

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

Chapter 1 : Sheehan's Alabama Visit Inflames Passions

9/11 and the invasion of Iraq -- Jason Richardson, Navy: a nuke on the USS Truman -- Nathan Hollway, Air Force: air support in Qatar -- Arthur Schoenfeld, Skip to main content Search the history of over billion web pages on the Internet.

Is his approach a significant change of course? We leave that to others to chew over. What we can say is that he was right on the facts he cited, although there were some notable omissions. Similarly, we found the rebuttal by Sen. Desire To Live In Peace? A big orange warning flag should go up over the accuracy of any polls of a population caught in the middle of a war. That said, the available polling data supports this claim. Only 13 percent agreed or strongly agreed, while 66 percent strongly disagreed. In addition, the summary of a 1, person poll in Sept. A large majority sees the current government as the legitimate representative of the Iraqi people. Iraq will pass legislation to share oil revenues among all Iraqis. By December , it was 2. Economic development is hobbled by insecurity, corruption, lack of investment, dilapidated infrastructure and uncertainty. In July , the U. Many professionals who worked in the government in the days of Saddam Hussein were purged because of their Baath Party ties in the weeks and months after Hussein was ousted. Al Qaeda has helped make Anbar the most violent area of Iraq outside the capital. It is fair to say that al Qaeda is still active in Iraq, even though its leader in the country, Abu Masab al Zarqawi, was killed by U. Operation Enduring Freedom, the U. Iran is providing material support for attacks on American troops. It is widely accepted that Iran, either directly or indirectly, has been involved in aiding militia groups fighting U. But the degree to which this is known and endorsed by the government of Iran is uncertain. Escalation of this war is not the change the American people called for in the last election. But 55 percent said they favored withdrawing some or all U. Democrats were far more likely than Republicans to favor withdrawal, and the few who favored a troop increase were Republican by three to one. The poll was taken in the days just before Bush spoke, and has a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percent, according to AP. The partisan split continues: Ignoring Advice of Generals? In ordering more troops to Iraq, the president is ignoring the strong advice of most of his own top generals. True, Abizaid said that at a Nov. Bush announced a few days ago he was replacing Abizaid as head of the Central Command, at the same time that he replaced Gen. George Casey as the top commander in Iraq. General Casey and his commanders came forward and asked for additional forces. They asked for additional forces for Baghdad, and they asked for additional forces for al-Anbar. Bush is glossing over some inconvenient facts, and so are his critics. Linzer, Dafna, and Ricks, Thomas E. The Iraq Study Group Report.

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

Chapter 2 : List of United States Marines - Wikipedia

Andre Queiroga, Marine Corps: president Bush's plan for Iraq Richard Riley, Army National Guard: destroying Iraq Pablo Rodriguez, Air Force Reserve: guarding Baghdad airport.

Foreign Policy George W. But do leaders learn from the mistakes of others? What America and China Can Learn look at eight examples of blunders -- and four cases where blunders were not made -- with the aim of warning leaders away from future blunders of their own. States like [Iraq, Iran, and North Korea] and their terrorist allies constitute an axis of evil. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. I will not wait on events while dangers gather. Bush, State of the Union, January 29, For us, war is always the proof of failure and the worst of solutions, so everything must be done to avoid it. There was a case to be made on several grounds for operations against Saddam Hussein. The initial phase of combat was highly successful, and some still argue that the American investment was worth the cost of toppling the Saddam regime. Bush was reelected in November of as much because of as despite his invasion of Iraq. The main premise for the war was that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction WMDs and that these were at risk of falling into the hands of terrorists. This robbed the invasion of legitimacy. The insurgency that ensued after initial combat operation robbed the invasion of success. Today, the United States has less influence in Baghdad than Iran does. Iraq is a Shia-dominated state with an alienated Sunni minority, rampant violence and virtually no control over the Kurdish north. At least , Iraqis died as a direct result of the American invasion, and the violence there continues. Violent Salafists from Syria and elsewhere have swept through the Sunni areas of Iraq, routing the Iraqi army, seizing important cities and declaring an Islamist caliphate. There were no U. The Kurds have taken the oil-rich contested city of Kirkuk and hinted at the possibility of separating from the Iraqi state. The United States has been compelled to send military advisors back to Iraq, and it may no longer have enough influence with any of the parties or in Baghdad to preserve a unified state. Meanwhile, the Afghan conflict was neglected for half a decade. Allied trust in America was eroded, and attitudes about the United States in the Muslim world were poisoned. Some 4, American service personnel were killed and more than thirty thousand wounded. Largely because of Iraq, the U. During the s, the United States would have preferred regime change in Baghdad, but it settled for containment. The Gulf War ended after one hundred hours of combat with Saddam still in power. Afterward, President George H. When the George W. Bush administration entered office, its initial focus was on China and military transformation. CIA threat briefings concentrated on al Qaeda, not Iraq,⁸ though efforts to have the new administration deal with al Qaeda failed. Well before the September 11 attacks, officials at the Pentagon, led by Deputy Secretary Paul Wolfowitz, quietly began to consider military options against Saddam. Deputy National Security Advisor Stephen Hadley developed a policy of phased pressure on Iraq, which included ratcheting up many of the measures used by the Clinton administration, such as sanctions, weapons inspectors, and aid to the opposition. It became clear that this was not the case, as Bush finally revealed,¹² but for many this connection stuck. The first order of business was to destroy al Qaeda in Afghanistan, but the case against Iraq moved rapidly to the front burner. Bush indicated that as soon as the Taliban were driven from Afghanistan, he would turn his attention to Saddam. The case for invasion resembled a layer cake. At the base was the acute sense of imminent national danger caused by the September 11 attacks. A rogue regime with WMDs and ties to terrorists aroused fear of a much more devastating attack on the U. Saddam had shown himself for the ruthless villain he was. He had used chemical weapons against his own people and against Iranian troops in the s. He had invaded Kuwait and started a bloody war against Iran. He perpetually threatened Israel. He refused to implement at least ten UN Security Council resolutions aimed at ending his WMD programs and had expelled weapons inspectors in This sense of immediate and extreme danger was amplified in the wake of the September 11 attacks by two other events that cemented the link between WMDs and terrorism. Soon after September 11, anthrax spores were mailed to the U. Congress and others, killing five people. Intelligence

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

reports indicated, wrongly it turned out, that Saddam had weaponized anthrax, although he was not suspected of initiating these particular attacks. If the US could change the regime in Baghdad, it might create a new model of democracy in the Middle East. In considering war on Iraq, the sibling of danger was opportunity. They had seen efforts at regime change work when the United States invaded Panama to topple Manuel Noriega in , when Eastern Europeans cast communism aside that same year, when the Soviet Union itself collapsed in , and when the Bulldozer Revolution toppled the Serbian strongman Slobodan Milosevic in the wake of the Kosovo War. Emboldened by these successes, this group now saw the opportunity to press for forcible regime change in Iraq. Meanwhile, there was growing recognition that U. The United States had developed new military technologies and tactics that Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld championed as defense transformation. These included data networking, accurate and voluminous intelligence, instantaneous command and control, and precision strike. By contrast, the Iraqi military had suffered contractions of 35 percent in its army and 60 percent in its air force since before Desert Storm. The thinking went that if the United States could change the regime in Baghdad, it might create a new model of democracy in the Middle East. After all, democracy was on the rise globally in what the political scientist Samuel Huntington called the Third Wave. Just as it was flourishing throughout Eastern Europe and Latin America, it could take hold in Iraq and serve as a model for the Arab world. In addition, a new regime in Iraq would allow the United States to remove its troops from Saudi Arabia, where they fueled extremism, and to have another friendly source of oil. The United States had been waging a low-grade undeclared war against Saddam since Desert Storm ended as part of its containment strategy. Air Force flew daily missions over 60 percent of Iraqi territory and was often fired upon, though never hit. France and Russia were not cooperating with international sanctions and funds were being diverted by Saddam from the Oil-for-Food Programme to buy arms. In January the CIA presented Vice President Dick Cheney with an assessment that Saddam had created a nearly perfect security apparatus that made the prospects of a successful coup nearly impossible. Saddam had earlier tried to have assassins attack his father while on a Middle East trip. Finally, after September 11, forcing a regime change in Baghdad made good political sense for the Republicans. The attack on Afghanistan had bipartisan and international support. But the administration needed to be seen as doing more in its declared global war on terror. From this logic developed a new national security doctrine of preemptive war. Bush made the case for this during a June speech at West Point, arguing that the United States could not rely on Cold War concepts such as deterrence and containment to deal with terrorists who are willing to commit suicide for their cause. Neither could it afford to wait for a rogue regime to transfer WMDs to others or gain a decisive capability to harm the United States. It had a responsibility to preempt if necessary. The overlap between states that sponsor terror and those that pursue WMD compels us to action. This concept, born of danger and opportunity, was deeply flawed. The preemption doctrine lacked international legitimacy and undermined international trust in the United States. And yet this flawed concept drove the Bush administration to an early and uncoordinated decision for war, brushing aside the need for analysis, distorting intelligence, marginalizing senior officers who raised doubts and neglecting postconflict stabilization requirements. Even before the inauguration, Cheney asked outgoing Secretary of Defense William Cohen to provide Bush with a briefing focused on Iraq. With little intelligence to support this assertion, the administration continued to repeat that claim. Some saw it as part of a two-track effort to rid Saddam of his WMDs by using diplomacy and military threats to give diplomacy teeth. But within the next six months, the cement began to dry. In March of , Bush informally told a group of senators: Bureaucratically they formed the leading position within the Bush administration in , with Cheney dominating the White House and Rumsfeld and Wolfowitz controlling Defense. Bush administration; but according to Brent Scowcroft, he had changed. Cheney had daily contact with Bush and was his closest advisor on national security matters. The doves were anything but s tie-dyed peaceniks. Wolfowitz gave Chalabi access and Chalabi provided intelligence that turned out to be of highly questionable veracity. They were generally influential pragmatic leaders who were not in the administration. He also felt that those pushing for war had no idea that the war might last ten years. But in the fall of , the Joint Chiefs cut off any further debate about

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

the wisdom of an invasion. The diplomats tended to see the same problems that the doves saw, but many were serving in the State Department or wanted to preserve their standing with the administration. Once it became clear that Bush was on a track to war, they sought to find a diplomatic exit or, failing that, to garner international support and create legitimacy for an invasion. Powell hoped that a UN resolution might force Saddam to back down from his intransigence on WMD inspections—which it in fact did. Bush did not back down from his decision to proceed toward war, but he did agree to give a UN resolution a try. The diplomats may have delayed the invasion by half a year by seeking UN authorization, but once a modest UN resolution was achieved, they lost the ability to prevent war. Foreign leaders also lined up as hawks and doves. The most important hawk was Blair, who was weary of letting a gap open with American policy. Getting the international consensus Powell wanted would not be easy. Bush was quick to reach decisions, and, once reached, he saw change as a sign of weakness. Her primary interest was protecting the President and translating his wishes into policy. But she did not develop the decision-making process needed to analyze and debate the wisdom and implications of going to war.

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

Chapter 3 : Surviving Iraq : soldiers' stories - East Baton Rouge Parish Library

Surviving Iraq Soldiers' Stories (Book): Tripp, Elise Forbes [Skip to main navigation](#) [Skip to main navigation](#) [Skip to search](#) [Skip to search](#) [Skip to content](#) [Help](#) [Help](#), opens a new window.

October 15, 6: Some expressions are associated with strategies used at the time, others convey a sense of place, a method of warfare, or a political view but they all contain some essence of the conflict. Words such as "trenches," "blitzkrieg," "search and destroy," "domino theory," and "quagmire" evoke strong images of the wars they represent and, while it will take many years for our most recent conflicts to shift to this realm of remembrance, a few phrases are already taking hold. Who can forget the opening rhetorical rounds of "shock and awe," the struggle to define the wars as "insurgencies," the great hope of the Iraq and Afghanistan "surges," and the solid logic of "clear, hold, and build. As Nagl chronicles in his invaluable memoir of service, *Knife Fights*: His memoir is also a cautionary tale of how the U. Army became an "un-learning" institution, "over-learning" the lessons from Vietnam that were most convenient to its bureaucratic interests and "under-learning" those lessons most central to victory in this type of warfare. However, before Nagl could help the U. Army become a learning institution, he first had to receive his own education in war. In many ways, it was not just a defeat for the Iraqis, but the death knell for a type of warfare that had characterized much of U. However much conventional nation-state wars on the scale of World War I and II had come to characterize "modern warfare," small-scale conflicts continued to persist, even in the age of nuclear bombs, strategic bombers, and MIA1 tanks. These types of wars, such as insurgency, had been a permanent condition of human conflict well before the birth of the nation-state at the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. Thus, while the United States celebrated its victory in parades down Madison Avenue in New York City â€” having applied the lessons it wanted to learn in Vietnam, such as applying overwhelming force, having a clear exit strategy, and gaining broad support from the American people â€” it reflected a selective learning, one more convenient to its institutional interests. Having successfully participated in his war, Nagl set out to expand the education he had received at West Point, building on his Masters degree from Oxford earned as a Rhodes Scholar to complete his doctoral studies in the United Kingdom. It was an education that would prove decisive to his career, the U. While the British were able to successfully defeat the insurgents, the U. While Nagl addressed the various differences in the respective counter-insurgency campaigns, different terrain, demographics, histories, etc, his central insight was that the U. In many respects, it had initially fought the war in a conventional manner utilizing "sweep and clear" and "search and destroy" operations in support of an attrition-based strategy seeking to defeat the enemy through imposing significant losses on its military. Creighton Abrams using a holistic, whole-of-government approach that fought the communist insurgency as well as its main force conventional units, it took many years for this to take place â€” years where countless lives were lost for a strategy that could not win. Over the course of his year tour, he would receive a brutal education in the difficulties of fighting an insurgency and would learn first-hand the challenges of putting counter-insurgency theory into practice. He quickly learned that constant clearing operations using outside forces against the insurgents was not a path to victory in Iraq, since it inevitably left the civilian population unprotected from reprisals and intimidation from the insurgents once the force departed. Additionally, absent an indigenous security partner, U. Nagl also discovered that U. Army units designed and organized to fight conventional wars had to quickly change their conception of the conflict, how they measured effectiveness, and were organized to be successful. Nagl was learning firsthand that deployed military units had to adapt quickly and constantly in an insurgency environment. However, even as he struggled to shape his own unit, the institution of the U. Army adjusted much more slowly. As Nagl internalized these lessons in Iraq, a reporter for *The New York Times Magazine* heard about his dissertation on insurgency, which he would subsequently publish as a book titled *How to Eat Soup with a Knife: Counterinsurgency Lessons from Malaya and Vietnam*, which would change his professional direction. The subsequent cover article brought Nagl to the

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

attention of key decision-makers at the Pentagon and he quickly found himself serving as a military assistant to Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz. Nagl would use his new position to launch his very own insurgency in Washington, D. C. By 2003, it was clear that the war in Iraq was not going well, but a shortage of ideas about which direction to go paralyzed decision-makers at the Pentagon and at the White House. Many military leaders at the time viewed the U. S. Other military commanders felt that an increase in U. S. In late 2003, following the departure of Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld, who had long opposed using the word insurgency to describe the conflict, a new energy was brought to the conflict with the arrival of Secretary Robert M. Additionally, with the capture of the U. S. Congress by the Democratic party, due, in part, to the problems in the war in Iraq, President Bush became more directly involved in shaping the course of a new strategy. Within this maelstrom of ideas, Nagl readily contributed his perspective and he was increasingly sought after to share his views on the war. As attention turned to a new way forward for the war in the Iraq, Nagl was selected by Gen. Petraeus to participate in the drafting of a new counter-insurgency manual to provide greater direction to U. S. Army forces as they adjusted to the counter-insurgency reality of the conflict. The manual they produced, *The U. S. Army Counterinsurgency Manual*. Instead of relying exclusively on military clearing operations and direct action raids against insurgents, operations were now nested within the matrix of "clear, hold, build. Instead of pulling back to large bases, U. S. The fact that he had missed them due to pursuit of his Ph. D. In 2004, Nagl retired from the U. S. The think tank had been founded by former Clinton Administration officials who sought to provide not only a different perspective on how to fight insurgencies, as well as on a broad array of other defense policy issues, but to prepare a government-in-waiting if the Democratic Party were to win the presidential election in 2004. While he would remain separate from the administration, Nagl was appointed to the Defense Policy Board, an in-house group of advisors to the Secretary of Defense, and he would actively participate in administration deliberations about the way forward in Afghanistan. Naval Academy and then became headmaster of a private boys school in Pennsylvania. Army a "learning institution," wherein it is able to not only understand the nature of the insurgency threat but make the necessary adjustments to its strategy and how it is organized to properly deal with the challenge. However, an interesting implication of his views is why did the U. S. Army become an "unlearning" institution, setting aside the lessons of Vietnam? When Nagl examines the decisions surrounding the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, he excoriates Bush and Rumsfeld, but is not equally outraged at the professional shortcomings of Generals Franks and Shinseki, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Richard Myers. Where military leaders are lauded for their successes, their shortcomings are due to poor civilian leadership. While Nagl did contribute to an article by then U. S. Army Lieutenant Colonel Paul Yingling titled "A Failure in Generalship," which argued that general officers, as a group, had failed to anticipate the Iraq insurgency and that they needed to be overhauled, it misses crucial linkages between civil and military authorities that allowed this to take place. A broader perspective needs to be adopted when examining these disparate outcomes. There are several reasons the U. S. Army set aside the lessons it had learned from Vietnam and why modern civil-military relations have complicated war planning. Army, the early death of U. S. Army Chief of Staff Creighton Abrams in 1972, the commander who had turned around the Vietnam War, robbed the institution of his leadership, largely preventing it from learning from his experiences. The fact too, that he was thus unable to write his memoirs contributed to a mis-remembering of the war that emphasized conventional war themes versus a holistic approach. The second contributing factor was the separate institutional development of the U. S. These "fugitives from discipline," as one U. S. Army chief of staff referred to them, were a necessary irritant to conventional thinking but were not actively included in army thinking or leadership following the war. Third, there is no real domestic political constituency for irregular warfare. Conventional military approaches are well funded and reach directly into the political constituencies of members of Congress, and so even lessons that are learned are not defended on Capitol Hill. Fourth, the switch to an all-volunteer force, versus a draft, removed the systematic exposure of the U. S. Army to unconventional thinkers who also brought an array of civilian perspectives. Fifth, the removal in 1987 of the Joint Chiefs of Staff from the chain of command by the Defense Department Reorganization Act of 1986 removed a crucial link between the

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

fielded force to uniformed leadership in Washington, D. Through the struggle over roles and missions between the services and separate perspectives on how to conduct war, the initial draft of a war plan is greatly improved – a process which would have helped the initial Iraq and Afghanistan war strategies immensely. Another benefit of having the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the chain of command is that it not only protects the military from the political machinations of an administration but protects the administration as well by providing it with the political cover it would need to transition a war plan mid-conflict. These and other factors help to explain how the U. Army became an "unlearning" institution and why, however effective civilian leaders may be at waging war, they are never experts and require not just the sound advice of the uniformed military, but its leadership as well. He is a former Bush administration political appointee working at the U. Department of Defense , and at the U. Department of State He earned his Ph. The Anbar Awakening and the Struggle with al-Qaeda.

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

Chapter 4 : The Federalist: WAR - Marines in the front lines of Iraq War

Surviving Iraq by Elise Forbes Tripp, , Olive Branch Press edition, in English - 1st ed.

Story Continued Below Ridiculous? Moulton has three degrees from Harvard, and he did four difficult, decorated tours as a Marine in Iraq. They dismiss Moulton, albeit never for attribution, as gratingly ambitious, a grandstanding backbencher who has advocated for the ouster of House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi to make way for new, younger standard-bearers like himself. Some of the opinions on Capitol Hill are even more scathing. They see somebody who could chip away at the intractable ideological conflict that is crippling this country and appeal to the sorts of voters who have turned away from the party. What excites his supporters the most is what Moulton did before he got to Washington—the four tours in Iraq over parts of five years, the two medals of valor, the special counterinsurgency team he served on that reported directly to Petraeus. In Moulton, they see the antithesis of Trump—a recipient of five Vietnam War draft deferments, considered by many to be the least service-oriented president ever. Stanley McChrystal left endorsed Rep. Part patriot and part rebel, Moulton in Iraq was committed to the war and also overtly critical of the way it was being waged of the administration and the Congress that put him and his Marines there. And the more he fought, the bolder he got. Or the only guy willing to do it. He has made himself the torchbearer of a crop of Democrats who are veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and are ramping up to run for Congress in , from New York to North Carolina, Texas to California. He recently got engaged to be married, and he proposed on the balcony of the office of Republican Paul Ryan, speaker of the House. The wedding is this fall, and the plan is to have on the guest list an even number of Republicans and Democrats from Congress. Above, Moulton is pictured on deployment in Iraq, then serving as an officer in the U. Talking to people who know him, though, the conversations are different. Gergen likened Moulton to a young John F. Based on discussions he had with Moulton over the course of years, Ferguson told me, Moulton has his eyes on the Oval Office. The only question is when he will run. He challenged a nine-term incumbent. He ran against not only John Tierney—a reliably liberal vote for nearly 20 years, known as a workhorse, not a show horse—but essentially the leadership of the Democratic Party. In March , internal polling showed Moulton trailing Tierney by 54 points. That summer, though, with the primary some 60 days out, the outcome of his efforts was still very much in doubt. To win the trust of its constituents, and then their votes, Moulton in acted as a kind of insurgent—cobbling together endorsements from lower-wattage local mayors, city councilors and area activists, presenting as a new voice and a fresh face. The pitch was generational more than political. He leaned on persona more than policies. But I know all veterans have it. You can unsubscribe at any time. Gergen met Moulton when Moulton was a senior at Harvard. But if there is a bigger fear, it is the tendency of leaders of the political establishment, for all its talk about change, to cling to the status quo, giving too little help and encouragement to these young candidates trying to break through. For Moulton, though, he headlined a gathering at the Peabody Elks Lodge. Tellingly, too, people thought Moulton had the better chance of winning in the general election against the waiting Republican, Richard Tisei, a moderate who had come surprisingly close to beating Tierney two years before. In the end, Moulton trounced Tierney by nearly 11 points. The victory party was at the VFW in Salem. Veterans staffed a cash bar. The animus that exists between Moulton and powerful quarters of the Democratic Party today dates back to this initial race. And the most important reason is that the American people are suffering because Democrats are not in power. We need to start winning again as Democrats. And maybe the attacks against her by the Republicans are unfair. I think it is. And the American people out there are demanding a change. Getty Images Moulton loyalists bristle when asked about this tension. He brought new donors to the fight. The Tisei campaign had been preparing to run against Tierney—with some of the staff hoping to run against Tierney. Moulton was, they thought, a rough-edged rookie, an oddly ill-at-ease physical presence and an uninspiring orator. He could be gruff. He had a lot to learn. But they suspected he could overcome all of this with his extraordinary biography. Moulton

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

was the archetype of the scholar-soldier journalists love—educated, articulate, equally at home in the home of a tribal leader or an Ivy League lecture hall. NPR reporters had located him repeatedly in Iraq. In congressional testimony, meanwhile, military brass had talked about Moulton reverentially. In the campaign, only Phaneuf knew about the medals. He sat down for lunch and ordered a milk. Now he just has it with every meal if he can. The oldest of three children of a real estate lawyer and a hospital secretary—staunch liberals who protested the Vietnam War as students at Brown University—Moulton as a boy watched a Marine land a helicopter in the field where he played soccer. He wired his house to create an intercom system through which he could talk from his bedroom to his parents downstairs and later built from scratch a sprinkler system in their yard. She was 7 years old. At Andover, where the motto is non sibi, or not for self, Moulton was one of two sports editors for the weekly student newspaper, the Phillipian. He was respected for that, but some found it irksome at times. Moulton was the captain of the varsity crew team and sat in the stroke seat for three years. In the Andover yearbook, he picked a Shakespeare quote: He and his brother and sister went to both kinds of churches growing up. Bush, preached humility, hope and grace—and, above all else, service. And he committed to memory the quote from former Harvard President Abbott Lawrence Lowell that wraps around the walls in the foyer: His parents did not approve. Truths That Last in Times of Need. What have I done to give back? He considered teaching abroad. The first time he went to Iraq in early , he was at 24 years old the commander of the 2nd Platoon of Alpha Company, 1st Battalion, 4th Marines, fighting north from the Kuwait border. That April, in Baghdad, according to military records I reviewed, he rushed to the aid of one of his men who was critically wounded by friendly artillery fire—despite a threat of another barrage directed at the same target. This is what he won the Navy and Marine Corps Commendation medal for. The second time he went to Iraq, he led his platoon and allied Iraqi soldiers in the Battle of Najaf against the Mahdi militia of radical Shiite cleric Muqtada al-Sadr. For 22 days in August , in fierce urban combat, and with little sleep, water or food, and in temperatures that reached degrees, according to military records, Moulton coordinated tank attacks, counter-sniper operations and perilous fighting in a cemetery swarming with machine-gunning, mortar-firing insurgents. From there, his platoon continued into the city, besieging a Mahdi-controlled shrine and buildings in which militants rolled grenades and sprayed bullets down stairs. This is what he won the Bronze Star for. You have to try to get them on your side. And he did that all the time. Above, Moulton is photographed on deployment in Najaf, Iraq. And Seth just blew right through them. While supporting the mission, he criticized the methods. By late August , toward the end of the Battle of Najaf, he hinted at his dissatisfaction in an interview with a radio reporter. Back in the U. He criticized the lack of planning and foresight of the politicians who used their power to put him there. Ferguson gave him the last word of the film. The screen went black. The premiere of No End in Sight was at the Sundance festival in Park City, Utah, where a mostly liberal crowd of some 1, gave it a standing ovation. Ferguson walked to the front of the auditorium. He introduced the people from the film who were present. He was working as the managing director of the Texas Central Railway, trying to develop high-speed rail between Dallas and Houston, when Gergen mentioned him at a donor breakfast in Boston, and Cherniack and Ferson were there, and they were intrigued and called him and urged him to move back and run for Congress—and that this was the first time he had considered the idea. And in early , Moulton and Lemons and some other Marines were making frozen hamburgers on the roof of their barracks in southern Iraq, talking about exit plans. Moulton was going back to Harvard, pursuing graduate degrees at the business school and the Kennedy School of Government. After that, though, he might run for Congress, he said. I could see you doing this. We were in the back seat of a Honda Accord. A staffer was driving him from Salem to Ipswich for a roundtable with local business executives. Before Moulton and the other aspiring Marine officers ran through mud and up and down hills with a long, heavy log on their shoulders, the platoon commander asked them about the first rule of this exercise. And the only objective was accomplishing the mission. Vice President Joe Biden left and Moulton shake hands. It should be doing the right thing for the country.

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

Chapter 5 : Bush's Iraq Speech - www.nxgvision.com

9/11 and the invasion of Iraq --Jason Richardson, Navy: a "nuke" on the USS Truman --Nathan Hollway, Air Force: air support in Qatar --Arthur Schoenfeld, Marine Corps: the invasion of Iraq --Andre Queiroga, Marine Corps: president Bush's plan for Iraq --Richard Riley, Army National Guard: destroying Iraq --Pablo Rodriguez, Air Force.

A group of about 30 protesters gathered that evening in Old Cloverdale across the street from the Capri Theatre in support of a rally led by anti-war activist Cindy Sheehan. We need to come where we can make the biggest impact. Mitchell looked on from a distance with his arms folded. He served in the Marine Corps from to Sheehan is making a mockery of men and women like him who served, he said. Plus, he has been spying on the American public, she accused. Sheehan has vowed to run against U. Sheehan said she would run as an independent if the time comes. She wanted to ask Bush directly why her son died in what she felt was a senseless war. The president never came outside to speak with her, but two years later she is still looking for that answer. After listening to Sheehan, Mitchell questioned her true intent. Many hands went into the air. Moments later a man wearing a tall hat adorned with an image of the American flag drove by in a convertible Volkswagen and honked his horn. This is the world we live in. This is the world we cover. Because of people like you, another world is possible. There are many battles to be won, but we will battle them togetherâ€”all of us. Common Dreams is not your normal news site. We want the world to be a better place. If you can help todayâ€”because every gift of every size mattersâ€”please do.

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

Chapter 6 : Surviving Iraq (edition) | Open Library

Summary. President Bush's sobering address to the nation laid out his plan to rescue Iraq by sending in more troops at a time when polls show the American people want just the opposite.

Tonight in Iraq, the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged in a struggle that will determine the direction of the global war on terror and our safety here at home. When I addressed you just over a year ago, nearly 12 million Iraqis had cast their ballots for a unified and democratic nation. The elections were a stunning achievement. We thought that these elections would bring the Iraqis together, and that as we trained Iraqi security forces, we could accomplish our mission with fewer American troops. But in , the opposite happened. The violence in Iraq — particularly in Baghdad — overwhelmed the political gains the Iraqis had made. And they responded with outrageous acts of murder aimed at innocent Iraqis. Radical Shia elements, some supported by Iran, formed death squads. And the result was a vicious cycle of sectarian violence that continues today. The situation in Iraq is unacceptable to the American people and it is unacceptable to me. Our troops in Iraq have fought bravely. They have done everything we have asked them to do. Where mistakes have been made, the responsibility rests with me. It is clear that we need to change our strategy in Iraq. So my national security team, military commanders and diplomats conducted a comprehensive review. We consulted members of Congress from both parties, our allies abroad and distinguished outside experts. In our discussions, we all agreed that there is no magic formula for success in Iraq. And one message came through loud and clear: Failure in Iraq would be a disaster for the United States. The consequences of failure are clear: Radical Islamic extremists would grow — would — would grow in strength and gain new recruits. They would be in a better position to topple moderate governments, create chaos in the region and use oil revenues to fund their ambitions. Iran would be emboldened in its pursuit of nuclear weapons. Our enemies would have a safe haven from which to plan and launch attacks on the American people. For the safety of our people, America must succeed in Iraq. The most urgent priority for success in Iraq is security, especially in Baghdad. This violence is splitting Baghdad into sectarian enclaves and shaking the confidence of all Iraqis. Only Iraqis can end the sectarian violence and secure their people. And their government has put forward an aggressive plan to do it. Our past efforts to secure Baghdad failed for two principal reasons: There were not enough Iraqi and American troops to secure neighborhoods that had been cleared of terrorists and insurgents. And there were too many restrictions on the troops we did have. Our military commanders reviewed the new Iraqi plan to ensure that it addressed these mistakes. They report that it does. They also report that this plan can work. Now, let me explain the main elements of this effort: The Iraqi government will appoint a military commander and two deputy commanders for their capital. When these forces are fully deployed, there will be 18 Iraqi Army and National Police brigades committed to this effort — along with local police. These Iraqi forces will operate from local police stations — conducting patrols and setting up checkpoints and going door-to-door to gain the trust of Baghdad residents. This is a strong commitment. But for it to succeed, our commanders say the Iraqis will need our help. So America will change our strategy to help the Iraqis carry out their campaign to put down sectarian violence and bring security to the people of Baghdad. This will require increasing American force levels. So I have committed more than 20,000 additional American troops to Iraq. The vast majority of them, five brigades, will be deployed to Baghdad. These troops will work alongside Iraqi units and be embedded in their formations. Our troops will have a well-defined mission: Many listening tonight will ask why this effort will succeed when previous operations to secure Baghdad did not. Well, here are the differences: In earlier operations, Iraqi and American forces cleared many neighborhoods of terrorists and insurgents, but when our forces moved on to other targets, the killers returned. This time, we will have the force levels we need to hold the areas that have been cleared. In earlier operations, political and sectarian interference prevented Iraqi and American forces from going into neighborhoods that are home to those fueling the sectarian violence. This time, Iraqi and American forces will have a green light to enter these

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

neighborhoods, and Prime Minister Maliki has pledged that political or sectarian interference will not be tolerated. If the Iraqi government does not follow through on its promises, it will lose the support of the American people and it will lose the support of the Iraqi people. Now is the time to act. The prime minister understands this. Here is what he told his people just last week: Our enemies in Iraq will make every effort to ensure that our television screens are filled with images of death and suffering. When this happens, daily life will improve, Iraqis will gain confidence in their leaders and the government will have the breathing space it needs to make progress in other critical areas. A successful strategy for Iraq goes beyond military operations. Ordinary Iraqi citizens must see that military operations are accompanied by visible improvements in their neighborhoods and communities. So America will hold the Iraqi government to the benchmarks it has announced. To show that it is committed to delivering a better life, the Iraqi government will spend 10 billion dollars of its own money on reconstruction and infrastructure projects that will create new jobs. To empower local leaders, Iraqis plan to hold provincial elections later this year. America will change our approach to help the Iraqi government as it works to meet these benchmarks. In keeping with the recommendations of the Iraq Study Group, we will increase the embedding of American advisers in Iraqi Army units and partner a Coalition brigade with every Iraqi Army division. We will give our commanders and civilians greater flexibility to spend funds for economic assistance. We will double the number of provincial reconstruction teams. These teams bring together military and civilian experts to help local Iraqi communities pursue reconciliation, strengthen the moderates and speed the transition to Iraqi self-reliance. And Secretary Rice will soon appoint a reconstruction coordinator in Baghdad to ensure better results for economic assistance being spent in Iraq. As we make these changes, we will continue to pursue Al Qaeda and foreign fighters. Al Qaeda is still active in Iraq. Its home base is Anbar Province. Al Qaeda has helped make Anbar the most violent area of Iraq outside the capital. Our military forces in Anbar are killing and capturing Al Qaeda leaders, and they are protecting the local population. Recently, local tribal leaders have begun to show their willingness to take on Al Qaeda. And as a result, our commanders believe we have an opportunity to deal a serious blow to the terrorists. So I have given orders to increase American forces in Anbar Province by 4,000 troops. These troops will work with Iraqi and tribal forces to up the pressure on the terrorists. Succeeding in Iraq also requires defending its territorial integrity and stabilizing the region in the face of extremist challenge. This begins with addressing Iran and Syria. These two regimes are allowing terrorists and insurgents to use their territory to move in and out of Iraq. Iran is providing material support for attacks on American troops. We will disrupt the attacks on our forces. We will interrupt the flow of support from Iran and Syria. And we will seek out and destroy the networks providing advanced weaponry and training to our enemies in Iraq. We are also taking other steps to bolster the security of Iraq and protect American interests in the Middle East. I recently ordered the deployment of an additional carrier strike group to the region. We will expand intelligence sharing and deploy Patriot air defense systems to reassure our friends and allies. We will work with the governments of Turkey and Iraq to help them resolve problems along their border. And we will work with others to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons and dominating the region. Countries like Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan and the Gulf states need to understand that an American defeat in Iraq would create a new sanctuary for extremists and a strategic threat to their survival. And on Friday, Secretary Rice will leave for the region to build support for Iraq, and continue the urgent diplomacy required to help bring peace to the Middle East. The challenge playing out across the broader Middle East is more than a military conflict. It is the decisive ideological struggle of our time. On one side are those who believe in freedom and moderation. On the other side are extremists who kill the innocent and have declared their intention to destroy our way of life. In the long run, the most realistic way to protect the American people is to provide a hopeful alternative to the hateful ideology of the enemy by advancing liberty across a troubled region. It is in the interests of the United States to stand with the brave men and women who are risking their lives to claim their freedom, and to help them as they work to raise up just and hopeful societies across the Middle East.

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

Chapter 7 : Transcript of President Bush's Address to Nation on U.S. Policy in Iraq

Transcript of President Bush's Address to Nation on U.S. Policy in Iraq Here is the transcript of President Bush's speech of 1/10/ Also accessible at The NY Times.

Origins[edit] Continental Marines land at New Providence during the Battle of Nassau , the first amphibious landing of the Marine Corps, during the revolution. The institution itself would not be resurrected until 11 July 1776. British and American troops garrisoned aboard Hornet and Penguin exchanging small arms musket fire with Tristan da Cuna in the background during the final engagement between British and American forces of the war. Marines storming Chapultepec castle under a large American flag, paving the way for the fall of Mexico City. Commandant Henderson volunteered the Marines for service in the Seminole Wars of 1817-18, personally leading nearly half of the entire Corps two battalions to war. The Marine Corps played a small role in the Civil War ; their most prominent task was blockade duty. The battalion of recruits formed for the First Battle of Bull Run also known as the First Battle of Manassas [43] by the Confederate forces , performed poorly, retreating with the rest of the Union forces. It would later be the Army base for bombardment of Fort Pulaski. Meanwhile, Marines served as a convenient resource for interventions and landings to protect American interests overseas. The Corps was involved in over 28 separate interventions in the 30 years from the end of the American Civil War to the end of 19th century. Between 1898 and 1914, the Corps continued its record of participation in foreign expeditions, including the Philippine-American War , the Boxer Rebellion in China , Panama, the Cuban Pacifications, the Perdicaris Incident in Morocco, Veracruz , Santo Domingo , and the Banana Wars in Haiti and Nicaragua ; the experiences gained in counter-insurgency and guerrilla operations during this period were consolidated into the Small Wars Manual. The Marine Corps had a deep pool of officers and NCOs with battle experience, and experienced a large expansion. During the war, the Marines, fighting on the Western Front in France, fought at the battle at Belleau Wood in mid 1918. Though the Marines and American media reported that Germans had nicknamed them Teufel Hunden as meaning " Devil Dogs ", for their reputation as shock troops and marksmen at ranges up to meters, there is no evidence of this in German records as Teufelshunde would be the proper German phrase. Nevertheless, the name stuck. Marine Corps entered the war with 13, enlisted personnel, and by 11 November had reached a strength of 2, officers and 70, enlisted. Lejeune , and under his leadership, the Corps studied and developed amphibious techniques that would be of great use in World War II. Many officers, including Lieutenant Colonel Earl Hancock "Pete" Ellis , foresaw a war in the Pacific with Japan and undertook preparations for such a conflict. Through 1941, as the prospect of war grew, the Corps pushed urgently for joint amphibious exercises with the Army and acquired amphibious equipment that would prove of great use in the upcoming conflict. Marine Corps officer Peter J. Ortiz , who served in the European theater, often behind enemy lines. The Battle of Iwo Jima, which began on 19 February 1945, was arguably the most famous Marine engagement of the war. The Japanese had learned from their defeats in the Marianas Campaign and prepared many fortified positions on the island including pillboxes and network of underground tunnels. The Japanese put up fierce resistance, but American forces reached the summit of Mount Suribachi on 23 February. The mission was accomplished with high losses of 26, American casualties and 22, Japanese. Nonetheless, they did continue to provide security detachments to U. Army amphibious operations, including the Normandy landings.

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

Chapter 8 : United States Marine Corps | Military Wiki | FANDOM powered by Wikia

The United States Marine Corps (USMC), also referred to as the United States Marines, is a branch of the United States Armed Forces responsible for conducting expeditionary and amphibious operations with the United States Navy as well as the Army and Air Force.

The USMC serves as an expeditionary force-in-readiness. As outlined in 10 U. The seizure or defense of advanced naval bases and other land operations to support naval campaigns ; The development of tactics, technique, and equipment used by amphibious landing forces in coordination with the Army and Air Force; and Such other duties as the President may direct. While these actions are not accurately described as support of naval campaigns nor as amphibious warfare, their common thread is that they are of an expeditionary nature, using the mobility of the Navy to provide timely intervention in foreign affairs on behalf of American interests. Marine Security Guard reviews a security system at a U. In addition to its primary duties, the Marine Corps has missions in direct support of the White House and the State Department. Continental Marines manned raiding parties, both at sea and ashore. The role of the Marine Corps has expanded significantly since then; as the importance of its original naval mission declined with changing naval warfare doctrine and the professionalization of the naval service, the Corps adapted by focusing on formerly secondary missions ashore. The Advanced Base Doctrine of the early 20th century codified their combat duties ashore, outlining the use of Marines in the seizure of bases and other duties on land to support naval campaigns. Throughout the late 19th and 20th centuries, Marine detachments served aboard Navy cruisers, battleships and carriers. Marines would develop tactics and techniques of amphibious assault on defended coastlines in time for use in World War II. They often were assigned to man anti-aircraft batteries. When gun cruisers were retired by the s, the remaining Marine detachments were only seen on battleships and carriers. Its original mission of providing shipboard security finally ended in the s when nuclear weapons were withdrawn from active deployment and the battleships were retired. Capabilities US Marines from the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit training in Amphibious Warfare during Operation Talisman Sabre at Shoalwater Bay in Australia The Marine Corps fulfills a vital role in national security as an amphibious , expeditionary , air-ground combined arms task force, capable of forcible entry from the air, land, and sea. It is capable of asymmetric warfare with conventional , irregular , and hybrid forces. While the Marine Corps does not employ any unique combat arms, as a force it can rapidly deploy a combined-arms task force to almost anywhere in the world within days. The basic structure for all deployed units is a Marine Air-Ground Task Force MAGTF that integrates a ground combat element , an aviation combat element and a logistics combat element under a common command element. Every other Marine capability exists to support the infantry. Unlike some Western militaries, the Corps remained conservative against theories proclaiming the ability of new weapons to win wars independently. For example, Marine aviation has always been focused on close air support and has remained largely uninfluenced by air power theories proclaiming that strategic bombing can single-handedly win wars. All Marines, regardless of military specialization, receive training as a rifleman ; and all officers receive additional training as infantry platoon commanders. The Marine Corps emphasizes authority and responsibility downward to a greater degree than the other military services. This allows the ability to function as first responders to international incidents. The United States Army now maintains light infantry units capable of rapid worldwide deployment, but those units do not match the combined-arms integration of a MAGTF and lack the logistics that the Navy provides. In larger conflicts, Marines act as a stopgap, to get into and hold an area until larger units can be mobilized. The Corps performed this role in World War I and the Korean War , where Marines were the first significant combat units deployed from the United States and held the line until the country could mobilize for war. The USMC is planning to reduce its logistical requirements and by eliminate all liquid fuel use for Marine Expeditionary Forces, except for highly efficient vehicles.

DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ

Chapter 9 : United States Marine Corps - Wikipedia

The following is a list of people who served in the United States Marine Corps and have gained fame through previous or subsequent endeavors, infamy, or successes. Marines who became notable in the United States Marine Corps and are part of the Marine Corps history and lore are listed and posted in the List of historically notable United States Marines.

It involved some of the wealthiest businessmen in the United States US. The twice decorated WWI veteran and former Commander of the Marine Corps testified before the McCormack-Dickstein Congressional Committee and laid out an amazing saga, detailing how the conspirators attempted to recruit him. I spent 33 years in active military service as a high class muscle-man for Big Business, Wall Street and bankers. I was a racketeer, a gangster for capitalism. I helped make Mexico, especially Tampico, safe for American oil interests in , then made Haiti and Cuba a decent place for the National City Bank boys to collect revenues. I helped rape half a dozen Central American republics for the benefits of Wall Street and did the same to Nicaragua for the international banking house of Brown Brothers in The BBC followed with a full documentary. A kaleidoscope of treason, "The Business Plot" is shrouded in secrecy and is a testament to how wealthy people in the US are held to a different standard of criminal justice. It called only Gerald MacGuire, a go-between, who possessed neither resources nor connections to organize such a plot. It covered up the involvement and protected the reputation of wealthy conspirators by not determining the source of the large sums MacGuire spent or said higher ups would provide. No prosecutions or further investigations followed. There is an old maxim which says, "If you want to get to the bottom of a conspiracy, follow the money! First and foremost, businessmen like Henry Ford, John D. Although at the point of the gun, fascists used a strong hand protecting business. They were ruthless dealing with labor unions and social unrest, which is what these men wanted in the US. Led by a former sergeant, Walter W. Waters, they pitched tents around the city and demanded payment of bonuses granted them under the Adjusted Service Certificate Law of Butler encouraged them to fight Hoover as though he was the Kaiser to get what they deserved. Hoover refused to meet with them and ordered the US Cavalry to remove them and their campsites. Butler threw his support to Roosevelt for president. They felt Roosevelt intended to conduct a massive redistribution of wealth from the rich to the poor. MacGuire claimed to have , war veterans from the American Legion and each man was a leader of 10 others, equaling 5 million men, if needed. Arms and equipment would be obtained from the Remington Arms Co. They would model their forces after the Croix-de-Feu in France, one of several fascists groups MacGuire studied while touring Europe. Backed up by such manpower, Wall Street plotters wanted Gen. Butler to deliver an ultimatum demanding either Roosevelt pretended to be incapacitated by polio and allow Butler to takeover or be forced out with the army of , war veterans from the American Legion. Money was no object according to MacGuire. Other major backers were leaders of U. Most astoundingly, the Bush family was a major backer of the coup. Thyssen was an early financial backer of the Nazi party. Bush was a director and shareholder, along with George Herbert Walker, his father-in-law, in the Union Banking Corporation UBC which also ran a complicated financial web that supported Hitler until Roosevelt signed the Trading with the Enemy Act. The following is a list of some of the fascist coup leaders: Morgan banks; William Doyle, former state commander of the American Legion and a central plotter of the coup; John Davis, former Democratic presidential candidate and a senior attorney for J. Raskob, officer and a former chairman of the Democratic Party. Years later, retired US Rep. Marine Corps had not been a stubborn devotee of democracy, Americans today could conceivably be living under an American Mussolini, Hitler, or Franco. Moreover, Barack Obama was expected to undertake some FDR type programs to redistribute wealth from the rich to the poor but just the opposite occurred. Obama is merely a figurehead, as Roosevelt would have been had Major General Smedley Butler not been there? Dedicated to the Dialogue on Race By John Burl Smith 2. Venue for an Artist Second Bill of Rights, By President Franklin D. By Mumia Abu-Jamal 4. Should Some Teenagers Die in

**DOWNLOAD PDF ANDRE QUEIROGA, MARINE CORPS : PRESIDENT
BUSH'S PLAN FOR IRAQ**

Prison? By Liliana Segura 5. By Andre Damon 6.