

“Civil War” Doesn't Mean It's Over

The printable version is no longer supported and may have rendering errors. Please update your browser bookmarks and please use the default browser print function instead.

This is an opinion item.

Author(s) Jonah Goldberg

Source National Review

Date May 18, 2007

URL <http://article.nationalreview.com/?q=ZjhmODg1MWEwYjNiNzhIMmRkYzI1OWNkMzFmYmQzMdk=>

Quote

“Surely it can't be a moral argument. Every liberal foreign policy do-gooder in Christendom wants America to interject itself in the Sudanese civil war unfolding so horrifically in Darfur. The high-water mark in post-Vietnam liberal foreign policy was Bill Clinton's intervention in the Yugoslavian civil war. If we can violate the prime directive of no civil wars for Darfur and Kosovo, why not for Kirkuk and Basra?”

”

Add or change this opinion item's references

This item argues against the position Coalition troops should pull out on the topic Post-invasion Iraq.

Retrieved from

"https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=“Civil_War”_Doesn%27t_Mean_It's_Over&oldid=5809"

This page was last edited on May 18, 2007, at 17:14.

All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License.