Mr. Speaker, I cannot think how we could have had two

better speeches than that of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Wolf),

which he just made, and mine. My real sadness about this House is that

this is not being done in a debate where all the Members are talking

and listening about this very, very important issue.

The question that I think the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Wolf) well

raises is, why are we in Iraq? Now, I recently was in Jordan, and I was

confronted by many of the Iraqis who have fled from Baghdad and other

parts of Iraq. There are about a million Iraqis of middle class and

above all living in Amman. The prices of real estate have gone up. It

is very hard to find a hotel room. They have left.

I sat at dinner with a number of them, and the question that many of

them asked me was, why is the United States in Iraq? And I sort of

dismissed the ideas that have been advanced at various times in this

Hall, that we are there for weapons of mass destruction, or we are

there because of al Qaeda. Many people say we are there for oil. I

think that is way too simplistic an explanation for what is going on.

Are we there to stop terrorism? Well, it is very hard to look at what

is going on in Iraq and say that what we have done is to end terror.

Rather, it seems like we have become a breeding ground and a training

ground for terrorists.

After I had exhausted my ideas about what it might be about, I asked

the Iraqis to tell me what they thought this was about. And they said,

well, it is pretty clear that what your goal was, and you succeeded

almost at this point, in dividing Iraq into three pieces and destroying

Iraq as ever being an Arab nation. That was your goal from the start;

and you have, by every decision you have made, you have worked in that

direction.

Now, it was not a design that was clear. People have not understood

this, in large measure because it was never enunciated in a public way

by public figures saying we are going into Iraq to destroy it. We have

talked about liberty, we have talked about democracy, we have talked

about every other thing under the sun except the fact that the effect

of our actions have been to destroy Iraq.

Now I will take you back to the appointment of the first governor of

Iraq. Most people, if you ask them who that was, they cannot remember

the name. It was a retired army general by the name of Jay Garner. He

was appointed and he went over there, and he had the idea that perhaps

the Iraqis should begin to take their own existence, now that Baghdad

had fallen and with the Americans in control militarily, let the Iraqis

put their country back together.

What happened to him? Anybody know? Well, I will tell you what

happened to him. He was immediately relieved. He was taken out of the

situation and Paul Bremer was brought in because Garner was not

following the script, and they knew that Bremer would.

Now, just take a couple of things very early that Bremer did and you

understand why the Iraqis feel the way they do about the situation

today. The first thing he did was to dismantle an army. He disbanded an

army of 500,000 people or so, all of whom had families, had homes, had

children, had grandparents, had all the responsibilities of citizens of

Iraq. They had salaries. They could pay for their families' food. They

could pay for their families' housing. All of this was what they had

been accustomed to.

Surely they had worked for Saddam Hussein. But to think that they all

were bad and, therefore, should be disbanded and thrown to the winds

was a terrible miscalculation about the attitude of the average soldier

in the Iraqi Army. And what that action did was to send 500,000 Iraqis

underground with a rifle and a grudge. We created 500,000 insurgents

instantly by that action.

Now, why would you do that? Why would you want to go into a country

that has an army that is functioning and not take off just the top

layer, no, no, no; not take off the first couple of layers, maybe down

to the sergeants or something, but to fire everyone and take away their

income, their whole existence, if you thought that was in the best

interest of the Iraqis?

But if you want chaos, put 500,000 people out on the street with guns

and a grudge.

The second thing that we did, equally disruptive and equally

destabilizing, was the decision to de-Baathize the government. Now, the

Baath Party, the party of Saddam Hussein, which is secular, not

religious, but a secular party of Arab nationalism, basically, and the

decision to say that everybody in Iraq who belonged to the Baath Party

was suddenly out of a job and out of government took another hundreds

of thousands of people who were simply public servants who ran the

utilities, ran the electric company, ran the sewage system, taught in

the schools, did the marriage licenses, recorded land deeds, and

whatever public servants in a society do. We suddenly said, if you are

a member of the Baath Party, you are out of here.

We absolutely denuded this country of any government whatsoever. Now,

you would not have to be older than about a seventh grade kid in this

country to realize if you take away the Army and take away the

government, you have chaos. If you go into the schools and you take

away the teacher, take away the principal, the hall monitors, the kids

are not going to run a very reasonable operation. That is what the

educational system is about. Well, we did that to a whole society.

You can say we know, and you are standing down there in the well

talking about this, but you never wanted to go to war in the first

place.

One of the interesting things that I have done over the course of

time since this all began was to read widely in the international

press. It is very often difficult in this country, either in the press

or in the media, to get anything like a comprehensive view of what is

going on in Iraq and why we have so much difficulty. We have the

strongest Army in the world. There is no question about that. We have

the bravest, the best trained, the most able people in the world are

over there representing in the United States Army and Marines, and Navy

and Air Force. That has never been the problem or the question.

The question has been after the gunfire stops, what do you do? How do

you run things? And from the very start, the administration has been

dominated by people whose intention was to destabilize Iraq, in fact,

into destabilizing very wide portions of the country. Not many of you

have probably ever read the Jordan Times. That is the main newspaper in

the city of Amman which is the capital of Jordan.

On August 10, 2005, an article appeared called, ``The Triumph of

Neoconservatives in Iraq,'' and which I will include for the Record.

The article was written by a man named Abbas J. Ali. He is a

professor and director of the School of International Management at

Indiana University of Pennsylvania; obviously an Iraqi living in the

United States, and he wrote this article.

If you read just this one article, and I wish I could get it into the

head of every Member of Congress, part of the reason for putting it in

the Congressional Record is people can get it and read it and see it.

You do not need to Google it. It will be in the Congressional Record.

He begins by saying that three recent developments in the Iraqi

political arena reaffirm the growing fear of destabilization and things

are becoming worse. First, the U.S. Secretary of Defense Donald

Rumsfeld predicts that the mess in Iraq could go on for 12 years. The

New York Times reported on June 30 that a type of federalism, as

supported by Washington, where each region in Iraq gains power

approaching true sovereignty, and that means creating three separate

countries.

Mr. Speaker, our goal or what we are actually doing right now is

creating three separate countries. We are not creating Iraq. We are

going to put some shine on it and try and say it has a constitution,

but the pieces will be sovereign from one another.

The third thing he says that happens is the appointment of Zalamy

Khalilzad as Ambassador, who is a neocon and will do the neocon bidding

from the start.

Now, this did not start with George Bush the second. This is not

something new. I do not think you can lay it all off on the present

occupant of the White House.

Dr. Ali writes that back in the 1970s, the neoconservatives

recognized Iraq constituted a threat to their design for the Middle

East, not because Iraq had ample natural resources, especially oil and

water, but because the Iraqis were considered a spirited and cultured

people displaying pride, patriotism and independent thinking. It had

the best water system in the Middle East, it had the best sewage system

in the Middle East, it had the best health care system in the Middle

East. It was really a functioning country. For whatever you want to say

about Saddam Hussein, and no one wants to say a good thing about him

and we should not, his actions as a leader were awful, but when he was

dealing with the running of the state, he did a reasonable job.

Now at that time in the 1970s, General Shinseki, then the U.S. Army

Chief of Staff, pointed out, and remember Shinseki was the guy they

fired because he gave them the truth about how many people this would

take, Shinseki pointed out that in 2002 Paul Wolfowitz, and remember

that name, now the head of the World Bank, as a young Pentagon analyst

and a neoconservative, designated Iraq in 1979 as a menace that must be

dealt with. Since then the invasion and occupation of Iraq have been

primarily a neoconservative venture. The neocons have wanted this and

that is why this article was entitled ``The Triumph of the Neocons in

Iraq.''

If Wolfowitz was not enough, in 1982 a man named Oded Yinon

accentuated the usefulness of internal strife and war with Iraq to

foster the demise of Iraq as an Arab state. He notice that in the short

run, it is Iraqi power which constitutes the greatest threat to Israel

and that a division of Iraq into provinces along ethnic religious lines

is possible. So three more states will exist around the major cities:

Basra in the south; Baghdad in the middle; Mosul in the north; and

Shiite areas in the south will separate from the Sunni and Kurdish

north.

This is 1982, people were laying this out.

It is for this reason that the neoconservatives have made a very

powerful argument, he goes on to say, and he quotes a man named Michael

Ledeen, who is not just some newspaper reporter or somebody drifting in

off the street. He was the former U.S. Under Secretary of State and he

stated, ``Stability is an unworthy American mission.'' This is a man

who was in the State Department, saying that stability is an unworthy

American mission and a misleading concept to boot. He said we do not

want stability in Iran, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, or even Saudi Arabia. We

want things to change. The issue is not whether but how to destabilize.

Think about that. The minds in the State Department, and this is an

Under Secretary of State saying we want to destabilize.

Now there have been books. Lawrence Kaplan and Bill Kristol, they

asserted in their book ``The War Over Iraq'' that this is more about

even than the future of the Middle East and the war on terror, it is

about what sort of role the United States intends to play in the world

in the 21st century. They argue that the only plausible and sensible

mission is to persistently supply American might in these parts of the

world that constitute a threat to American interests.

And the mission, Michael Ledeen goes on to say, is ensure the total

submission of the people in the region. He stated this in 2001. We have

gone from 1979 all of the way up to 2001. We will not be sated, and

this is an Under Secretary of State saying we will not be sated until

we have had the blood of every miserable little tyrant in the Middle

East and every last drooling anti-Semitic and anti-American mullah,

imam, sheik, ayatollah either singing the praises of the United States

or pumping gasoline for a dime a gallon on American bases in the Arctic

Circle. Gasoline is not a dime a gallon.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Ledeen and his men have worked and been very

consistent and very determined. We are talking about a 25-year effort

from 1979 to the present. But in the Bush second term, this article

goes on, the neoconservatives appear to have secured indisputable

domination in designating American foreign policy. They have situated

themselves at the core of the three primary agencies responsible for

foreign affairs: the National Security Council, and State and Defense

Departments. Now, with Ambassador Khalilzad in Baghdad, they have him

in position to carry this out from the green zone.

They are building the biggest embassy in the world in Baghdad. Why

would you be building an embassy of that size for a country of several

tens of millions of people unless you had some grand design, strategy

into the future?

Now, if you look at this, you say to yourself, why? We have

sacrificed 1,900 of our young men and women in this war. They have

died. For what? To destabilize Iraq? That is what the people in the

State Department and in this government are up to. It is why it has

never made any sense.

We have had thousands of people come home to Walter Reed Hospital. I

have been up there. I was a physician in the Vietnam era. I dealt with

casualties coming back from Vietnam, 1968 to 1970. You do not have that

experience and forget it. That is what got me into politics. I was

going to be a doctor, a research doctor. I thought my life would be

spent in medicine. But that experience of dealing with those casualties

and realizing what the government did by its foreign policy, what it

did to all of the people of this country, brings me to the floor today

to talk about what we are doing in Iraq.

We have been misled in many, many, many ways. I do not go to these

secret briefings they have in the House, because I know that the people

who led us into this war are not going to tell us the truth even when

the doors are locked when we are in private. They simply are not

leveling with the American people.

The President says we are going to stay the course, and we put our

governor in there, Mr. Bremer. We destabilized everything and things

fell apart, and now we say oh, they are all coming over the border from

Syria. There are only two places where they can come in where there are

roads. It is very difficult to get in from that side. They are not

capturing these people. They are killing people and they identify them

just as they did in the Vietnam War. We have killed so many soldiers.

The body count in Iraq is people who have died. That is okay. They have

died, but they are not insurgents coming from somewhere else. By and

large, the insurgency in this country of Iraq was created by sending

500,000 soldiers underground with weapons and a grudge. We are tasting

the fruit of our planting those vines. Unfortunately, we have also in

the process killed I do not know how many thousand because no one will

count the number of Iraqis. It is as though they do not matter.

Nor do we talk about the number of them that are injured. When we

look at that situation and we see what we are doing, we have to ask

ourselves how much longer can we persist in staying there. The

gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Wolf) and I might disagree at this point

because he thinks that it is just going to be the end. Well, my belief

is that we are already in a lose-lose situation.

Let me explain why I say that. We have gone into a country that was a

secular country. People did not think of themselves as Catholics and

Protestants like Northern Ireland. They did not fight about that kind

of stuff. They thought of themselves as being tribal: I belong to this

tribe; you belong to that tribe. We take care of our tribe; you take

care of your tribe. We work out an arrangement. You get some; we get

some. And that is basically how Iraq has run for thousands of years.

So the Americans came in, and suddenly we whipped up this business

that is understandable in this country about religion. Shi'a do not

like Sunni and Sunni do not like Shi'a. There is a much bigger force at

work here that people simply, I think, maybe because it is complex, and

I have got an hour, so I can talk about it a little bit and explain it,

but simply do not understand the makeup of the Middle East.

There are two large groups of Muslim people. Iraq had Muslims from

Shi'a and Muslims from Sunni. They also had Christians living there.

They had Jews living there. They had Kurds living there. They were a

secular society that did not go around checking people's religious card

to see what they were. Our attempts, as we have gone in there, to

create this chaos and turn it loose and say, well, you Shi'a have

always been under the control of the Sunnis forever here, you are the

majority. This is your chance to be the majority. So we have gotten

them fighting. It is an old, old strategy. The British Empire used to

use it all the time: let you and him fight and I stand by and watch and

I control what is going on.

So we have gotten the Sunni and the Shi'a to fight each other. But

what we do not understand is there is more than one kind of Shi'a. Some

of the Shi'a are those living in Iraq. They are Arab in background.

They are Arab tribal people who are Shi'a. And then there are the Shi'a

who live in Iran. Iran, before it was called Iran, was called Persia.

So in Iraq, people talk about Arabs and Persians. And the fight between

these two countries is not about Sunni versus Shi'a. It is about

whether those Persians are going to come in and take over our country.

If this situation that we are setting up where we are going to have one

part being Shi'a in the south and a little bit of Sunni here in the

middle and the Kurds in the north, if that three-part government is set

up, we will have set Persia, Iran, with a chance to invade. And as some

of us said many, many months ago, the danger of this war is we are

going to wind up with two Irans, one next to the other.

Now, one can say whatever they want about that; but, of course, Iran

has been the source of a lot of tumult and terrorism and all kinds of

stuff. So the question of having two of them does not sound like that

makes things better in the Middle East. But that is what we are driving

toward right now. We are driving in that direction.

What will derail it and the name people see on television once in a

while, it is a young man and his name is Muqtada al-Sadr, S-a-d-r.

Muqtada al-Sadr is a young flamethrower of a Shi'a, but he is Arab. And

he, last week, turned out 200,000 people on the streets in Iraq to

protest this constitution, which is going to give the control of the

country to the Shi'a. He himself, Shi'a, that does not matter. What

matters is he is Arab; so he is now aligning himself sort of

imperceptibly, at least as far as Americans seem to be knowledgeable,

with the Sunnis. The Sunni army that was sent underground is now

aligning itself with Muqtada al-Sadr.

We then have created two equal forces. And every Iraqi I met said

almost the same thing one way or other. They would say, If you succeed

in pushing that constitution you people are pushing, and you wrote it

and you gave it to those people and said pass it, there was never any

agreement on it. They just passed it and brought it out.

They are going to put it out for referendum in October. If you succeed

in passing that, you will have civil war in this country for 15 years

or more. That constitution will not serve as a governing document for

the Iraq of today because you have created so much dissension and given

the Iranians such a chance to come in.

Now, we hear our President say, well, not only are they coming in

from the west, from Syria; they are coming in from Iran. Of course they

are. The leading spokesman for the Shi'a in Baghdad to whom everyone

listens and is the one that our government responds to is a man named

al-Sistani. Al-Sistani is a Persian. Someone told me, and I am not sure

because I have not had a chance to check, that he did not actually vote

in that Iraq election before because he was not a citizen of Iraq. He

is a citizen of Iran. So the main spokesman with whom we have been

dealing, and people will see his name, we call him a moderate, that he

is a moderate Shi'a and all this. We have built him up. Well, he is a

Persian and he is connected to all the Persians.

And Muqtada al-Sadr, of course we can see. I mean we have had plays

from the Greek times of Oedipus Rex. We have got the old man and the

young kid and they are fighting. Whatever the reasons are, the Shi'a-

ness does not hold them together. Certainly their Arab-Persian thing is

pushing these two apart, and Muqtada al-Sadr is going with the Sunnis.

Now, the Kurds sit up in the north; and for the first time since the

World War I, they have been promised over and over again, and they have

been let down over and over and over and over again, that they are

going to have their own state. There are about 40 million Kurds. Most

of them will live in Iraq, but large numbers of them live in Turkey to

the north and Syria to the west and in Iran to the east.

And they are a fierce, independent people who are Sunni by religion;

and the Shi'a, who are writing the constitution, say the Kurds' army,

which are called Peshmurga, the Peshmurga has to come into the Iraq

army. We cannot have an army in Kurdistan and an army in the rest of

Iraq. It has got to be one army. Well, the Kurds say, I do not know how

thick the ice is going to be on hell before that happens because we are

never going to allow any army to come into the territory we have in

Kurdistan. We are prepared to die because we finally have our own

country.

They have a parliament that functions. They have two factions there

that fight with each other, and it is like every other country. There

are Democrats and Republicans. That is fine. They need that for

government to work. But they have put down their arms against one

another and are dealing with the outside world and saying, no, we will

be a part of Iraq. We certainly will. We have oil up here in Kirkuk in

the north, and we think we are entitled to some of the revenue from the

oil, and we will run our area and we will educate our children and we

will send them to the United States for medical school. There are a lot

of Kurds in the United States going to school. They are very bright,

very hard-working, very tough people. They have gone through a lot in

the last 85 years since World War I when they were promised that they

would have their own land.

If we look at that situation, we have the Kurds and we have the

Sunnis and we have the Shi'a. One says to himself, gosh, you have just

now painted a picture that you are saying a constitution will not bring

them together. Well, let me say there is some hope. There is hope in

this. But what it requires is the United States and the people, the

neocons who think they have won, to recognize that they have not won

anything. They have created a horrible, horrible costly mess that has

cost us at least $240 billion so far and God knows how much more it is

going to cost us, and it made us incapable of responding to our own

people when problems came in New Orleans.

Part of the Governor of Louisiana's problem was that 13,000 of her

National Guard were in Iraq. She could not call them out, to get their

trucks and go out, help people, put sandbags, do whatever they do in

that kind of situation. They were not there. That is just one element

of what went on. Because we were enmeshed in this war in Iraq, we were

unable to respond to them.

Now, God forbid that we are waiting for another hurricane, Rita, to

hit the coast of Texas. We do not know what it is going to do. Are the

Texans ready? How could they have gotten ready since what went on over

here in Louisiana and Mississippi and Alabama? Do people think they

have suddenly magically gotten ready for Texas? The Texas National

Guardsmen who are over in Iraq, they are not home to take care of their

people.

And we simply have a President who says we are going to stay the

course, that we are going to keep doing the same thing we are doing in

Iraq because it is the right thing to do and we are going to keep doing

it. Well, there is an old joke in psychiatry about the definition of

mental illness is doing the same thing over and over again and

expecting a different result each time. We get the same result.

We are doing the same thing. We go into a town like Fallujah. We

flatten it. Now we have gotten rid of those terrorists. We go away. And

lo and behold, they come springing up again, coming back into the town.

They know where we are. They just run off and hide. They are not going

to confront our military head on head. That is not guerilla warfare.

Guerilla warfare is to let the enemy figure that they have got it made

and then get them when they are not paying attention. That is what they

have done all over the country. We do not control any part of Iraq at

the moment, except the Green Zone where we have a fence and barbed wire

and razor wire and everything else. And the only way we are going to

manage to undo this situation is for our administration to find some

way, some way, to honestly say we are not going to establish permanent

bases in Iraq.

When I suggested that to the Iraqis I talked to, they laughed. They

said, your President is not going to say that. But our administration

is going to have to say something like that, and then do a second

thing. Because they have to say, we are not going to have permanent

bases and we are going to leave the country in some orderly period in

an orderly way. But before we go, we want to set up, and I suggest, and

I do not know, maybe there is another place to do it; maybe Paris or

some place, but Amman in Jordan, not very far away; it would be a place

to convene an Arab summit made up of Sunni, Shia, Kurds, Turk men, Turk

men are people who came from Turkey and have settled in this basic

area; and have them go to a peace place and sit down and work this out

among themselves.

They do not want their families killed. They do not want to have this

continuing warfare. I mean, they are like everybody else. They want a

place, a house for their family, they want food for their kids and

their wife or their mother or their father, whoever; they want schools,

they want health care, they do not want this continuing warfare with

the people dying in the streets and the awful pictures we see. They do

not want somebody falling down with a bridge, because there is a threat

of some sort, people run out on a bridge and it collapses. They are not

looking for that.

If we would get that summit going where everybody who had a stake

would come and sit down and say, let us have a cease-fire in Iraq while

we work on the problem here and see if we cannot come up with a way to

govern a new country without Saddam. Everybody is glad he is gone. You

do not find many people who say, boy, I sure wish Saddam was around.

There is not anybody.

So it is not that they want to bring Saddam back at all. Some people

say, oh, you are just talking about bringing Saddam back. No. These

groups can sit down and work it out. Arabs have worked things out in

their culture for thousands of years.

Now, there are also parties that would be interested in being

helpful, perhaps, because my colleagues will remember we talked about

Iraq has got Shia and Sunni in it. Well, what do we have in Syria? It

is all Sunni. What do we have in Jordan? Almost all Sunni. What do we

have in Saudi Arabia? Almost all Sunni. What do we have in Turkey?

Almost all Sunni. These other countries have a huge stake in this not

becoming a second Shia Persian threat

to their way of life, because they think, well, take Saudi Arabia. The

area around the oil fields from which we get our oil, or the world gets

its oil, the biggest oil fields in the world are right in the middle of

a Shia area. So, if you have Iran and Iraq, and you moved on into Saudi

Arabia, which is not very far, you suddenly have a crescent of Shia

control of almost all the oil in the area. A big threat to everybody;

to the Sunnis, certainly, to the Americans, to the Europeans. Everybody

has a stake in this. And if you get a conference going where you have

people sitting down talking and not killing each other, then they can

work out an equitable arrangement and find a way to resolve this.

It cannot be dictated by the United States. Unfortunately, what

happens again and again is that we have these parliaments. We have

elected a parliament, and then we go in and tell them what they have to

do. Here is what it has to look like. It has to have this provision,

that provision, we do not like this, you take that out. We, by our

heavy-handedness, have really tried to run everything in this

situation. And it can be ended. It can be ended, if we will allow a

process to begin in which Arabs can sit down among themselves and solve

it.

Now, I tell my colleagues this because let me tell my colleagues how

it works. I have a very good friend, a Jordanian, who told me a story

that he knows. And this is Arab culture. A man was driving a cab and he

drove the cab and he hit a man and killed him. Well, that means you are

responsible, and the crowd was about to get him. This guy ran up the

street and ran into the home of a young man and demanded that he be

given sanctuary. That is the Arabic custom. You will give sanctuary. In

fact, the young man, when the police came and when people came, he

said, I never saw this guy you are talking about. I do not know what

you are talking about. The crowd went away. He called his brother and

said, take this man and take him home, so the man went home, was taken

to a safe place. Then he went down in the street and discovered that

the man that had been killed was his father. So now he has a legitimate

cultural right to exact a price for his father's death. What would you

do? You now know where the guy lives; you can go over to his house and

kill him. He did not do that. He just left it alone. He met him in the

street some months later, about four years later, met him in the street

and he said, the guy knew who it was and he was frightened and he said,

look, you and I will have coffee together. So they had coffee together.

And he said, the man whose father had been killed said, you must put on

a feast for our family in memory of my father. So the man put the feast

on and the issue was gone.

People in this Arab culture have a long history of certainly

violence, but also of peacefully resolving situations. And what we are

doing by continually bombing; one of the things the Iraqi said to me

was, you have to stop this business of kicking in the door of a guy's

house and going in and dragging his wife out of bed and embarrassing

her and him and making him look weak and impotent and all the rest, you

have to stop that. You keep doing that, you keep making Iraqis angrier

and angrier, and yet we continue to do these things. As long as we

continue to do war and do not allow a peace process to begin to spring

up, actually, the King Ab'dullah was here in the city today talking at

the prayer breakfast. He, or his uncle, the Crown Prince al-Hasan, or

there are other people who are trusted by both Shia and Sunni who could

be seen as an honest broker.

But we must take the first step. We have to allow that to happen. If

we continue to do what we are doing and stimulate, this will go on

until probably the next election or beyond, until one day we do what we

did, and that image, the very famous picture in Vietnam of that

helicopter lifting off that building, it was not the embassy actually,

it was a hotel down the street where people are hanging on the skids of

this helicopter as it lifts off the ground, that is going to be our

fate in Iraq if we continue on this path. Because we cannot win it with

military might.

The time has come to talk. And we have never been able to get the

gunfire down to the point where this constitutional process that was

supposed to lead to peace, that was supposed to be a peace conference

under other names, but the Sunnis did not participate in it. So you

cannot have it be that way. It cannot come out with a peace if one of

the groups has boycotted it. You can say, oh, it was stupid for them to

boycott it, they should not have done that. You can blame all you want.

But it did happen that way. They did not participate. So the only way

you are going to get it is a conference some place where you can get

all the parties sitting down and saying, all right, look, how are we

going to work this thing out? We have oil revenue, we are a rich

country, there is no reason for us to be in poverty like we are in; we

can use that wealth for everybody, not just for one group or another

group. We will let everybody have a part of it, and we will make this

again the country that it was. This country has a long tradition of

being a place of refinement and intelligence and civil society, and it

can be that again if we will allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that you will ask the President to reconsider the

advice he is getting. I know it is very difficult to be President of

the United States and you do not know everything that you are going to

face. Certainly, one can have empathy for the President having suddenly

been confronted by 9/11 and all the rest. But the advice that he has

been listening to and following is leading him deeper and deeper into

chaos, and it is time for the President to lead us out of that chaos by

taking the role of saying, I believe it is time for us to convene a

peace conference somewhere. We will not have any part of it, but we

think it ought to happen over there, and maybe so-and-so could be the

leader. I mean, maybe it would be better if the President did not

suggest anybody, because it would probably work better if he just said

to the Arabs, who would be the one to convene the conference? Let them

decide. If we want peace and we want democracy and we want liberal

treatment of women, and if we want all of those things for the Iraqi

people, we have got to change our policy.