



The Conflict, the Stakes, and What Comes Next
Crisis in Ukraine
New eBook Now Available

[LEARN MORE](#)

Save 55% off the newsstand price



[SUBSCRIBE NOW](#)



Published by the Council on Foreign Relations

[Home](#) | [International Editions](#) | [Digital Newsstand](#) | [Job Board](#) | [Account Management](#) | [RSS](#) | [Newsletters](#)

[Login](#) | [Register](#) | [\(0\) My Cart](#)

[New Issue](#) | [Archive](#) | [Regions](#) | [Topics](#) | [Features](#) | [Discussions](#) | [Video](#) | [Books & Reviews](#) | [Classroom](#) | [About Us](#) | [Subscribe](#)

[Home](#) > [Features](#) > [Postscripts](#)

Iraq Syndrome Redux

Behind the Tough Talk

By *John Mueller*

JUNE 18, 2014



Combat boots bearing the names of some 800 U.S. soldiers killed in Iraq, May 25, 2004. (Kevin Lamarque / Courtesy Reuters)

The Iraq Syndrome has played a role in U.S. politics for nearly a decade. [As I wrote in 2005](#), public support for the war in Iraq followed the same course as for the wars in Korea and Vietnam: broad acceptance at the outset with erosion of support as casualties mount. The experience of those past wars also suggests that there was nothing U.S. President George W. Bush could do to reverse this deterioration -- or to stave off an "Iraq Syndrome" that would inhibit U.S. foreign policy in the future.

In recent years, the Iraq Syndrome has indeed colored U.S. foreign policy -- from its timorous “lead from behind” approach in Libya (where American forces have since been withdrawn due to the ensuing civil war) to its cheerleader (vast proclamation and half-vast execution) approach to the Arab Spring. The Iraq Syndrome could be seen in fullest flower last year, when U.S. President Barack Obama, supported by Republican leaders in Congress, initially signaled that he would bomb Syria for its apparent use of chemical weapons and then backtracked when his plans were met with intense hostility by a public determined not to be dragged into another war in the Middle East -- even though no American lives were likely to be lost in the exercise and even though U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry [assured Americans](#) that the bombings would be “unbelievably small.”

Just over a year later, the Iraq Syndrome has found a new application, as it happens, in Iraq itself. It has been obvious for some time that last decade’s Iraq War would spawn a “let’s not do that again” attitude. For example, a poll in relatively hawkish Alabama in 2005 -- even before the Iraq War got really bad - - found that only a third of the respondents agreed that the United States should be prepared to send troops back to Iraq to establish order if a full-scale civil war erupted there after a U.S. withdrawal. The percentage today would likely be considerably lower, even as Iraq teeters on the brink of collapse.

It’s a true debacle. However, as I suggested in my *Foreign Affairs* article and in [later](#) commentary, Americans are quite capable of taking foreign policy debacles in stride. When sending policing troops to war-torn Lebanon in 1983, U.S. President Ronald Reagan [grandly declared](#) that the conflict there somehow was “a threat to all the people of the world, not just to the Middle East itself.” The public accepted his decision, but it then supported -- indeed, impelled -- his abrupt withdrawal after a terrorist attack killed 241 of those troops. It then handily re-elected him a few months later.

Similarly, the spectacular failure of the U.S. position in Vietnam in 1975 was used by the man who presided over it, U.S. President Gerald Ford, as a point in his favor in his reelection campaign the next year. When he came into office, noted Ford, the United States was “still deeply involved in the problems of Vietnam, [but now] we are at peace. Not a single young American is fighting or dying on any foreign soil.” His rather bizarre declaration in defense of debacle may not have helped him in the election, but it didn’t hurt him either.

Americans have never been very supportive of putting American troops in harm’s way for purposes that are primarily humanitarian. As with the wars in Korea and Vietnam, they did buy the war in Iraq for a while because they saw it, like Afghanistan, as a response to 9/11 -- a direct attack on the United States.

Now, however, with the Iraq Syndrome in force, political leaders have done lot of tough taking, but no one seems willing to advocate sending in troops. Supporters of doing something of that sort would have to convince the public that it would be necessary to prevent a direct attack on the United States.

On Sunday, Senator Lindsey Graham (R–S.C.) tried his hand, explaining that an Islamist takeover of parts of Iraq would provide terrorists with a “staging area” from which they would carry out “another 9/11.” Former U.S. Ambassador to Iraq Ryan Crocker issued a comparable warning. Obama has made similar statements, and the *Washington Post*’s David Ignatius has [speculated](#) ominously, if vaguely, that a newly established terrorist “safe haven” -- as

DON'T MISS


ESSAY

The Iraq Syndrome

John Mueller

Public support for the war in Iraq has followed the same course as it did for the wars in Korea and Vietnam: broad enthusiasm...





opposed to the ones that have existed in the area for years -- “could soon be used to attack foreign targets.”

However, 9/11 remains an **aberration**, not a harbinger. No terrorist act in history has visited even one-tenth as much death and destruction, even ones launched during civil wars, when terrorists have had plenty of time and space in which to stage them. It is thus hard to follow the logic of Senator John McCain (R–A.Z.), who opines that having Syria and Iraq in extremist hands would represent an **existential threat** to the United States; that is, that if Syria and Iraq acquire reprehensible new leaders -- different from the reprehensible ones they have had in the past -- the United States will cease to exist. This sort of **extravagant threat-inflation** has been applied frequently since 9/11, and it has gone amazingly unchallenged.

But such alarmism has become less common in recent years, and getting it accepted seems to be increasingly difficult, in major part because it was used to justify two disastrous wars as well as spillover violence in Pakistan. These have led to destruction at least 40 times greater than witnessed on 9/11 and have resulted in the deaths of twice as many Americans as were killed that day -- and more deaths overall than at Hiroshima and Nagasaki combined.

In other words, American foreign policy at its most active over the last dozen or so years, routinely decorated with extravagant alarmism, has been an **abject failure**. If those who established and maintained this disastrous record have, at long last, lost all credibility, we may all be the better for it.

ON THIS TOPIC



POSTSCRIPT, MARCH 28, 2011

The Iraq Syndrome Revisited

John Mueller

In a November/December 2005 article, “The Iraq Syndrome,” I concluded that Americans, because of the experience in Iraq, were likely acquiring a perspective on intervening in overseas conflicts somewhat like the one that followed the Vietnam War. Such once-fashionable terms as ...



ESSAY, MAR/APR 2012

The Iraq We Left Behind

Ned Parker

Nine years after U.S. troops toppled Saddam Hussein and just a few months after the last U.S. soldier left Iraq, the country has become something close to a failed state. Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki presides over a system rife with corruption and brutality, in which political leaders use ...



RESPONSE, AUGUST 23, 2012

Why the MRAP Is Worth the Money

Christopher J. Lamb and Sally Scudder

In “The MRAP Boondoggle,” Chris Rohlfs and Ryan Sullivan argue that mine-resistant ambush protected vehicles are a colossal waste of money. To be sure, the MRAP program is a big, almost irresistible target -- apparently for economists as well as insurgents. But the logic for the ...

LATEST COMMENTARY & NEWS ANALYSIS

COUNCIL *on*
FOREIGN
RELATIONS

More from the publisher

of *Foreign Affairs*

The Tragedy of Syria's Civilians

FOREIGN
AFFAIRS *Newsletters*

E-mail (example:

johndoe@foreignaffairs.com): *Get the

- [Can Iraq Survive the ISIS Storm?](#)
- [Is Iraq Headed for Civil War?](#)
- [Syria: Humanitarian Disaster—and Security Threat](#)
- [The Different Taliban Worlds](#)

latest commentary and analysis delivered straight to your inbox.

Sort by Best ▾

Share Favorite



Join the discussion...



P DELESPINASSE · 7 minutes ago

"Americans have never been very supportive of putting American troops in harm's way for purposes that are primarily humanitarian."

Right! And our recent interventions, military and otherwise, have hardly produced humanitarian results for the people of the countries involved, whatever "intentions" we might have had. Saddam Hussein was a nasty bit of work, to be sure, but the number of Iraqis he killed in order to retain power was tiny compared to the number Iraqis have been bumping off since then.

I am reminded of Machiavelli's comment "A prince should care nothing for the accusation of cruelty so long as he keeps his subjects united and loyal; by making a very few examples he can be more truly merciful than those who through too much tender-heartedness allow disorders to arise whence come killings and rapine. For these offend an entire community, while the few executions ordered by the prince affect only a few individuals."

Common Dreams drew sharp criticism for publishing my article about a defense Saddam Hussein could make at his trial (how could a progressive publication run such a thing!?) but I still stand by every word of it:

<http://www.commondreams.org/vi...>

Reply

About Foreign Affairs

- Submissions
- Staff
- Employment
- Advertising
- Sponsored Sections
- Graduate School Forum
- World Traveler Section

More on Foreign Affairs

- Job Board
- International Editions
- Permissions
- RSS
- Media Inquiries

Regions

- Africa
- Americas
- Asia
- Europe
- Global Commons
- Middle East
- Russia & FSU

Topics

- Economics
- Environment
- Security
- Law & Institutions
- Politics & Society
- U.S. Policy

Features

- Snapshots
- Letters From
- Postscripts
- Reading Lists
- Comments
- Essays
- Responses
- Collections

Discussions

- Roundtables
- Author Interviews
- Letters to the Editor
- News & Events

Books & Reviews

- Review Essays
- Capsule Reviews
- Foreign Affairs Books

In the Magazine

- New Issue
- Browse Archives

Customer Care

- Subscribe
- Renew
- Gift Subscriptions
- Account Management
- Bulk Subscriptions