

## **US History DBQ: 2003 Invasion of Iraq**

**Background:** On March 19th 2003, the United States, along with coalition forces primarily from the United Kingdom, initiated war on Iraq. Just after explosions began to rock Baghdad, Iraq's capital, U.S. President George W. Bush announced in a televised address, "At this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from grave danger." President Bush and his advisors built much of their case for war on the idea that Iraq, under Dictator Saddam Hussein, possessed or was in the process of building weapons of mass destruction that threatened the United States.

You will choose **one** the following prompts to answer in your essay:

- 1) Was the US justified in invading Iraq in 2003?
- 2) How was the decision to invade Iraq in 2003 a fundamental change in US foreign policy?

### **Document A**

**Source: President Bush's 2002 State of the Union Address, January 19<sup>th</sup> 2002.**

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror. The Iraqi regime has plotted to develop anthrax and nerve gas and nuclear weapons for over a decade.

This is a regime that has already used poison gas to murder thousands of its own citizens, leaving the bodies of mothers huddled over their dead children. This is a regime that agreed to international inspections then kicked out the inspectors. This is a regime that has something to hide from the civilized world.

States like these, and their terrorist allies, constitute an axis of evil, arming to threaten the peace of the world. By seeking weapons of mass destruction, these regimes pose a grave and growing danger. They could provide these arms to terrorists, giving them the means to match their hatred. They could attack our allies or attempt to blackmail the United States. In any of these cases, the price of indifference would be catastrophic.

We will work closely with our coalition to deny terrorists and their state sponsors the materials, technology and expertise to make and deliver weapons of mass destruction.

- 1) According to President Bush why is Iraq a threat to the United States?

## Document B

**Source: Interview with Vice President Dick Cheney on Meet The Press, March 16, 2002.**

**MR. RUSSERT:** Many Americans and many people around the world are asking one question: Why is it acceptable for the United States to lead a military attack against a nation that has not attacked the United States? What's your answer?

**Vice Pres Cheney:** Tim, we have, I think admittedly, a new and unique set of circumstances we're trying to deal with here. If you think back to the way we were organized in the last century, the 20th century, to deal with threats to the United States, or to our friends and allies, we had to deal with large states, significant military forces, intercontinental ballistic missiles, the kinds of threats we dealt with throughout the period of the Cold War, all of that changed on September 11 of a year and a half ago...

And at the front of our concerns as we try to deal with these issues is the proposition that the al-Qaeda organization is absolutely determined to do everything they can to acquire chemical, biological and nuclear weapons...

we also have to address the question of where might these terrorists acquire weapons of mass destruction, chemical weapons, biological weapons, nuclear weapons? And Saddam Hussein becomes a prime suspect in that regard because of his past track record and because we know he has, in fact, developed these kinds of capabilities, chemical and biological weapons.

1) According to Vice President Cheney how was foreign policy different before September 11<sup>th</sup> 2001?

2) What is the relationship between Al-Qaeda and Iraq according to Cheney?

## Document C

**Source: Speech by Representative Ron Paul (R-TX) on the floor of the House of Representatives. October 8<sup>th</sup> 2002.**

I oppose the resolution authorizing military force against Iraq... There is no convincing evidence that Iraq is capable of threatening the security of this country, and, therefore, very little reason, if any, to pursue a war.

[A]n important aspect of the philosophy and the policy we are endorsing here is the preemption doctrine. This should not be passed off lightly. It has been done to some degree in the past, but never been put into law that we will preemptively strike another nation that has not attacked us. No matter what the arguments may be, this policy is new; and it will have ramifications for our future, and it will have ramifications for the future of the world because other countries will adopt this same philosophy

1) Why does representative Paul oppose authorizing military force against Iraq?

2) What is the preemption doctrine and why is Paul concerned about it?

## Document D

**Source: Speech by Representative Bernard Sanders (I-VT) on the floor of the House of Representatives, October 9<sup>th</sup> 2002.**

Mr. Speaker, the front page of The Washington Post today reported that all relevant U.S. intelligence agencies now say despite what we have heard from the White House that "Saddam Hussein is unlikely to initiate a chemical or biological attack against the United States."

I am deeply concerned about the precedent that a unilateral invasion of Iraq could establish in terms of international law and the role of the United Nations. If President Bush believes that the U.S. can go to war at any time against any nation, what moral or legal objection could our government raise if another country chose to do the same thing?

1) What does Rep. Sanders say about Saddam Hussein?

2) What does Rep. Sanders worry will happen if the US invades Iraq unilaterally?

## Document E

**Source: Brett Scowcroft, "Don't attack Saddam," *Wall Street Journal*, August 15, 2002.**

**Brett Scowcroft served as National Security Advisor to Presidents Jerald Ford and George HW Bush.**

[T]here is scant evidence to tie Saddam to terrorist organizations, and even less to the Sept. 11<sup>th</sup> attacks. Indeed Saddam's goals have little in common with the terrorists who threaten us, and there is little incentive for him to make common cause with them. He is unlikely to risk his investment in weapons of mass destruction, much less his country, by handing such weapons to terrorists who would use them for their own purposes and leave Bagdad as the return address.

There is a virtual consensus in the world against an attack on Iraq at this time. So long as that sentiment persists, it would require the United States to pursue a go-it-alone strategy against Iraq.

1) What events would Scowcroft have been involve with while serving as NSA advisor to presidents Ford and Bush?

2) What does Scowcroft say about links between terrorist organizations and Iraq?

3) According to Scowcroft how do other world leaders feel about invading Iraq?

## **Document F**

**Source: Interview with Dr. Condoleezza Rice on CNN, September 8<sup>th</sup> 2002.  
Dr. Rice was President George W. Bush's National Security Advisor at the time of the interview.**

There is no doubt that Saddam Hussein's regime is a danger to the United States and to its allies, to our interests.

We've waited a very long time. It has been, after all, 11 years, more than a decade now, of defiance of U.N. resolutions by Saddam Hussein.

Every obligation that he signed onto after the Gulf War, so that he would not be a threat to peace and security, he has ignored and flaunted.

"What we're hearing from everyone is that they understand that Saddam Hussein is a threat. They understand that he's been a threat for a long time. After all, France and China and Russia are members of the permanent five of the Security Council that voted for the 16 U.N. resolutions that he [Saddam Hussein] has repeatedly violated. So there is no confusion about the threat."

1) According to Dr. Rice why is Hussein a threat to peace and security?

2) What is the consensus of world leaders about Hussein according to Rice?