Mr. Speaker, as always, I appreciate the honor and

the privilege of addressing the Speaker and, in doing so, addressing

this Chamber as well. I know that the voices that come to this floor to

make these addresses echo across America, as our Founding Fathers

envisioned.

Before I pick up the issue I came to this floor to speak about, I

would say a few words in support of the remarks made by my colleague,

the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. Davis), with regard to Dr. Martin

Luther King, Jr. Sometimes we lose perspective of that time in America,

back in the 1960s, when there was the institutionalization of

segregation, particularly in the South.

Those were glorious days when there were civil rights marches for

civil rights reasons and the rights that everyone has in this country

that are guaranteed by our Constitution. These are individual rights.

They are rights without regard to what group you might think you are

aligned with. They belong to men and they belong to women, and they are

rights that preclude group rights. They are individual rights, the

rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, but more

specifically freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion,

freedom of assembly, freedom to keep and bear arms, and the right to

property ownership, which has been eroded by the Kelo decision here in

these last few months, I might add for your benefit particularly, Mr.

Speaker, and for mine.

In those days, when there was a peaceful civil rights movement in

this country that stood on solid philosophical ground that all people

that are citizens of this country, that live here, have equal rights.

That is a different kind of a civil rights call than we have heard

sometimes across this country today.

There is the argument that there is a civil right to marry anyone

that you choose, say, for example, a same-sex marriage civil right they

claim. Or a civil right that people claim because

they are illegally in this country and they say I have a global civil

right to come to the United States of America and the Americans do not

have a civil right to set immigration policies. Those are not civil

rights, Mr. Speaker. There is not any civil right to come to America

and demand the rights of citizenship; and there is no civil right to

marriage, even for opposite sex couples that are madly in love, that

traditionally have and will hopefully continue to be joined together in

holy matrimony. That is not a civil right.

In fact, we give a license for marriage. And a license is, by

definition, a permit to do that which is otherwise illegal. So the

State, meaning the government, the Federal Government, there are State

governments and some of our local governments, take an interest in that

sacred institution of marriage when a man and a woman are joined

together in holy matrimony. Because we know that the value of this

entire society and civilization is poured through into the next

generation of our children through that relationship of holy matrimony

between a man and a woman.

We teach our children in that relationship everything that we know

and everything that we believe about our values. We pass our religious

values along through that marriage relationship. Children are our

projects for our life. There is nothing more important that we can do

in our lifetime than raise children. So we make them projects. And our

first and most important thing is to be able to teach them our

religious values and our moral values and our work ethic. And all the

things that flow from our culture flow from a father and a mother and a

family.

Now, that is the ideal circumstance. And it doesn't mean that there

aren't millions of children in America that aren't raised in that kind

of an environment. It doesn't mean that they will not have

opportunities. They will. And they will pick up their values sometimes

from a single mother or a single father. But they need extra nurturing

from their pastors and teachers in the neighborhood. We know that

statistically most of society's pathologies can be solved by two people

joined together in marriage raising children in that marriage and

having them also keep a job.

But the fact that there is a marriage license that is granted

precludes the idea that there is a civil right to marriage, just like

there is not a civil right to someone who lives in another country to

come into the United States. Those are not civil rights. Civil rights

are specified in title VII of the Civil Rights Act, and those are

defined characteristics. There will be no discrimination against people

based upon race, creed, religion, ethnicity, skin color, or national

origin. And I am not sure that is exactly the quote, but it is exactly

the theme, Mr. Speaker.

I know that behind that some of the States have added also age or

marital status. But those are all immutable rights or immutable

characteristics, characteristics that can be independently identified

and can't be willfully changed. Those are the reality. It is not

something that I decide I am going to be a man or a woman or a person

of a certain other country or color. You can't change that, Mr.

Speaker.

The immutable characteristics are those that are real, they are

distinct, they can't be changed, and they can be independently

identified. And what we say in title VII of the Civil Rights Act is it

shall be unlawful to discriminate against people for that list of

immutable characteristics that I have given.

That is what gives the Civil Rights Act the dignity and respect and

sets it apart for many of the claims for civil rights that come out

today. There is always looking to be another successor to the civil

rights movement, and there will never be another need for the civil

rights that were demanded in the 1960s, and provided by peaceful

demonstrations done in the right way for the right reasons with the

right ideals, and those were glorious days for America to go through

that change and emerge. I will say we are very sensitive to these

issues of race and ethnicity, and we are very respectful of the issues

of race and ethnicity, and the work that was done in the 1960s, the

benefits flow to us today.

The legacy is with us today. We look across our public life and see

successes in people from all avenues, from people that have come from

any origin. They have overcome many obstacles, and we applaud that as

Americans. As Americans, we are for the underdog. We are for the one

who pull themselves up by their bootstraps. We are for the ones who had

the least opportunity and made the most from the least opportunity.

The reason that we are is because that embodies the American spirit,

the American spirit which is embodied by the massive number of

immigrants that have come to this country legally.

Mr. Speaker, 66.1 million Americans have come to the United States

legally, many of them through Ellis Island starting when we first began

keeping records in 1820 until the year 2000 is the last time I can get

the numbers added up and be firm on them. So 66.1 million self-selected

individuals that brought their vitality to the United States because of

the clarion call of freedom and liberty, and that liberty that was

ensured and enhanced during the civil rights era.

I applaud Mr. Davis for his remarks, and I am a great fan of the

contribution of Martin Luther King, Jr.

But, Mr. Speaker, I came to speak on an issue which has significant

impact on the destiny of the United States of America. That is some of

us found out very early yesterday morning, it came to my information

about 3:30 yesterday morning here, that perhaps the worst, most

horrible murderer on the face of the earth had been brought to justice

by Coalition Forces and Iraqi intelligence as well as Task Force 145 of

the United States military, and I will say, all of the Coalition Forces

together, and that would be the end of the very tyrannical career of

Abu Musab al-Zarqawi.

We know they had followed him to a safe house where he was having a

meeting with six of his other colleagues, some of them high level. Our

surveillance had tracked him there. As they watched that safe house,

they thought about different ways that they might be able to take

action against Zarqawi, the person who was responsible for thousands of

murders in Iraq.

Zarqawi was the inspiration, was the person that led the recruitment

of al Qaeda fighters to come into Iraq and take on Coalition Forces and

try to foment an insurrection, tried to foment a civil war. One who

argued and promoted and schemed and planned and strategized to attack

Shiites within Iraq for the specific and stated purpose of fomenting

civil war in Iraq.

It was not just to fight Americans, which was bad enough, but it was

to get Iraqis to fight Iraqis. And al Qaeda knew that if they lost a

base of operations in Iraq, they didn't have another place to go to.

When our military went into Afghanistan in the fall of 2001 and won

the significant victories there, that took out a base of operations for

al Qaeda. They had operations that were beginning to take place down to

Mogadishu, and when they moved some of those operations up to

Afghanistan, they had a base of operations that would allow them to

penetrate anywhere in the world and mount their terrorist operations

against the United States embassies in Africa, the USS Cole, and

bombings across the globe against other countries as well as the United

States.

But when they had a base of operations, then they could raise funds,

control those funds, bring in military supplies and munitions. They

could train and recruit and send people out around the world. We picked

out a lot of Taliban fighters during the Afghan operation, and many of

them were brought to Guantanamo Bay. As we began to interrogate them,

we found out that they had been going into Afghanistan to train. They

came from different places in the world. And there was a handful of

Americans that went to Afghanistan to train with al Qaeda to come back

and fight somewhere in the world against the United States of America.

Certainly we know that is the case for other countries as well.

Well, that base of operations in Afghanistan was wiped out in the

fall of 2001. Justifiably so. And then the base of operations shifted

over to Iraq. Now we know that there was an al Qaeda training camp in

northern Iraq up in the Kurdistan region. We know that Saddam was

working and strategizing

with al Qaeda. Some would say Saddam was secular; and, therefore, he

would not have collaborated with Osama bin Laden. We know better than

that.

The thing that is in history that we know the enemy of one's enemy is

their friend. But Stalin and Hitler teamed together in World War II and

converged in their battles over on Germany's eastern front until such

time they met and clashed, and then Hitler turned around and attacked

Stalin. The enemy of my enemy is my friend.

So we joined up with Stalin at that point and began to engage in that

war that turned it into a two-front war for Germany. The idea that

someone like Hitler could not have collaborated with Emperor Hirohito

in Japan because they didn't match the same ideology doesn't matter

throughout history. That is an erroneous assumption. That does not

matter. It is an erroneous assumption throughout history that people

will not cooperate and collaboration because they do not match the same

goals or ideology. It is the enemy of my enemy is my friend. That is

what was going on over between bin Laden and Saddam.

We know that Zarqawi went to Iraq and established himself as the

leader of al Qaeda in Iraq. He said that he pledged his allegiance to

Osama bin Laden. We have watched on television the horrible beheading

of at least one American at the hand of al-Zarqawi. We know how bad

this evil individual was.

I believe it was a year ago last April that he produced a letter. And

the letter stated what the circumstances were like in Iraq. It should

have been given us great heart. All Members in this Chamber should have

read the letter and understood what it was Zarqawi was writing about.

Many people on the other side of the aisle denied the reality of what

Zarqawi knew last April when he wrote this letter. If I remember right,

it was about a 17-page letter. I remember some of the things that were

in the letter, and it followed along these lines of now we are here in

Iraq and we have to find a place where we can hide because if we are

going to operate out of this country, it is a very dangerous place to

do it because we have coalition forces and U.S. military that are

breathing down our neck at every turn.

He said there is a difference between some countries where they have

been successful in their guerrilla warfare and Iraq. And these are the

reasons why Iraq will never be a Vietnam. He said there are no

mountains or forests to hide in, we must hide in the homes of the Iraqi

people who are willing to take us into their homes, and Iraqis willing

to do so are as rare as red sulfur. That was a quote from the letter.

Iraqis who are willing to receive al Qaeda and harbor and protect them

are as rare as red sulfur.

Now I don't know how rare red sulfur is. I don't know if I have ever

actually seen red sulfur. I have seen quite a lot of yellow sulfur. I

am going to assume it might be an expression like as rare as frog's

hair or as rare as hen's teeth. But as rare as red sulfur.

So there weren't many places for al Qaeda to hide in Iraq even last

April. They had to take over communities, and then we would go in and

break up those cells. So they kept reforming again, kind of like flies

do. We would scatter them and swat some and arrest some and kill some,

and it was going along at a very brisk pace.

In fact, as recently ago as last summer the Coalition Forces, and

this includes the Iraqi military of which there are at least 245,000

that are in uniform defending Iraqis today with those numbers going up

70,000 to 90,000 within a year, but these Coalition Forces were taking

out between killed and captured 3,000 a month.

So as those numbers diminished within Iraq, so did Zarqawi's

supporters. And the stronger the opposition to Zarqawi and the

terrorist was, and the more confidence the Iraqi people got, the more

tips that they handed over then to the Coalition Forces that we could

act on.

We know that Uday and Qusay, Saddam Hussein's two sons, and actually

one of his grandsons that were taken out in Mosul a couple of years

ago, that was as a result of a tip.

Our 101st Airborne reacted and took them out. In the end the house

that they were in, they demolished the house and hauled the rubble away

and graded the lot empty. There will not be a martyr's shrine on that

location, Mr. Speaker.

It was intelligence that did that, and it was intelligence that took

out Saddam Hussein some months later, to find him and track him and

find him in his spider hole. This is another high level of intelligence

to be able to close in on Zarqawi.

We know they were close to him a number of times in the last few

months. We have heard different people in the news state that

eventually they would get Zarqawi. This should not be a surprise to us.

Sometimes it is a surprise that a person can stay on the run and last

as long as they did, but he stayed on the run until a little more than

a day ago when our task force people put the laser on the safe house

that he was in and then directed two 500-pound bombs into that house.

We have seen the pictures of it. The house, made of cement blocks, is

just a jumbled pile of broken up cement blocks.

Of the people who were in there, Zarqawi was the only one that was

alive by the time our forces arrived there. I understand he expired not

too long after they closed in, but he had at least enough left to

recognize that it was Americans that had closed in and put an end to

his terrible reign as the leader of al Qaeda in Iraq.

Now, I believe that Zarqawi got his just desserts. I believe he has

been sent to his eternal reward, or his eternal punishment is a more

precise way to speak of that. I am grateful to the Coalition Forces, to

the Iraqis, and especially to the United States military for the job

they are doing over there in that country and in all of the theaters

that we have in operations now in this global war on terror.

We know that things have heated up some in Afghanistan and the

intensity that is there in Iraq, and the futility of the people on the

other side who believe they can keep blowing up women and children and

noncombatants.

The other day they pulled a bus over and sorted out the Sunnis and

gave them a pass and executed the Shiias and the Kurds on the bus. It

is a horrible thing to create that kind of violence.

This man, Zarqawi, there was no level, no depth he would not stoop

to. We know he has done the beheadings. He initiated the beheadings.

Even today there were heads that were found in banana boxes in Iraq.

They were put there to drive fear into the hearts of the people who

would oppose al Qaeda.

We know also there are retribution killings, revenge killings on the

other side. But the truth of it is there is progress being made in

Iraq, and the progress that has been made in the last 3\1/2\ years

while we have been in those operations has been slower than many of us

would have liked. But compared to any other similar operation in

history, it is going along pretty good.

Mr. Speaker, we need to keep in mind that the Iraqis have established

themselves as a sovereign nation. That is no small task in a nation of

25 million people torn by violence and strife and torn by an al Qaeda

parasite that came into that society that was determined to tear them

apart, that was attacking and fomenting the kind of violence that was

designed to produce a civil war.

With all of those forces inside, with Iran providing resources to try

to incent a civil war within Iraq, Iran not wanting to see free people

in Iraq, for obvious reasons, the clerics, the mullahs that run the

country of Iran, they want to stay in power.

And we know that there is a significant amount of unrest within Iran.

The people in Iran have memories of a more modern, open society under

the Shah, and they want to join the world community of nations and they

want to move into the future. And they understand that if they are held

back into the Dark Ages by a clerical group of leaders who are

determined to hold them there and tell them what they can wear and what

they can say and how they are going to live, to hold women back, to not

allow elections, at least legitimate elections, that they will not be

able to move Iran into the 21st century. And they want their

opportunity. But the leaders in Iran want to hang on to the power.

That is all the way it is, Mr. Speaker. The leaders want to hang onto

the

power, and so they are promoting the violence also in Iraq. Some of

that violence has been supported out of Syria the same way and the

infiltrators that come in that are the fighters for the insurgents come

across the border from Iran into Iraq and from Syria into Iraq in the

greatest numbers from those two countries. There is support in both of

those countries for an insurgency that had we had the cooperation of

Iran, had we had the cooperation of Syria, this operation in Iraq would

have been over a long time ago.

And, Mr. Speaker, I would point out for the edification of the folks

that don't think about this very much that a war is never over until

the losing side realizes that they have lost. It isn't a function of

how many people are killed, or a function of how much land is occupied,

or a function of how many battles are fought and won. They are all

factors. But those are all factors that are designed to influence and

convince the other side that they will eventually lose, in fact, may

have lost the war. And so every operation that we have, military

operation, any kind of a sanction that is there, any kind of a

blockade, any kind of psyops, any psychological operations that are

going on, media message that is going out there, the voice of the

President, the Secretary of Defense, the voices on this floor of

Congress, Mr. Speaker, should all be designed to promote the idea that

America will not blink, that we will not back out, that we will stand

up for freedom and stand up for liberty. And if that consistent message

goes across the ocean into the Middle East, those people that are

sitting in those huts making bombs and deciding that they are going to

plant them and detonate them on American troops or coalition troops or

Iraqi troops, or Iraqi women and children, at some point they will

understand, we will not blink. We will not flag. We will not fail. We

will carry out our efforts on this war on terror globally, and Iraq is

a battle field in the global war on terror.

This country cannot fail in our resolve. We will be resolved and we

will finish this task. And the task will be over when the enemy

realizes that they have lost. That is the very definition of winning a

war, Mr. Speaker. In fact, Von Clausewitz wrote in his book on war that

the object of war is to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct

war. Destroy the enemy's will and ability. And Von Clausewitz

understood that if you could destroy the enemy's will, they would not

have the ability to conduct war. And if you take away the enemy's

ability to conduct war, part of that ability is having the will.

Without the will, no amount of weapons, no amount of resources would

even be used at all because there would be a lack of will to ever use

them.

So to destroy the enemy's will and ability to conduct war boils down

in the Steve King version to make the enemy realize that they have

lost. Once they reach that realization, then they will give up their

arms, they will give up their efforts and there will be peace and there

be a peaceful reconciliation that resolves things hopefully for the

better so that people can live free. That is the effort that is going

on in Iraq. And we lose sight of the reason that we want to see the

Iraqi people with peace and freedom and, in fact, I would say freedom

first and peace second. And the reason for that is because, after all,

we have an obligation to promote freedom throughout the world, but we

also can't be denying this freedom to anyone.

And we need peace in the Middle East. It is a critical part of the

world. It puts a threat on everyone in the world when we don't have

peace in the Middle East. One of those things would be to look to the

freest people that are in the Middle East today, and that would be the

citizens of Israel. And where they sit with enemies surrounding them

all around, the threat to them, the pressure on them is a threat and

the pressure that threatens to annihilate an entire people. They have a

right to be there. That is their sovereign nation. And they are a lamp

of liberty in the Middle East. The people that live around them don't

have the freedom that Israel has.

But soon, I believe they will. I believe they will because Iraq is

emerging as a free Arab nation. And Afghanistan has emerged as a free

Arab nation. Not without trouble, not without strife, not without

violence, not without some more outbreaks of Taliban violence, not

without some more battles with al Qaeda over in Afghanistan, certainly

not without more battles with al Qaeda within Iraq. But if Afghanistan,

a nation of 25 million people, and Iraq, a nation of 25 million people,

can emerge a free people, Afghanistan has, Iraq is poised to do so.

They become the lode star for all the Arab people in the world. And the

people that have lived the least under freedom now have an opportunity

to live under freedom.

And I don't believe that the force of freedom can be held back,

because the march of history is always, Mr. Speaker, a march towards

freedom. And it has been a gradual progression throughout the ages, but

in our age, in our lifetime, and this past half a century and

peripherally in this next half a century, we will see more progress

towards freedom than ever in the history of the world and, in fact, in

all the rest of the history of the world put together, I believe we

will look back on this time and say this was the time that freedom

emerged on the globe. And it emerged in the aftermath of World War II

and it burst out when the Berlin Wall came down, November 9, 1989, and

we saw freedom echo across Eastern Europe, almost bloodlessly, in a

historical miracle of people that now live and breathe free. Five

hundred million people at least freed in that echo of freedom when the

Berlin Wall went tumbling down and families were reunited.

And as I watched that on the news, I noticed that the national news

media missed it. They thought it was about reuniting families and

breaking champagne bottles on the Berlin Wall. They didn't realize it

was the crashing down of the Iron Curtain. They didn't realize that

that era was over. And even for 2\1/2\ years after that, as nation

after nation emerged free, as they stood in the square in Prague and

people stood there and shook their keys by the tens of thousands and

just rattled their keys, Mr. Speaker, in a chorus, in a din that said

we will be free, and that country is free today. They had their Velvet

Revolution and separated again and they seem to be happy between the

Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic and their neighbors are free.

And as I look at the coalition troops that are there in Iraq today,

the ones that I have met as I have been over there in my several trips

over to the Iraq region and into Iraq, I recognize that the

participation in this effort is greater within the countries that lived

under tyranny up until the fall of the Wall and the end of the Cold War

on November 9, 1989. That participation of those countries is greater

in percentage than the countries that have lived under freedom longer.

Those that got their freedom back from the Third Reich at the end of

World War II, some of those countries forgot what it was that they

achieved 60 years ago. But those countries that just achieved their

freedom less than 15 years before sent their troops to fight for

freedom in Afghanistan and in Iraq because they have an institutional

memory within the people in the government and within their leaders on

what it is like to live under tyranny.

But here in this country, we have a better memory than that. We have

not ever lived under tyranny here in the United States of America. We

have lived free from July 4, 1776, even though we had to fight a few

wars to keep it, all the way up until today. Some of us would argue

that our freedom gets diminished and we argue, here, Mr. Speaker,

rather than going to the streets to clash in the streets, we have our

debates here. We have an outlet for our desire to make change. And this

is that outlet. And there are outlets in the State legislatures all

across this land and in the county supervisors and the city halls. We

take our disagreements to the public forum, and we have a civilized

debate. And as the former majority leader and my friend and colleague,

Tom DeLay, said on this floor, this very podium about this same time

yesterday, you show me a nation that doesn't have partisanship and I

will show you a tyranny.

If there is not a forum for debate and for disagreement and dialogue,

then that means a tyrant will be in control and be denying that forum.

Well, a tyrant was in control in Iraq and he is now under trial, Saddam

Hussein. And there were tyrants in control of the lawless regions in

Afghanistan. And

now they are free and there are people who have a future. And now, Iraq

has a brighter future because the tyrant, the murderer, the baby

slaughterer, the person who beheaded people on television has gone to

meet his eternal justice. And I think I know where he will spend

eternity, Mr. Speaker, and I can think of no better justice for someone

like Zarqawi than that.

Some of the things that he did would be to go take someone off the

street and kill them because maybe they had a different viewpoint about

what the future of Iraq should be. Kill them, disembowel them, fill

their body up with explosives and projectiles such as screws and bolts

and ball bearings and then put their body alongside the road and sit

back and wait for the family to come and recover the body and then

detonate the body and blow it up and kill the rest of the family. I

cannot think of anything more horrible than an act like that.

But I can tell you that Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, Mr. Speaker, spent a

great deal of his time trying to think of more brutal things that he

could do, more shocking things that he could do, more ways that he

could try to crack the nerve of the Iraqi people so that somehow, in

that conflict, in the confusion into a civil war that he would have

like to have created, he could have found a way to take power and turn

Iraq not into a sovereign nation, not even into a real tyranny, but to

turn it into a terrorist camp so that he could bring funds in, train

people and dispatch people around the world to attack civilizations

unlike him.

And that is what the hatred is of al Qaeda. That is the kind of enemy

that we are up against, Mr. Speaker, and that is that this is a battle

and Western Civilization is an element in this battle. And I will

submit that al Qaeda, radical Islam is a parasite on the religion of

Islam. And this parasite has attached themselves to Islam. And a

parasite will attach themselves to the host; Islam is the host. And

they will travel on the host. They will feed off the host; they will

reproduce on and within the host. And they will attack the host and

they will drop off the host and attack other species. That is what a

parasite is.

And I will submit that al Qaeda and radical Islam is that parasite

that is now riding on the host of Islam. And we need to be asking Islam

to rid themselves of this host, with our help, help guide us, but purge

yourselves, rid themselves of this parasite. Purge themselves of the

parasite radical Islam, al Qaeda, because sometimes parasites are

fatal, and they will consume their host and the host will perish. Well,

this parasite has caused numerous Muslims to perish because they have

turned and attacked the host and, in fact, I believe that there is not

really any question about it. When we look across the world and we

count the bodies, the bodies of Muslims lie in significantly greater

numbers than the bodies of Jews or Christians that are victims of al

Qaeda, victims of radical Islam. They turn on their own. Zarqawi was

one of those people. He drew a distinction between Shiias and Sunnis.

And when he did that, he began attacking Shiias to try to get them

infuriated. He blew up their mosque to try to get them to turn around

and attack the Sunnis so that they could have a civil war.

And we had leaders within this country and this Congress, Mr.

Speaker, that would join together and declare that there was a civil

war in Iraq, and their definition of a civil war would be when the

unrest in Iraq got to the point where they had lost their level of

tolerance to watch it on the news, I guess. And so some came to the

floor and said that there was a civil war. Many said so in the news.

There was a group of Senators from the other body that did so. A junior

Senator from Iowa declared a civil war to be taking place in Iraq. And

I contend that you need to define a civil war before you declare there

is one, and I will define it this way:

We will know when there is a civil war in Iraq, and I do not believe

for a moment there will be one. I think the steps that were taken

yesterday and the death of Zarqawi move things closer towards peace and

freedom and further away from the threat of a civil war. But a civil

war in Iraq will be defined when the Iraqi military that are in uniform

protecting Iraqis, and remember we have Kurds and Shiias and Sunnis all

wearing the same uniforms, Mr. Speaker, and they all take the same

training and they all carry the same weapons, and they answer to

officers that are officers, without regard to whether they are Shiias,

Kurds, or Sunnis. But if that ecumenical military, if I can use a

little license to describe them that way, chooses up sides and starts

to shoot at each other, that is how we will know there is a civil war.

But what we have are at least 250,000 Iraqis in uniform protecting

Iraqis without regard to whether they are Shiias, Sunnis, or Kurds,

wearing the same uniforms, mixed up in roughly proportionate numbers

and defending Iraqis against al Qaeda, defending Iraqis against

terrorists, defending Iraqis against criminals, and defending Iraqis

against former Baathists that are in their last gasps.

Now, there are also some that believe that somehow Saddam Hussein

will come back to power. And because he is alive, because he is able to

put up a fight in the courtroom, it gives inspiration to those people

that have always been intimidated by Saddam and believe that somehow he

has, I don't want to call it a supernatural power, but a power that

transcends the limits of a mortal human being in a way that they can't

be confident that he is out of power forever until he checks into the

next life and joins Zarqawi.

For that reason, I am hopeful that we can get the trials over in

Iraq. I am hopeful that we can move forward and if Saddam is found

guilty, and so in this country we say innocent until proven guilty and

I will afford him on this floor, Mr. Speaker, at least that much

latitude, he is innocent until proven guilty. But I have seen and the

world has seen plenty of evidence to the contrary.

Now, if that evidence is continually presented in court and the Iraqi

court finds him guilty, I did meet with the judges over there last

August and sat down with the panel of the judges and one of the

questions that I asked the judge was, what is the penalty for Saddam?

And he said, Well, first I cannot speak about a case that is before the

court. That is appropriate. That is the rules we have in this country.

And I should probably not have asked him such a direct question, but I

did test out apparently his good judgment to not speak about a case

that was before the court.

So I asked him the longest convoluted question one could imagine, at

least that I could imagine at the time, which is: If there were crimes

that were committed or alleged to have been committed which would be of

a similar vein, of the murders up in the region in Kurdistan and the

killing of the swamp Arabs in the south, I went through the whole list

of hundreds of thousands of Iraqis that had died, if that had happened

and if hypothetically we had someone who was found responsible for

committing those kind of atrocities, if that person were brought before

this court and they were faced with a penalty that would be similar to

or charges that were similar to a charge that was being faced by Saddam

Hussein then, what would the penalty be?

That is how you have to ask the question without him addressing the

case. And he said if someone is charged under Iraqi law the charge of

crimes against humanity, then there is only one penalty available and

it all is in one paragraph in Iraqi law and I have read it, and that

one penalty is death. And so that would be I think a suitable

punishment for someone who may well be responsible for the deaths of

half a million Iraqis.

I have looked at some of the statistics, and under Saddam's reign

there are varying numbers, but I am always asking these questions

trying to quantify how bad was the violence under Saddam Hussein, and I

can come up with some conclusions. The number that I see come up the

most often, the annual deaths in Iraq or the total deaths during

Saddam's regime, and then divide it by the year and by the day. And,

Mr. Speaker, the most common number that came up was that Saddam was

killing his own people at the rate of 182 per day; 182 of his own

people per day murdered, many of them tortured, many of them raped in

rape rooms. Can you imagine an administration that had professional

rapists that

are on salary to torture and terrorize and rape family members within

the presence of other family members in order to extract certain

confessions out of them or just simply punish them to watch their loved

ones treated in that fashion? Put through shredders, plastic shredders

and ground into little pieces, fed to lions. Those are the kinds of

things that Saddam Hussein was doing as well as unleashing gas on the

Kurds, for example.

This was going on in that country for years and years. And maybe that

number is not 182 a day. The lowest number I can find is about 135 a

day. But if you add these numbers up and you subtract from it the

numbers of Iraqi civilians that have lost their lives in this conflict

since the aberrations began in March of 2003, if you add that up, there

are at least 100,000 Iraqis alive today in Iraq that would not be if we

had not intervened and pulled Saddam Hussein from power and given the

Iraqi people their opportunity at freedom. 100,000 lives at least

statistically have been saved in this operation that the news media

characterizes as so utterly violent that we should sack up our bats and

hit the road no matter what the consequences.

I have heard that statement made even in the aftermath of Zarqawi.

The gentleman from California (Mr. Stark) made the statement, or at

least the news reported that, this is, that we should get out of Iraq.

This is a sign that tells us to get out of Iraq.

Well, those that want to get out of Iraq will use any excuse to try

to make the argument. But I asked the question sometime back and I have

made the statement on this floor, Mr. Speaker, and I will go down this

path of making it again. And it is from memory and not some notes, so

there could be a decimal point or two that I could be off, but I will

be exactly right on the substance and on the theme.

I asked the question, myself: How can the regular Iraqi civilian,

people that are living there scattered all over Iraq in random places,

some in Baghdad, some in Kirkuk, some in Mosul, some down in Basra,

some in smaller towns, Tikrit and wherever, how can those people, those

citizens that want to live a peaceful life and raise their families and

have a future, how can they tolerate living in a country that has the

level of violence that every day shows these bombings on television to

the point where we are jaded here in America and hardly look at them

anymore. We kind of do a little mental calculation of what kind of

casualties there are over there in civilians. Here was a bombing with

10, here is a bomb that killed 20, here is the bus they pulled aside

and, by Zarqawi's orders everyone has to assume, when they sorted out

the Sunnis and let them go and killed the Kurds and the Shiias, how can

one live in a country that has that level of violence? How violent is

Iraq?

And I will have to admit that some of the places that I have been in

this country and the statistics that I see caused me to pay attention.

And not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, I was down in Brazil in Sao Paulo,

and some of the briefings as I came into that city from the airport and

it is a large city in southern Brazil that they have 10,000 homicides

in that city every year. 10,000. A division, a number greater than a

division are annihilated in that one city in Brazil by murder.

So I began to simply calculate, statistically what does that mean.

And I didn't get good statistics on how large an area that was, so I

didn't commit those numbers to where I could repeat them here, Mr.

Speaker. But you divide the 10,000 into the population of Sao Paulo to

find out how many homicides per 100,000. And internationally that is

the way we measure the risk of violence and homicide.

And so I don't have that number, but that is the one that inspired me

to look. So we went back and we added up all the deaths, all the deaths

that are in Iraq, all the deaths that we can calculate and tabulate.

And there are a couple of Web sites that do that, and at least one of

those Web sites is designed to be able to add as many numbers as

possible to this.

Now, here are the statistics then, Mr. Speaker, on how dangerous it

is to be a regular civilian living in an average place in any of these

countries that I have laid out here on this graph, and you can see by

the chart.

Here is the United States. Out of every 100,000 people, every year

annually there are 4.28 Americans that are murdered, that die violently

at the hands of someone who willfully wished them harm and acted upon

it: 4.28 per 100,000. Mexico's rate is three times greater than ours, a

little more than three times greater. Theirs is 13.02 per 100,000.

We move up the line. Here is Iraq down here pretty low in this graph

scale, 27.51 per 100,000 people. That is their level of violence. Now,

it is possible that the tabulation has missed some murder in Iraq that

maybe didn't get reported perhaps out in some of the obscure towns and

cities because their bureaucracy is not very efficient at this point.

But it is also likely and in fact very probable that they double-

counted some of the other homicides; so I can't tell you if this number

is maybe a little bit lower than it is in reality or it is a little

higher than it is in reality, but I can tell you this, we don't expect

this number to be down here. And if we would double this number, we

would still not anticipate that is the case, and the reason is because

of the United States news media, Mr. Speaker. And I so will take you up

the line.

Venezuela, 31.61 violent deaths per 100,000; Jamaica, 32.42 violent

deaths per 100,000. I can remember these. Venezuela and Jamaica, I

teamed those together. They both average out at 32 deaths per 100,000.

That happened to be OJ Simpson's jersey number, so I will never forget

that number. You can ask me in 20 years. Thirty-two violent deaths per

100,000 for Venezuela and Jamaica.

And then you go to South Africa, and down in that country, a great

welcome when I visited and met good people and they are struggling to

move themselves into the 21st century as well, Mr. Speaker, but in

reality you look around and you will see that there are fences built

around the homes and walls built around the homes. And they will take

glass, and when they finish their wall on top of their wall put mortar

on top and set broken glass in the top of that mortar, so those people

that want to climb across the wall have to get cut up on that glass.

And then I talked to one of our U.S. council employees and asked him

what it was like to live in a country that was walled in, that you were

shut in in your own little fortress of your home. And he said, Well, it

is not so bad for me because we have a good wall around our house and

it has got good security on top of it, and we have got cameras and we

have got warning devices, and we have got good solid doors and bars

across the windows. And, if they get through those doors or through

those bars and get into the interior of the house, we have good solid

doors there, too, but we have a chamber that we can go into to protect

ourselves that is almost impregnable. So we can always retreat into

that if someone invades our home.

It kind of sounds like a war. It sounds like an invading army coming

into a country the same way one might consider to be an invading

terrorist, criminal coming into a home. It is not a lot different when

someone comes across our border, especially when they are armed.

South Africa, 49.60 violent deaths per 100,000. Colombia, one of the

highest murder rates in the world and it ranks significantly higher

than the United States. So of 61.78 violent deaths per 100,000 in

Colombia, well over twice as high as the violent deaths in Iraq.

Now I start to ask the question: How can an individual, an average

citizen in Colombia, tolerate the level of violence in Colombia? How

long has it been since you have seen the mainstream news media run a

story on that? And I would say you could do a Lexus-Nexus search, but

never wouldn't surprise me, Mr. Speaker. So Colombia is not the highest

murder rate in the world, but they are multiple times greater than the

United States. Honduras is not on here, but their rate is nine times

that of the United States. And Swaziland is out there at 88.61 violent

deaths per 100,000. Now, that is a lawless society. But I just about

guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that nobody hears a word about that lawless

society in Swaziland, but it approaches that number of three times as

dangerous to live in Swaziland, in fact it exceeds that of number as

three times as dangerous to live in Swaziland as it is to live in Iraq

today.

And yet people think that civil society has broken down in Iraq and

that there is not a way to operate in that country because it has been

taken over by violence.

Well, we had a little violence there for al Zarqawi and lots of

people were dancing in the street and firing their weapons in the air

like they did when Saddam Hussein was collared, and it is a significant

moment in the history of this war on terror, and it is an indicator of

what will happen to the next person that emerges to take the head of

the operation of al Qaeda and the enemy operations within Iraq. We will

always be targeting those people at the top, those people that are

second tier, third tier, grabbing them wherever we can. And we have an

individual here on the floor with us who has, as I know, been to a very

intense and detailed and informative briefing on the operations that

were able to take Zarqawi out.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield so much time as he may

consume to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. Pearce).

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

In the interim I was able to come up with this picture that I think is

important to have posted here for us to remember this individual.

Remember, Zarqawi was an inspiration to our enemy. And I do not

believe that Zarqawi is going to end up being the inspiration in the

form of a martyr as we often consider them to be.

You know, when you think about what a martyr is, that would be one

person who committed and dedicated their lives to a cause selflessly,

in an inspirational way, and perhaps one who might have died in that

cause.

Can you think of two martyrs for the same cause, Mr. Speaker? And I

think back, I cannot think of two martyrs for the same cause. But I

would point that out. Maybe there are.

But if I cannot think of two, I am convinced I cannot think of three,

or four or five or six or ten martyrs for the same cause, or 100 or

1,000 or 10,000. Martyrs come along in groups of 1, not groups of 2, 5,

10, 20 or 1,000.

I would submit this, Mr. Speaker, that the more of these alleged

martyrs that there are, the less they are martyrs and the more they

become statistics, and the less anyone is inspired by someone who is

full of murder and hatred and brutality.

They do not stand for anything except murder, hatred and brutality. I

would be happy to yield to Mr. Pearce.

I thank the gentleman. I point out also to key into

that point, that Stonewall Jackson may have been the most inspiring

general in the South, but you cannot inspire people from the grave.

Well, you can do that, but you cannot recruit military to fight

underneath you from the grave.

This fellow, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi is done recruiting for al-Qaeda.

They are not going to come here to fight in his memory, because they

are going to meet the same kind of end as Zarqawi.

But I want to point out his statement here, Mr. Speaker, because I

think it is important for Americans to burn into

their mind his attitude towards Americans. He said, ``Americans are the

most cowardly of God's creatures. They are an easy quarry, praise be to

God. We ask God to enable us to kill and capture them.''

That was his letter to al-Qaeda, February 2004. Americans, the most

cowardly of creatures? You know, in this entire conflict, the battle in

the global war on terror, in the breadth of Afghanistan and Iraq and

all points in between and the periphery of all of those, I have yet to

hear of a single incident of an cowardly American soldier.

I mean, it may have happened. But I have not heard of a single

incident. I have only heard of bravery and courage and sacrifice. And

each quarter, I never let it be longer than that, I go to visit our

wounded Americans in places like Bethesda, Walter Reed and Landstuhl

there in Germany. And when I go in to visit those wounded soldiers,

they give me strength, they give me inspiration. They believe in this

cause, and we must not let them down.

And most of them feel guilty that they were wounded, because now they

are not with their men. Most of them want to go back to their unit. In

fact, we have had amputees that have gone back to their unit and

engaged in combat again. That is the kind of inspiration, that is what

Americans are about.

Zarqawi could not be more wrong. I am happy to say today he could not

be more dead. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico

for joining me and raising his voice and standing up for United States

of America.

Mr. Speaker, I have this one quick chart that I am going to run

through quickly. That is, the Iraq numbers again for civilians, 27.51

for 100,000.

Where is the place most comparable to that in the United States

today? Oakland, California. If you are safe in Oakland, that is about

how safe they feel in Iraq today with the exception of the national

news media's exceptions.

God bless our troops. I yield back.