Mr. President, during the recent debate of the Defense

authorization bill, we saw attempt after attempt to declare the new

strategy, General Petraeus' strategy, in Iraq a failure. The other side

of the aisle wanted to declare that the strategy, which had been in

full force only a couple of weeks, had failed and direct the President

to begin withdrawing troops from Iraq, which is today the central front

in the war against terrorists. Indeed, after the other side lost a vote

to withdraw the troops, the majority leader pulled the bill from the

floor, thus leaving important business for our military unfinished.

The Democratic majority's insistence that the General Petraeus'

strategy has failed makes it easy to overlook what the strategy has

accomplished and what the strategy seeks to accomplish.

In that regard, I ask unanimous consent to have an article by Michael

Gordon from New York Times of July 24 printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in

the Record, as follows:

Mr. President, I wanted to insert this article in the Record

because it provides an objective description of the Petraeus plan and

how it came to be. The goals of the strategy are ``ambitious,'' as the

article notes, but that is all the more reason to support the plan and

not undermine it in the Senate.

Those who have criticized the surge at this early stage have offered

few options for dealing with the aftermath. One option is to follow the

recommendation of the Baker-Hamilton Commission.

At this point, I request unanimous consent to print in the Record a

column by Steven Biddle that appeared in the July 11 Washington Post.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in

the Record as follows:

Mr. Biddle provides a need evaluation of the flaws in the

Baker-Hamilton. Among those flaws, as he explains, our combat forces

are restraining the intensity of the violence in Iraq, and removing

them would cause the violence to rise. This rise in violence would put

the safety of Americans who remain to train Iraqis in even greater

jeopardy.

Of course, prematurely withdrawing our troops would have many other

consequences. Indeed, a sobering assessment of the risks of withdrawal

is too often missing from debates about the U.S. mission in Iraq.

In this regard, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the July

17 Washington Post be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in

the Record as follows:

Mr. President, a premature withdrawal would have severe

consequences, all of which would pose severe risks. Clearly, we should

allow General Petraeus's plan time to succeed.

Finally, Mr. President, as I noted previously, by setting the aside

the Defense authorization bill because he lost a vote to withdraw our

troops, the Majority Leader left important business for our military

undone. Recently, the Senate passed parts of the bill--a pay raise and

``wounded warriors'' provisions--but more needs to be done.

For instance, the Defense authorization bill should be the vehicle

for setting our national security priorities, one of which is how we

should deal with antisatellite weapons the Chinese could use against

us.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that an article on China's space

weapons that appeared in the July 23 Wall Street Journal be inserted

into the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in

the Record as follows:

I asked that this article be printed in the Record because

it is a wake-up call to a new threat we need to take seriously. By

setting aside the Defense authorization bill, we missed an opportunity

to deal with this threat from China.