

Post-invasion Iraq / United States should fight more ruthlessly

< Post-invasion Iraq

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 fight more ruthlessly

This position addresses the topic Post-invasion Iraq.

For this position

“ We must kill - not capture - Muqtada, then kill every gunman who comes out in the streets to avenge him. Our policy of all-carrots-no-sticks has failed miserably. We delivered Iraq to zealots, gangsters and terrorists. Now our only hope is to prove that we mean business - that the era of peace, love and wasting American lives is over.” ”

From Kill Muqtada Now, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, October 26, 2006) (view)

“ Someone, please explain something to me: How does it follow that, because Islamic cultures reject democracy, we somehow need to talk to Iran and Syria? What earthly logic that supports talking with these Islamic terrorists would not also support negotiating with al Qaeda — a demarche not even a Kennedy School grad would dare propose? There's none.” ”

From Can We Talk?, by Andrew C. McCarthy (*National Review*, November 29, 2006) (view)

“ Why then, when the numerical disparities are so much more favorable to our cause than during the Vietnam War, are we, rather than our vastly outnumbered enemies, lamenting the paucity of troops? That we have not secured the country may be due to the limitations put on our soldiers rather than their number; and to our preference for conventional rather than counter-insurgency fighting.” ”

From The Fighting Over the Fighting, by Victor Davis Hanson (*National Review*, November 17, 2006) (view)

“ We're blind to the fundamental moral travesty in Iraq (and elsewhere): Spare the killers in the name of human rights, and you deprive the overwhelming majority of the population of their human rights. Instead of being proud of ourselves for our "moral superiority," we should be ashamed to the depths of our souls. We're not really the enemy of the terrorists, militiamen and insurgents. We're their enablers.” ”

From Arabian Nightmares, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, November 15, 2006) (view)

“ “At present, we let those other considerations rule our behavior: We overreact to media sensationalism (which our enemies exploit brilliantly); we torment ourselves over the least mistakes our troops make; we delude ourselves that mass murderers have rights; we take prisoners knowing they'll be freed to kill more Americans - and the politicians and Green Zone generals alike pretend that "it's not whether you win or lose, it's how you play the game."”

From *Why Iraq's So Hard*, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, May 14, 2007) (view)

“ “The standard response from the campus commandos is that, if we descend to the level of our enemy's behavior, we'll become as bad as them. That's crap. In World War II, we didn't exactly coddle the residents of Hamburg and Dresden, Tokyo and Hiroshima. American soldiers can do what must be done without losing their virtues as citizens (most critics don't even know any soldiers personally). ”

From *Baghdad Blues*, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, May 11, 2007) (view)

“ “Lashed by lawyers, timid generals are better suited to fight for funding on Capitol Hill than to defeat our nation's enemies in the field. They're show-dogs that don't hunt. Despite all the shimmering technology we've bought, our military leaders remain trapped in 20th-century thinking - while the terrorists, for all their invocations of the past, are clear-eyed about what it takes to win in the 21st century.”

From *Out-thought by the enemy*, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, June 1, 2007) (view)

“ “We helped make this mess. Instead of relentlessly destroying terrorists and insurgents, we tried to wage war gently to please the media. We always let the bad guys off the ropes - and apologized when they showed the press their rope burns. We passed up repeated chances to kill Moqtada al-Sadr and break his Mahdi Army militia. We did what was easiest in the short term, not what was essential for the long term.”

From *Back To Baghdad*, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, July 28, 2006) (view)

“ “Regaining control of Baghdad - after we threw it away - will require the defiant use of force. Negotiations won't do it. Cultural awareness isn't going to turn this situation around (we need to stop pandering to our enemies and defeat them, thanks).”

From *King David Returns*, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, January 5, 2007) (view)

“ “Military success on the ground now demands that we expand the rules of engagement to allow our troops to shoot more of the jihadists, disarm the militias, train even more Iraqi troops to take over security more quickly, and seal the Syrian and Iranian borders.”

From *Just call it the war of endurance*, by Victor Davis Hanson (*Chicago Tribune*, January 5, 2007) (view)

“ “To a soldier, the most encouraging thing the president said last night was that there had been "too many restrictions" on our troops in the past. Rules of engagement must be loosened. We have to stop playing Barney Fife and fight.”

From *W's Last Chance*, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, January 11, 2007) (view)

“ "What Mookie's hasty hejira to Hamadan tells us is that our fanatical enemies, Sunni and Shia, face a leadership crisis. The dons of terror are afraid. If we can't take advantage of that, shame on us. "

From Mook's Spooked, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, February 15, 2007) (view)

“ "But the Iraqis can't "step up to the plate," and they can't "pull up their socks." The plan envisioned that they could do so whenever they chose. The plan said their political progress would be the way for them to reach the plate and reach their socks. The plan failed."

From The Truth on Iraq, by John Podhoretz (*New York Post*, December 5, 2006) (view)

“ "One thing's clear: If we can't enforce security, nothing else matters. So the wisest course of action seems obvious - except to the Washington establishment: Return to a wartime footing. Focus exclusively on security. Concentrate on doing one thing well. Freeze all reconstruction and aid projects. Halt every program and close every office that doesn't contribute directly to pacifying Iraq. "

From Strip For Action, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, December 27, 2006) (view)

“ "We've never been willing to do all it takes to win. Now the clock's running out. Without a comprehensive crackdown, Baghdad (and Iraq) will be lost irrevocably in 2007. If we stayed on for a decade, we'd only be keeping the patient on life-support."

From Fighting to Win, by Ralph Peters (*New York Post*, December 18, 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_fight_more_ruthlessly&oldid=4697"

This page was last edited on March 11, 2007, at 19:37.

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