Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the

resolution offered by the majority expressing the disapproval of

President Bush's decision to deploy more than 20,000 additional troops

to Iraq.

This resolution, in my opinion, is nothing but politics. Opposition

to a plan is not a plan. This resolution is using our service men and

women in a debate that does not address policy. If this was an earnest

debate about the administration's proposal, then the majority would

have offered a bill that answers two pertinent questions: What is

success, and how do we achieve it?

Instead, we stand here debating a bill that opposes sending

reinforcements to Iraq. There are no amendments allowed, and there is

certainly no plan offered in this bill.

In fact, this debate is incredibly ironic since many of those on the

other side of the aisle were calling for more troops not too long ago.

Once again, the debate was not about success, but about opposition to

the administration's vision.

Let us talk about policy. First, nostalgic thoughts and longing for

the times before the U.S. entered Iraq are not useful nor can they be

used as a vision for the future. We are in this war. We must win.

Anything less than an honest discussion on how to proceed forward is a

disservice to this Nation and to our military.

Second, if our policy is to support a stable Iraq, then we must

employ a strategy to achieve that goal. The President and our military

commanders have stated that in order to fulfill that policy objective,

Baghdad must be secured. In order to secure Baghdad, the Iraqi security

forces need more American troops to reinforce their operations.

President Bush agreed to this on the condition that the Iraqis lead the

fight and that the Iraq Government take more responsibility for

securing their country.

If the majority party disagrees with this policy objective and the

strategy to achieve it, then I ask them, what is their policy

objective, and how do they plan to achieve it? I have yet to hear a

consensus from my friends on the other side of the aisle on what they

believe our policy should be. They certainly cannot suggest that this

resolution even faintly resembles a plan or vision for a successful

resolution to the current conflict.

I will tell you what the debate is. It is a sound bite. It is a quick

and easy way to feed the defeatists in this country. More than anything

it is a disappointment. The majority would rather score political

points than have a real discussion on the most important question of

this generation, how to win the war against our enemies and keep our

country safe.

We should be asking ourselves, what would failure in the Middle East

mean?

Our enemies have stated that they believe that Western Civilization

is rotten to the core. Unless we get out of the Middle East entirely

and convert to Islam, we will always be their enemy. In chapter 2 of

the 9/11 report, the authors answer what the terrorists want from

America:

``To the second question, what America could do, al Qaeda's answer

was that America should abandon the Middle East, convert to Islam, and

end the immorality and godlessness of its society and culture.''

Al Qaeda is closely watching Iraq, sending fighters and weapons and

doing most everything in its power to bring about an American retreat.

If we leave Iraq before it is secure, what will that do to our enemy,

an enemy who has already stated that they seek to destroy us not for

being in Iraq but for being in the Middle East and for being non-

Muslim?

An American failure would bolster al Qaeda and every other terrorist

organization in the world. It would give them a reason to believe that

they can win and that it could give them confidence so they could

surely breach our shores one day. It would let them believe that their

plan, a plan to destroy Western culture for its godlessness, is

correct.

As 9/11 taught us, warfare is no longer limited to the enemies within

our region. Geographic boundaries and long distances do not keep us

safe.

An enemy encouraged by a retreat in Iraq will be close to our heels.

That is exactly why we must stay and confront our enemies.

So how is this enemy, who is at a military and financial

disadvantage, seeking to win? They simply studied a little American

history. Both Osama bin Laden and al-Zarqawi have referenced the

Vietnam conflict in forming their strategy to defeat us.

Many in this body often rush to compare this conflict with Vietnam,

and in one respect it is very similar: both enemies understood the way

to victory was through American politicians. If they can weaken the

American political will, they knew they could achieve victory. The

majority often invokes the number of our war dead as the reason to

leave or the fact that this conflict has gone longer than our

involvement in World War II. These arguments play right into the hands

of the enemy and their propaganda machine.

What people don't seem to understand is that we cannot fall into the

trap of comparisons, or we risk losing sight of what our men and women

in the Armed Forces need from us: they need our support. They need a

coherent policy and strategy that does not make politics the long pole

in the tent.

Courage to do the right thing is not always easy. I will not abandon

those who have fought and given their lives in this conflict. I will

not abandon the Iraqis who long for peace. Instead, I support the

President's call for more troops. I believe it is the right thing to

do. It is illogical to say you support the troops that are there, but

not the reinforcements that they need.

In closing, I would like to remember those who have lost their lives

to the acts of terrorism:

The Beirut embassy and Marine barracks bombing in 1983; the bombing

of Pan Am 103, 1988; the first bombing of the World Trade Center in

1993; the bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires

in Argentina in 1994; the bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia

1996; the bombings of the U.S. embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998;

the bombings of the USS Cole in Yemen in the year 2000; the attacks on

New York City and the Pentagon, September 11, 2001; the Madrid train

bombings, March 11, 2004; the London bombings, July 7, 2005.

Do not doubt that if they were given the chance, our enemies would

come in this Chamber tonight and kill us all.

This resolution is not a solution. It is nothing but doubt, fear, and

weakness. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution and

stand up for victory.