

credible job of making sure that Hussein's desires and ambitions did not materialize into weapons and delivery systems.

Containment, however, has a bad name in this administration. But I am old enough to remember President Reagan using it to bring down the Soviet Union. But containment was abandoned on March 19; and it is not over, that war they started.

While it is important for us to continue questioning how we got into the war and learn what lessons we can, our urgent task now is to figure out how to get out. We need to know whether there are 5,000 guerillas fighting us, as General Abizaid says, or 50,000, as the CIA apparently believes.

This is no small matter. Our Defense Secretary has created his own in-house Office of Special Intelligence to rival the CIA. We do not know which agency is closer to the truth. Lawrence of Arabia in World War I did awfully well with just 3,000 Arab irregulars. They tied down nearly 70 times that many Turkish troops. With a ratio like that, 5,000 guerrillas could tie down 350,000 of our troops. If 50,000 is the right number, we are looking at 3½ million of our own troops. And remember the Turks did not beat Lawrence, just as the Russians did not defeat the Afghan mujahedeen and Carthage did not rout Rome.

Our troops are identified as crusaders, invaders, occupiers, the superpower. American troops are magnets for centuries of resentment and targets for those who within Iraq are happy for the opportunity to stir those resentments up.

We need to know whether there is a plan to get out in a reasonable way or not. I do not believe we should walk away and leave the Iraqis in chaos. However much I deplore the way we went in, I do not want to have to deplore the way we get out. It is tempting to do what Senator Aiken from Vermont suggested in Vietnam, declare victory and get out; but it would be wrong. What would be right is to level with the American people, level with our allies, level with the U.N., and make a sustainable plan to leave Iraq; and I pray to leave Iraq better off than when we found it.

So far, the President has only said we were going to have an election after we had a constitution. Now we are going to have an election before the constitution and we are going to be out of there on June 1. It looks like it is all tied to the timing of the election in 2004. That is unfair to the people that we are serving in Iraq who have lost arms, who have lost legs, who have been severely injured. The President should be honest with us and honest with the U.N. and strike a workable deal. It can be done, but it requires the President of the United States to get off this attitude of "bring them on." That was foolishness from the start, and now we have people coming in from all over the Middle East to be involved in taking on our troops, and each day we lose more. There is no excuse.

But the President goes out to fund-raisers. He goes to Great Britain. He says he will meet with the bereaved over in Great Britain. But he does not go to public ceremonies honoring our dead in this country. Why is that? Is he afraid? Why does he not go forward and stand next to the mothers and the fathers as they lower their loved ones into the ground?

This President has never been straight with us about this war, and he is going to have to be, or we are going to wind up exactly as we did in Vietnam, running from the top of the embassy or some other way that we leave the country in disgrace. We should not allow that to happen to our troops.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members not to make personal references to the President such as accusing him of lying.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HINCHEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INSLEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WATSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WATERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening because I came to defy the President of the United States of America. I came to talk about what is happening in Iraq.

I came to do that, understanding that this President does not want this

kind of discussion. I recognize that the President does not want us to continue to remind him of this disaster in Iraq. This is a President who has tried to intimidate the news media and told them to stop writing about the bad things that were going on in Iraq, and he told them to write about good things that are happening in Iraq. But thank God that the news media of this country has continued to report on what is really going on in Iraq. Oh, yes, they have talked about some of the children returning to school, and they have talked about the book bags. But the American people want to know about what is happening with our soldiers. The American people are terribly upset about the loss of the lives of our soldiers.

So I am here in defiance of the orders and the attempts to keep us from talking about what is going on. The President's unilateral invasion of Iraq and his administration's subsequent mismanagement of the Iraq conflict have left our Nation in a quagmire. According to the Pentagon's own figures, 422 American servicemen and -women have been killed in Iraq since the beginning of the war and 2,041 have been wounded. No less than 284 Americans have been killed since the President announced the end of the major combat operations on May 1, and the casualties continue to climb.

I believe that this administration is in denial. Yes, the President posted that sign "Mission Accomplished." However, the war really did begin after the sign was posted, and our soldiers have been picked off one by one.

Mr. Speaker, attacks on U.S. helicopters have killed nearly 40 soldiers this month alone, and the attacks continue every day. This past Monday, two more soldiers were killed in two separate attacks near the town of Balad, 45 miles northwest of Baghdad.

□ 2145

One soldier died and two more were wounded when Iraqi insurgents engaged their patrol with small arms fire. The other soldier was killed when a convoy was struck by a roadside bomb. Every day, more American soldiers are killed in Iraq with no exit strategy and no end in sight.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when our soldiers rolled into Baghdad. I remember the way the President bragged about Operation Shock and Awe. I remember how they said to the American people, we have all of the equipment and supplies and the military might that we need. We are going to shock and awe. And this kind of sloganeering that I thought was unbecoming of this administration was the order of the day.

Now, this administration is doing it again. The administration's most recent response to the mounting American casualties has been a new bombing campaign. This campaign is known as

Operation Iron Hammer in Baghdad and Operation Ivy Cyclone north of Baghdad. It involves heavy aerial attacks on so-called suspected terrorists' meeting places and infrastructure. For the past 6 days, U.S. forces have pounded targets with 500-pound bombs, cannon fire, and artillery.

I believe it is another public relations campaign. Mr. Speaker, this administration is famous for spinning and sloganeering and basically posturing, and this is another kind of spinning that is going on. They think when they come up with this kind of sloganeering that somehow they are more believable.

So we have this new Operation Iron Hammer in Baghdad, and what is it doing? We are told that they are hitting suspected terrorists. Who are they killing? What terrorists are they stopping when, in fact, the terrorists, as they have been identified who are killing our soldiers, continue day after day to pick our soldiers off. There is no evidence to suggest that this bombing campaign will accomplish anything. In fact, it may make the situation worse.

A top secret CIA assessment from Iraq, which was widely reported last week, warned that bombing campaigns like this one could only incite more Iraqis to fight against Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I will be coming often to tell the truth about what is going on in Iraq. I will not be intimidated.

EXPLORING IRAQ EXIT STRATEGIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Alabama). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, over the last year and a half, the administration has attempted to make the case that the Iraq war is part of the global "War on Terror." They argued that military action to disarm Iraq would save the United States from being directly attacked by Iraq's weapons of mass destruction, and would also prevent Iraq from giving weapons of mass destruction to terrorist groups that could then launch attacks against the United States.

Of course, no weapons of mass destruction have been found, and there has been no proof offered that legitimately connects Saddam Hussein with the September 11 attacks or the work of the al Qaeda network on September 11.

The war has effectively had the opposite effect of what was desired. Al Qaeda, which was not proven to exist inside of Iraq prior to the war, is now thriving in Iraq and is targeting U.S. soldiers in their war against the United States. The U.S. occupation is fueling internal and regional hatred towards the U.S. and is providing al Qaeda with a recruiting poster for their anti-American ambitions.

The world is considerably less safe because of this endeavor. Terrorist at-

tacks in Saudi Arabia and Turkey, and a complete breakdown in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, only reinforce that the war in Iraq did not bring peace to the region as President Bush said it would.

Clearly, the mission has not been accomplished. More U.S. troops have died since the end of the war than during combat operations. Last week, the U.S. military launched Operation Iron Hammer, a version of shock and awe, targeted at foreign and nationalist terrorists insurgents whose presence in Iraq is a direct result of the U.S. invasion.

Most of the world's nations view the war and occupation of Iraq to be a U.S. folly. The U.S. is stuck, mostly alone, with a costly, unpopular, and unending occupation of Iraq.

This is why a major change is needed. That is why I believe we need to get the U.S. out and the United Nations in. The U.N. will not go in, however, unless the main focus of resistance and instability, the United States, agrees to pull out.

The U.S. must also renounce all political and economic interests in Iraq. It will be necessary to renounce, clearly and unequivocally, any interest in controlling Iraq's oil resources. The U.N., not the U.S., will administer Iraq's oil revenues.

Under a new U.N. resolution, the U.N. will administer contracts to repair Iraq. War profiteering will no longer be tolerated. It will be necessary to suspend all reconstruction contracts and close the U.S.-led Coalition Provisional Authority, because of the suspicion that various contracts have been given to large American corporations were as a result of political connections. In its place, the U.N. would help Iraqis administer funds to employ Iraqis to repair the damage from the invasion.

I believe if we hand over the security, administrative, and economic responsibilities to the United Nations, member countries would be more inclined to help pull the United States out of this quagmire.

I am not suggesting that we do not have responsibilities there. We need a phase-in of the U.N. force and a phase-out of the U.S., while keeping a Navy fleet to defend the territorial integrity of Iraq from foreign invasion.

The U.S. owes a moral debt to the people of Iraq for the damage caused by the U.S. invasion. The U.S. will also owe a contribution to the U.N. to help Iraq make the transition to self-government.

American taxpayers deserve their contributions to be handled in an accountable, transparent manner. However, Americans are not required to build a state-of-the-art infrastructure as the administration seems to be planning.

All we can do now is to make a dramatic reversal. Of course, we must acknowledge that the continued U.S. military presence in Iraq is counterproductive and destabilizing. We have a choice in front of us: either we change

course, withdraw our troops, and request that the U.N. move in and bring the U.N. in and take the U.S. out, or we sink deeper into this occupation, with more U.S. casualties, ever higher financial costs, and diminished security for Americans. I think that we can still turn this around. I think that America can take a new direction.

Today, Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post on page A21, there is a story called "Sending a Message," and I will include that in the RECORD of my Special Order. What that does is it talks about the aspects in which the war is escalating and the damage that is occurring to Iraqi communities as a result of U.S. military action. I would suggest that the damage inherent, as is described in this story, is not only to the humble people whose homes are being blown up, but it is also to the U.S. reputation, because as we get into the cycle of violence, we will be digging ourselves in deeper, and we will be distancing ourselves from the world community. This is a time that we need to reach out to the world community, take a new approach, and that will then enable the United States to finally end this unfortunate episode.

"SENDING A MESSAGE" WITH A SHOW OF

FORCE

RURAL IRAQI HOMES DESTROYED IN U.S. OFFENSIVE

(By Daniel Williams)

TIKRIT, IRAQ, Nov. 18.—The house of Omar Khalil Ibrahim is a flattened jumble of broken bricks and roofing. Three of his neighbors' homes, still standing, are riddled with big holes made by tank shells that blasted through two or three walls. A dead cow lies rotting beside a broken shed.

The scene in central Iraq was the result of a U.S. military offensive aimed at taking the initiative away from anti-occupation guerrillas. It is using helicopter gunships, tanks and Bradley fighting vehicles, as well as an occasional jet strike, unleashing 500-pound bombs and satellite-guided rockets.

One high-ranking commander described it as a "no-holds barred" operation. The targets are suspected hideaways, command centers and safe houses of the elusive guerrillas, U.S. officials said.

"We have to use these capabilities to take that fight to the enemy, and why not?" said Maj. Gen. Charles H. Swannack Jr., the commander of the 82nd Airborne Division, which patrols western Iraq. "That's why we use them. They are the right systems."

For all the heavy and sophisticated armaments, the targets in Hawijat al-Ali, a rural hamlet near Tikrit, are small-scale. The houses are single-story structures set within walled rose gardens.

"We were surprised by all the big shooting," said Kafi Khalaf, Ibrahim's wife. "They spent a lot to get rid of our houses."

U.S. military officials say the show of force is a necessary response to escalating attacks in central Iraq. Maj. Gordon Tate, a spokesman for the 4th Infantry Division in Tikrit, said the offensive, which began Oct. 1, picked up steam after Nov. 2, when guerrillas shot down a U.S. CH-47 Chinook transport helicopter near the western town of Fallujah, killing 16 soldiers. Rocket and artillery operations replaced search-and-seizure raids that characterized U.S. military activity in the summer and early fall.

"We are sending a message. We are showing we are here," Tate said. Among the