hezbollah in Lebanon has worked its way nearly to the fourth stage of

the insurgency process. Other groups like al Qaeda in Iraq are

following the same course elsewhere.

The third thing I would like to talk about a little bit is how they

work to achieve superiority strategically internationally. Let's look

at the process, the process that fosters the doubt that some citizens

in the U.S. have today. That is why we are here tonight. Some people

doubt our capabilities. And this is the type of thinking that brings us

here tonight. This is the doubt that fuels the desire to disengage, to

pretend that the danger doesn't exist, to discuss, as we are here today

or tonight, solutions to limit our success and move toward

disengagement.

The enemy has demonstrated a strong understanding and some success

internationally in developing this unconventional strategy of warfare.

It has evolved something like this:

In the early 19th century, armies met each other on the battlefield,

frontline to frontline. We all remember looking at those old movies of

wars in the 19th century. Warriors were trained in techniques aimed at

defeating their foe's frontlines so as to prevail on the battlefield.

There was little thought, planning, or training given to reaching

beyond the frontlines in battle, much less to strike directly at

central governments. Today, this strategy of warfare is called first-

generation warfare.

Then, during the 20th century, specifically during World War I and

World War II, two new generations of warfare evolved. During World War

I, armies were trained to carry out tactics not only against frontlines

but also against logistical supply lines. The intent was to damage the

enemy's ability by reaching back beyond the battlefield frontline. This

is called second-generation warfare.

World War II brought about third-generation warfare by using tactics

to reach even further behind the lines to attack the industrial

production facilities of the enemy's central governments.

Finally, the most recent evolution, strategic and tactical execution

of warfare, designed as fourth-generation warfare. The goal, to destroy

the determination of the enemy's decision makers to continue the fight.

Today's decision makers are the citizens of Europe and the rest of the

West, including, of course, the United States and the decision makers of

the United States Congress. Unconventional tools have been used by al

Qaeda through fourth-generation warfare and other groups to convince

the decision makers to discontinue the effort. Unconventional tools such

as the Western media, terrorist acts such as those on 9/11, and

unconventional warfare such as killing Shiia citizens, Sunni citizens

and coalition military participants with IEDs and car and truck bombs.

Through the media, every one of these acts which is reported has an

effect and carries a message intentionally to discourage

decision makers,

and that is precisely the plan. That is precisely why we are having

this debate tonight.

That brings us to the debate today. Often American decision makers

have been convinced through fourth-generation warfare used by al Qaeda

and used by other groups, Shiia militias, Sunni insurgents, to convince

some here to vote to discontinue necessary efforts in one of the

central theaters of the global war on terror, Iraq, and hence convince

us not to provide the level of national security so important to the

citizens and children and future generations of the United States of

America.

Fourth, let me talk about understanding the consequences of

withdrawal and our record. Withdrawal under fire is unacceptable and

history is replete with examples of harmful consequences in doing so.

Lebanon and Somalia are two examples where we presently face increased

threats to our national security as a result of previously ill-timed

withdrawals.

As a result of the U.S. withdrawal in Lebanon, for example, after the

Marine barracks bombing in 1983, the country, Lebanon, even today

remains a terrorist hotbed. The withdrawal strengthened Hezbollah. It

contributed to years of civil war in Lebanon. It diminished U.S.

prestige in the region and influence throughout much of the world.

The lingering question: Could the U.S. have prevented the rise of

Hezbollah and the influence of Tehran with sustained engagement in

Lebanon? We will never know.

In 1993, we withdrew our forces from Somalia after a failed military

operation in Mogadishu. A decade later an Islamic militia with ties to

al Qaeda has controlled that country and is responsible for

destabilizing the entire Horn of Africa. We didn't know it at the time.

We decided to withdraw. It was a mistake. This radical movement briefly

shows signs of regaining lost ground in Somalia, even today.

At the very least, Somalia remains a dangerous, ungoverned place, and

the lingering question, could the United States have prevented the

spread of radicalism in the Horn of Africa with a sustained engagement

in Somalia, but we withdrew.

Further evidence of failure to respond to terrorism emboldened al

Qaeda. In 1993, the World Trade Center was bombed. No response. In

1996, Khobar Towers were bombed. No response. In 1998, the U.S. Embassy

bombings in Kenya and Tanzania took place. No response. In 2000, the

attack on the USS Cole took place. No response.

Result? September 11. We are not alone. The Soviet Union and Israel

both paid heavy prices for implementing a precipitous withdrawal on two

separate occasions. The Soviet Union withdrew from Afghanistan in 1989

and left behind the conditions of anarchy and warlordism, which

ultimately led to the rise of the Taliban and provided safe haven for

al Qaeda.

Israel's withdrawal from Lebanon in 2000 resulted in an empowered

Hezbollah, weakened Lebanese moderates failed to keep peace. The best

example was Hezbollah's naked aggression this past summer in delivering

unbelievable attacks against Israel's civilian population. As one

commentator has put it, this is from Victor Hanson in the National

Review Online, December 1, 2006, ``By not responding to a decade of

prior attacks in East Africa, New York, Saudi Arabia and Yemen and

withdrawing precipitously from Lebanon and Mogadishu, we gave the fatal

impression that terrorists could strike the U.S. with near impunity.''

That is what we are talking about doing now in Iraq.

The lesson here is obvious. We must remain engaged until we complete

our mission. Finally, what is at stake? It is clear that al Qaeda and

other groups constitute a serious threat to the citizens of the U.S.

for this generation and, even more importantly, for the future

generations. Our enemies have demonstrated significant success in

carrying out activities to the detriment of the citizens of the U.S.

They have successfully attacked numerous targets overseas, mostly

with explosives, and have used missiles known as jumbo jets to attack

New York City and Pennsylvania and at the Pentagon, and they have used

explosives in terror operations in Afghanistan, and even more

successfully in Iraq to pit the minority Sunni population against the

Shiia. They fueled the insurgency and have cost Sunni, Shiia, as well

as the lives of U.S. soldiers.

Our choices may be difficult. It is not easy to be at war. It is even

harder to stay at war, but it is clearly proven by history that we must

not abandon the missions in the war on terror nor in the Iraqi theater.

We have seen the results of the precipitous withdrawals. It would be

unconscionable to vote and to do other than to support the

administration's plan.