

# Post-invasion Iraq / United States should change its approach

---

< Post-invasion Iraq This is the approved revision of this page, as well as being the most recent.

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.

## Position: United States should change its approach

*This position addresses the topic Post-invasion Iraq.*

For this position

“ While consolidating bases is a short-term way to reduce troop requirements, fielding more adviser teams will eventually allow more Americans to come home. American troops embedded with the Iraqis they train usually require less support than conventional units; many rely on the Iraqis for food, shelter and basic defenses. Green Berets in 12-man teams have already replaced entire battalions of conventional forces in some Iraqi cities.”

From *The Right Troops in the Right Places*, by Seth Moulton (*The New York Times*, September 15, 2006) ([view](#))

“ The U.S. military has never set itself the goal of establishing and maintaining security. It has always prioritized training Iraqi forces and allowing them to undertake such operations on their own. This strategy might have had some merit when the principal problem in Iraq was the Sunni Arab insurgency (although it was dubious even then). It has little or no merit today, when sectarian violence is the most important challenge.”

From *We Can Put More Forces in Iraq...*, by Frederick W. Kagan (*The Weekly Standard*, November 23, 2006) ([view](#))

“ Still, the Bush administration has 29 months left in office. “Staying the course” is unsustainable. Rather than forcing a new administration to figure a way out of Iraq, it ought to begin the rethinking now.”

From *The generals' worry*, by The Boston Globe editorial board (*The Boston Globe*, August 5, 2006) ([view](#))

“ The majority of Iraqis may be irritated by the presence of foreign forces, but most realize that a premature withdrawal would create hideous problems for the country. This majority includes Sunnis as well as Shiites and Kurds.”

From *What Iraq Needs*, by Samir Sumaidaie (*New York Post*, August 28, 2006) ([view](#))

“ "At best, the course we're on has no end in sight. At worst, it leads to a terrible civil war and possibly a regional war. This plan offers a way to bring our troops home, protect our security interests and preserve Iraq as a unified country." ”

From A Plan to Hold Iraq Together, by Joe Biden (*The Washington Post*, August 24, 2006) (view)

“ "As Americans debate where to go from here on Iraq, one thing should be clear. Staying the course until President Bush leaves office 29 months from now is not an option. It is no longer even clear just what course America is on." ”

From Meanwhile, in Baghdad, by The New York Times editorial board (*The New York Times*, August 16, 2006) (view)

“ "...the violence in Iraq has belied the rhetoric of progress and prevented any reduction in troops. Bush would be much better served by forthrightly acknowledging Iraq's distressing circumstances and backing an all-out push to secure Baghdad even if it takes thousands more American troops in the country." ”

From Bush's Vietnam?, by Rich Lowry (*National Review*, August 15, 2006) (view)

## Against this position

---

*No results*

## Mixed on this position

---

*No results*

---

Retrieved from

"[https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Post-invasion\\_Iraq/\\_United\\_States\\_should\\_change\\_its\\_approach&oldid=4715](https://discoursedb.org/w/index.php?title=Post-invasion_Iraq/_United_States_should_change_its_approach&oldid=4715)"

---

**This page was last edited on March 11, 2007, at 19:44.**

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