

Why Did the United States Invade Iraq in 2003?

A History/Political Science Inquiry Lesson

Mike Harris
History/Political Science
Grade 12
October 11, 2006

THE 2003 IRAQ WAR: INQUIRY LESSON OUTLINE

ABSTRACT

After September 11th, 2001, the United States was forced to cope with a new kind of enemy; one without a face. Terrorists had infiltrated the United States and brought the battlefield onto American soil for the first time since Pearl Harbor. In order to prevent future attacks on the United States, President George W. Bush began to lobby Congress and international allies to join forces against rogue nations who could aid in assisting terrorists. One country in particular, Iraq, became the focus of the Administration's attention. Why was Iraq singled out as an imminent threat to the America? Students will study the information both preceding and following the March 2003 invasion in order to better understand the motivations of the United States.

IDEAL AUDIENCE

This inquiry lesson is geared toward 12th grade advanced placement/honors history and political science students. This inquiry lesson requires students to be able to think critically about a complicated, controversial topic. In addition, it is necessary that students have the capability to comprehend and evaluate multiple data sets that, in many cases, were written by and for a highly educated audience (i.e. U.N. members, intelligence officers, scholars, etc.). This inquiry lesson could be successfully implemented in 9th, 10th, or 11th grade with modifications.

OBJECTIVES

By engaging this inquiry lesson, students will:

- Identify possible reasons for the U.S. invasion of Iraq
- Critically analyze a variety of documents related to the Iraq war
- Assess the credibility of sources and documents
- Evaluate the strength of arguments regarding the Iraq war
- Integrate a number of data sets in order to arrive at a conclusion
- Engage in substantive debate regarding the legitimacy of the Iraq War
- Present evidence to argue in support of or against a particular view
- Explain the changes in foreign policy as a result of the attacks on 9-11

PRIMARY WISCONSIN MODEL ACADEMIC STANDARDS ADDRESSED

- B.12.1** Explain different points of view on the same historical event, using data gathered from various sources, such as letters, journals, diaries, newspapers, government documents, and speeches
- B.12.2** Analyze primary and secondary sources related to a historical question to evaluate their relevance, make comparisons, integrate new information with prior knowledge, and come to a reasoned conclusion
- B.12.15** Identify a historical or contemporary event in which a person was forced to take an ethical position, such as a decision to go to war, the impeachment of a president, or a presidential pardon, and explain the issues involved
- C.12.8** Locate, organize, analyze, and use information from various sources to understand an issue of public concern, take a position, and communicate the position

SECONDARY WISCONSIN MODEL ACADEMIC STANDARDS ADDRESSED

- B.12.4** Assess the validity of different interpretations of significant historical events
- B.12.8** Recall, select, and explain the significance of important people, their work, and their ideas in the areas of political and intellectual leadership, inventions, discoveries, and the arts, within each major era of Wisconsin, United States, and world history
- B.12.11** Compare examples and analyze why governments of various countries have sometimes sought peaceful resolution to conflicts and sometimes gone to war
- B.12.16** Describe the purpose and effects of treaties, alliances, and international organizations that characterize today's interconnected world.
- B.12.17** Identify historical and current instances when national interests and global interests have seemed to be opposed and analyze the issues involved
- C.12.12** Explain the United States' relationship to other nations and its role in international organizations, such as the United Nations, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and North American Free Trade Agreement

TIME

The time allocated for this inquiry lesson is five 45 minute class periods. This is primarily due to the number, length, and detail of the data sets and a realistic assessment of the time it will take to adequately discuss the data, student questions and responses throughout the inquiry.

MATERIALS

The materials necessary to complete this inquiry lesson include:

- 30 copies of the “Hypothesis/Evidence Worksheet”
- 6 copies of the data sets packets
- A computer with an internet connection
- Video Projector
- Overhead Projector
- DVD player or VCR (If computer and projector are unavailable)
- CD player (If computer and projector are unavailable).
- Overhead projector with transparency paper
- Chalkboard or Dry-Erase board
- Chalk or Dry-Erase markers

THE 2003 IRAQ WAR: INQUIRY LESSON PROCEDURE

I. ENGAGEMENT IN THE INQUIRY

Students will be shown a clip from 9-11 when the terrorists hijacked planes and crashed them into the World Trade Center. After this clip, the students will hear a speech by President George W. Bush. In the speech he discusses his feelings about 9-11, terrorism, and the need to prevent rogue nations from directly or indirectly attacking the free world.

II. ELICIT HYPOTHESES

After watching the clips and listening to the audio, the inquiry question, “Why Did the United States Invade Iraq?” will be written on the board. The teacher will provide background information and distribute the Hypothesis/Evidence worksheets to each student. The teacher will then instruct the students to consider several hypotheses to answer the inquiry question. After the students have formed hypotheses individually, they will be broken down into small groups of 4-5 students where they will discuss their hypotheses and come up with additional ones. The teacher will then ask each group to present one hypothesis to the class which will be written on the overhead projector by the teacher and on the worksheets by the students. This procedure will be repeated as each group takes turns submitting hypotheses. After all “logical” hypotheses have been presented the teacher will have the option to allow the students to provide at least one “unlikely” hypothesis. These hypotheses will also be recorded by the teacher and the students. (Due to the nature of the topic this step may be omitted, depending on the anticipated responses by the students).

III. GATHERING DATA AND REVISING HYPOTHESES

The teacher will pass out the data sets and will then ask one student to read a data set to the class (In some instances, the data sets will be read within the groups). After the student has finished reading (or the groups have completed reading), the teacher will facilitate discussion on the data set, clarifying information as necessary to ensure proper understanding of the data. After critical discussion has taken place, the teacher will ask the students to state which hypotheses are supported or undermined by the data. The teacher will mark hypotheses that are supported by the data with a “plus” sign and undermined hypotheses with a “minus” sign. After this has been completed, the teacher will ask the students if the data set has inspired any new hypotheses. If so, the new hypotheses will be recorded. This process will be repeated for each of the remaining data sets until all pre-war data sets have been presented and evaluated.

IV. CONCLUSION

At this time the teacher will instruct the students to choose the hypothesis they think is most likely based on the given data. The students will then write a short essay in class that includes a thesis statement and cites evidence from the data sets that supports their tentative conclusion. After this has been completed, the teacher will pass out the final data sets that had previously been withheld from the students. These data sets will have more up to date information regarding the intelligence used to support the Iraq war, the current status of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, the clarification of prewar evidence. This information is of vital importance because many of the data sets pertain to information known prior to invading Iraq. By having more recent scholarship, the students can assess the validity of some of the hypotheses that might have come up during discussion and analysis of the previous data sets. The students will then revise their conclusions based on the new data sets, explaining why their tentative conclusion was supported or undermined by the new data. Students will also be asked to note whether or not they agree with the Iraq war and why on their revised conclusion (this information will be used by the teacher to determine groupings for a short presentation).

V. ASSESSMENT

In order to ensure that the students have achieved the objectives, this inquiry lesson will be assessed using both formal and informal techniques. The teacher will assess the students informally by listening in on group conversations and evaluating the comments made by students during discussion. The teacher will gauge the number of students participating and will determine whether or not the students are engaged in higher order thinking and substantive debate. In addition, teacher will assess the students by observing them during a short, 5-7 minute group presentation on whether or not they feel the Iraq war is justified. Due to the fact that this inquiry lesson is designed around student analysis of data and formation of an opinion, it is integral that the students participate in this process. Thus, the teacher will make every effort to engage all students in the discussion. The students will be formally assessed by their thorough completion of the Hypothesis Evaluation worksheet and their formal revised conclusion essays.

DATA SETS 1 AND 2

In the following two data sets, then Secretary of State Colin Powell presents the case for war to the United Nations. The transcript of his speech is data set 1 and the pictures he uses to support his claims make up data set 2. These data sets can be accessed online at the websites provided below.

Powell, Colin. *Transcript of Powell's U.N. Presentation*. (6 February 2003). Retrieved October 2nd, 2006 at the following address:<http://www.cnn.com/2003/US/02/05/sprj.irq.powell.transcript/>

Powell, Colin. *Secretary Powell at the UN: Iraq's Failure to Disarm*. (5 February 2003). Retrieved October 2nd, 2006 at the following address <http://www.state.gov/p/nea/disarm/>

DATA SET 3

Briefing on the Iraq Weapons Inspectors' 60-Day Report: Iraqi Non-cooperation and Defiance of the UN

Secretary Colin L. Powell
Washington, DC
January 27, 2003



[Video file for: [DSL/cable](#) or [dial-up](#) ; [audio-only](#) file]

Well, good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. Earlier today, in accordance with UN Resolution 1441, Doctors' Blix and El Baradei provided the United Nations Security Council their 60-day reports on inspection activity in Iraq.

We listened carefully as the inspectors reported that Iraq has not provided the active, immediate and unconditional cooperation that the Council demanded in UN Resolution 1441.

As Dr. Blix said, "Iraq appears not to have come to a genuine acceptance, not even today, of the disarmament that was demanded of it." Let me repeat, because this is the essence of the problem. Dr. Blix said, "Iraq appears not to have come to a genuine acceptance, not even today, of the disarmament that was demanded of it." 1441 is all about the disarmament demanded of Iraq.

The inspectors' findings came as no surprise. For 11 years before 1441, Saddam Hussein's regime refused to make the strategic decision, the political decision, to disarm itself of weapons of mass destruction and to comply with the world's demands.

To this day, the Iraq regime continues to defy the will of the United Nations. The Iraqi regime has responded to 1441 with empty claims, empty declarations and empty gestures.

It has not given the inspectors and the international community any concrete information in answer to a host of key questions: Where is the missing anthrax? This is not just a question of historical curiosity. It is essential for us to know what happened with this deadly material.

Where is the VX? Also not just a trivial question. We must know what happened to this deadly material.

Where are the chemical and biological munitions? Where are the mobile biological laboratories? If the Iraqi regime was truly committed to disarmament, we wouldn't be looking for these mobile labs. They'd drive them up and park them in front of UNMOVIC headquarters for inspection.

Why is Iraq violating the restrictions on ballistic missiles? Why is it violating the ban on missiles with a range of more than 150 kilometers? Where are the credible, verifiable answers to all of the other disarmament questions compiled by the previous inspectors?

Today, we heard that the inspectors have not been able to interview any Iraqi in private. We heard that the inspectors have not been allowed to employ aerial surveillance. Why not? If Iraq was committed to disarmament, if Iraq understood what 1441 was all about, they would willingly allow this kind of surveillance, they would willingly allow people to be interviewed without minders, without fear of retribution.

We have heard that the inspectors have still not received, a full list of Iraqi personnel involved with weapons of mass destruction. If Iraq no longer has weapons of mass destruction, they should willingly give the names of all who were involved in their previous programs to the inspectors for examination and interview.

The inspectors told us that their efforts have been impeded by a swarm of Iraqi minders. Why, if Iraq was committed to disarmament, would they be going to these efforts to deceive and to keep the inspectors from doing their work? Passive cooperation is not what was called for in 1441.

The inspectors have also told us that they have evidence that Iraq has moved or hidden items at sites just prior to inspection visits. That's what the inspectors say, not what Americans say, not what American intelligence says, but we certainly corroborate all of that. But this is information from the inspectors.

And the inspectors have caught the Iraqis concealing "top secret" information in a private residence. You all saw the pictures of that information being brought out. Why? Why, if Iraq was committed to disarmament, as required under 1441, would we be finding this kind of information squirreled away in private homes, for any other reason than to keep it away from the inspectors?

The list of unanswered questions and the many ways Iraq is frustrating the work of the inspectors goes on and on. Iraq's refusal to disarm, in compliance with Resolution 1441, still threatens international peace and security. And Iraq's defiance continues to challenge the relevance and credibility of the Security Council.

The international community's goal was, is and remains Iraq's disarmament. The Security Council and the international community must stand behind Resolution 1441. Iraq continues to conceal quantities, vast quantities, of highly lethal material and weapons to delivery it. They could kill thousands upon thousands of men, women and children if Saddam Hussein decides to use these against those men, women and children, or, just as frightening, to provide them to others who might use such weapons.

Iraq must not be allowed to keep weapons of mass terror and the capacity to produce more. The world community must send a clear message to Iraq that the will of the international community must be obeyed.

Last September, the United Nations acted at the request of the United States. We acted through 1441 with the hope - the President had the hope, the other members of the Security Council who voted unanimously for this resolution had the hope -- that Iraq would take this one last chance presented to it by the international community to disarm peacefully.

And remember the key elements of that resolution. Iraq has been and continues to be in material breach of all of its earlier obligations. We are giving, the resolution said, one more chance to Iraq. We put a firm list of conditions for Iraq to meet and what they should allow the inspectors to do to assist them in that disarmament. And let's not forget a vital part of the resolution that comes toward the end: there would be serious consequences for continued Iraqi violation of its obligation. Those serious consequences are the lever that was needed to get the inspectors in to get the inspectors to be able to do their work, which was to assist Iraq in disarmament.

Iraqi intransigence brings us to a situation where we see that regime continuing to confront the fundamental choice between compliance with 1441 and the consequences of its failure to disarm.

Even at this late date, the United States hopes for a peaceful solution. But a peaceful solution is possible only if Iraq disarms itself with the help of the inspectors. The issue is not how much more time the inspectors need to search in the dark. It is how much more time Iraq should be given to turn on the light and to come clean. And the answer is not much more time. Iraq's time for choosing peaceful disarmament is fast coming to an end.

Thank you, and I am prepared for your questions.

United States Department of State. (27 January, 2003). *Briefing on the Iraq Weapons Inspectors' 60-Day Report: Iraqi Non-cooperation and Defiance of the UN*. Retrieved October 1st, 2006, from <http://www.state.gov/secretary/former/powell/remarks/2003/16921.htm>

DATA SET 4

Fact Sheet

Excerpt from White House background paper "A Decade of Deception and Defiance"
Washington, DC
November 8, 2002

Security Council Resolutions Concerning Iraq

Read the entire White House background paper "[A Decade of Deception and Defiance](#)"

Saddam Hussein's Defiance of United Nations Resolutions

Saddam Hussein has repeatedly violated seventeen United Nations Security Council Resolutions (UNSCRs) designed to ensure that Iraq does not pose a threat to international peace and security. In addition to these repeated violations, he has tried, over the past decade, to circumvent UN economic sanctions against Iraq, which are reflected in a number of other resolutions. As noted in the resolutions, Saddam Hussein was required to fulfill many obligations beyond the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait. Specifically, Saddam Hussein was required to, among other things: allow international weapons inspectors to oversee the destruction of his weapons of mass destruction; not develop new weapons of mass destruction; destroy all of his ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 kilometers; stop support for terrorism and prevent terrorist organizations from operating within Iraq; help account for missing Kuwaitis and other individuals; return stolen Kuwaiti property and bear financial liability for damage from the Gulf War; and he was required to end his repression of the Iraqi people. **Saddam Hussein has repeatedly violated each of the following resolutions:**

[UNSCR 1441 - November 8, 2002](#)

- Called for the immediate and complete disarmament of Iraq and its prohibited weapons.
- Iraq must provide UNMOVIC and the IAEA full access to Iraqi facilities, individuals, means of transportation, and documents.
- States that the Security Council has repeatedly warned Iraq and that it will face serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations.

[UNSCR 1284 - December 17, 1999](#)

- Created the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspections Commission (UNMOVIC) to replace previous weapon inspection team (UNSCOM).
- Iraq must allow UNMOVIC "immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access" to Iraqi officials and facilities.
- Iraq must fulfill its commitment to return Gulf War prisoners.
- Calls on Iraq to distribute humanitarian goods and medical supplies to its people and address the needs of vulnerable Iraqis without discrimination.

[UNSCR 1205 - November 5, 1998](#)

- "Condemns the decision by Iraq of 31 October 1998 to cease cooperation" with UN inspectors as "a flagrant violation" of UNSCR 687 and other resolutions.
- Iraq must provide "immediate, complete and unconditional cooperation" with UN and IAEA inspectors.

[UNSCR 1194 - September 9, 1998](#)

- "Condemns the decision by Iraq of 5 August 1998 to suspend cooperation with" UN and IAEA inspectors, which constitutes "a totally unacceptable contravention" of its obligations under UNSCR 687, 707, 715, 1060, 1115, and 1154.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA weapons inspectors, and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

[UNSCR 1154 - March 2, 1998](#)

- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access, and notes that any violation would have the "severest consequences for Iraq."

[UNSCR 1137 - November 12, 1997](#)

- "Condemns the continued violations by Iraq" of previous UN resolutions, including its "implicit threat to the safety of" aircraft operated by UN inspectors and its tampering with UN inspector monitoring equipment.
- Reaffirms Iraq's responsibility to ensure the safety of UN inspectors.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

[UNSCR 1134 - October 23, 1997](#)

- "Condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to allow access" to UN inspectors, which constitutes a "flagrant violation" of UNSCR 687, 707, 715, and 1060.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.
- Iraq must give immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom UN inspectors want to interview.

[UNSCR 1115 - June 21, 1997](#)

- "Condemns repeated refusal of Iraqi authorities to allow access" to UN inspectors, which constitutes a "clear and flagrant violation" of UNSCR 687, 707, 715, and 1060.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.
- Iraq must give immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access to Iraqi officials whom UN inspectors want to interview.

[UNSCR 1060 - June 12, 1996](#)

- "Deplores" Iraq's refusal to allow access to UN inspectors and Iraq's "clear violations" of previous UN resolutions.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

[UNSCR 1051 - March 27, 1996](#)

- Iraq must report shipments of dual-use items related to weapons of mass destruction to the UN and IAEA.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA inspectors and allow immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.

[UNSCR 949 - October 15, 1994](#)

- "Condemns" Iraq's recent military deployments toward Kuwait.
- Iraq must not utilize its military or other forces in a hostile manner to threaten its neighbors or UN operations in Iraq.
- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN weapons inspectors.
- Iraq must not enhance its military capability in southern Iraq.

[UNSCR 715 - October 11, 1991](#)

- Iraq must cooperate fully with UN and IAEA inspectors.

[UNSCR 707 - August 15, 1991](#)

- "Condemns" Iraq's "serious violation" of UNSCR 687.
- "Further condemns" Iraq's noncompliance with IAEA and its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- Iraq must halt nuclear activities of all kinds until the Security Council deems Iraq in full compliance.
- Iraq must make a full, final and complete disclosure of all aspects of its weapons of mass destruction and missile programs.
- Iraq must allow UN and IAEA inspectors immediate, unconditional and unrestricted access.
- Iraq must cease attempts to conceal or move weapons of mass destruction, and related materials and facilities.

- Iraq must allow UN and IAEA inspectors to conduct inspection flights throughout Iraq.
- Iraq must provide transportation, medical and logistical support for UN and IAEA inspectors.

[UNSCR 688 - April 5, 1991](#)

- "Condemns" repression of Iraqi civilian population, "the consequences of which threaten international peace and security."
- Iraq must immediately end repression of its civilian population.
- Iraq must allow immediate access to international humanitarian organizations to those in need of assistance.

[UNSCR 687 - April 3, 1991](#)

- Iraq must "unconditionally accept" the destruction, removal or rendering harmless "under international supervision" of all "chemical and biological weapons and all stocks of agents and all related subsystems and components and all research, development, support and manufacturing facilities."
- Iraq must "unconditionally agree not to acquire or develop nuclear weapons or nuclear-weapons-usable material" or any research, development or manufacturing facilities.
- Iraq must "unconditionally accept" the destruction, removal or rendering harmless "under international supervision" of all "ballistic missiles with a range greater than 150 KM and related major parts and repair and production facilities."
- Iraq must not "use, develop, construct or acquire" any weapons of mass destruction.
- Iraq must reaffirm its obligations under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- Creates the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) to verify the elimination of Iraq's chemical and biological weapons programs and mandated that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) verify elimination of Iraq's nuclear weapons program.
- Iraq must declare fully its weapons of mass destruction programs.
- Iraq must not commit or support terrorism, or allow terrorist organizations to operate in Iraq.
- Iraq must cooperate in accounting for the missing and dead Kuwaitis and others.
- Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War.

[UNSCR 686 - March 2, 1991](#)

- Iraq must release prisoners detained during the Gulf War.
- Iraq must return Kuwaiti property seized during the Gulf War.
- Iraq must accept liability under international law for damages from its illegal invasion of Kuwait.

[UNSCR 678 - November 29, 1990](#)

- Iraq must comply fully with UNSCR 660 (regarding Iraq's illegal invasion of Kuwait) "and all subsequent relevant resolutions."
- Authorizes UN Member States "to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolution 660 and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area."

United States Department of State. (08 November, 2002). *Security Council Resolutions Concerning Iraq*. Retrieved October 1st, 2006, from <http://www.state.gov/p/nea/rls/01fs/14906.htm>

DATA SET 5

President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat

Remarks by the President on Iraq
Cincinnati Museum Center - Cincinnati Union Terminal
Cincinnati, Ohio

...Tonight I want to take a few minutes to discuss a grave threat to peace, and America's determination to lead the world in confronting that threat.

The threat comes from Iraq. It arises directly from the Iraqi regime's own actions -- its history of aggression, and its drive toward an arsenal of terror. Eleven years ago, as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf War, the Iraqi regime was required to destroy its weapons of mass destruction, to cease all development of such weapons, and to stop all support for terrorist groups. The Iraqi regime has violated all of those obligations. It possesses and produces chemical and biological weapons. It is seeking nuclear weapons. It has given shelter and support to terrorism, and practices terror against its own people. The entire world has witnessed Iraq's eleven-year history of defiance, deception and bad faith...

... Members of the Congress of both political parties, and members of the United Nations Security Council, agree that Saddam Hussein is a threat to peace and must disarm. We agree that the Iraqi dictator must not be permitted to threaten America and the world with horrible poisons and diseases and gases and atomic weapons. Since we all agree on this goal, the issue is : how can we best achieve it?...

.. First, some ask why Iraq is different from other countries or regimes that also have terrible weapons. While there are many dangers in the world, the threat from Iraq stands alone -- because it gathers the most serious dangers of our age in one place. Iraq's weapons of mass destruction are controlled by a murderous tyrant who has already used chemical weapons to kill thousands of people. This same tyrant has tried to dominate the Middle East, has invaded and brutally occupied a small neighbor, has struck other nations without warning, and holds an unrelenting hostility toward the United States...

Some ask how urgent this danger is to America and the world... If we know Saddam Hussein has dangerous weapons today -- and we do -- does it make any sense for the world to wait to confront him as he grows even stronger and develops even more dangerous weapons?

... In 1995, after several years of deceit by the Iraqi regime, the head of Iraq's military industries defected. It was then that the regime was forced to admit that it had produced more than 30,000 liters of anthrax and other deadly biological agents. The inspectors, however, concluded that Iraq had likely produced two to four times that amount. This is a massive stockpile of biological weapons that has never been accounted for, and capable of killing millions...

We know that the regime has produced thousands of tons of chemical agents, including mustard gas, sarin nerve gas, VX nerve gas. Saddam Hussein also has experience in using chemical weapons. He has ordered chemical attacks on Iran, and on more than forty villages in his own country. These actions killed or injured at least 20,000 people, more than six times the number of people who died in the attacks of September the 11th.

And surveillance photos reveal that the regime is rebuilding facilities that it had used to produce chemical and biological weapons. Every chemical and biological weapon that Iraq has or makes is a direct violation of the truce that ended the Persian Gulf War in 1991. Yet, Saddam Hussein has chosen to build and keep these weapons despite international sanctions, U.N. demands, and isolation from the civilized world.

Iraq possesses ballistic missiles with a likely range of hundreds of miles -- far enough to strike Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey, and other nations -- in a region where more than 135,000 American civilians and service members live and work.

... We know that Iraq and the al Qaeda terrorist network share a common enemy -- the United States of America. We know that Iraq and al Qaeda have had high-level contacts that go back a decade. Some al Qaeda leaders who fled Afghanistan went to Iraq. These include one very senior al Qaeda leader who received medical treatment in Baghdad this year, and who has been associated with planning for chemical and biological attacks. We've learned that Iraq has trained al Qaeda members in bomb-making and poisons and deadly gases. And we know that after September the 11th, Saddam Hussein's regime gleefully celebrated the terrorist attacks on America...

... Many people have asked how close Saddam Hussein is to developing a nuclear weapon. Well, we don't know exactly, and that's the problem...

... Iraq has attempted to purchase high-strength aluminum tubes and other equipment needed for gas centrifuges, which are used to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons.

... If the Iraqi regime is able to produce, buy, or steal an amount of highly enriched uranium a little larger than a single softball, it could have a nuclear weapon in less than a year. And if we allow that to happen, a terrible line would be crossed. Saddam Hussein would be in a position to blackmail anyone who opposes his aggression. He would be in a position to dominate the Middle East. He would be in a position to threaten America. And Saddam Hussein would be in a position to pass nuclear technology to terrorists...

... Some citizens wonder, after 11 years of living with this problem, why do we need to confront it now? And there's a reason. We've experienced the horror of September the 11th. We have seen that those who hate America are willing to crash airplanes into buildings full of innocent people. Our enemies would be no less willing, in fact, they would be eager, to use biological or chemical, or a nuclear weapon...

... Some citizens wonder, after 11 years of living with this problem, why do we need to confront it now? And there's a reason. We've experienced the horror of September the 11th. We have seen that those who hate America are willing to crash airplanes into buildings full of innocent people. Our enemies would be no less willing, in fact, they would be eager, to use biological or chemical, or a nuclear weapon...

... Failure to act would embolden other tyrants, allow terrorists access to new weapons and new resources, and make blackmail a permanent feature of world events. The United Nations would betray the purpose of its founding, and prove irrelevant to the problems of our time. And through its inaction, the United States would resign itself to a future of fear...

... We did not ask for this present challenge, but we accept it. Like other generations of Americans, we will meet the responsibility of defending human liberty against violence and aggression. By our resolve, we will give strength to others. By our courage, we will give hope to others. And by our actions, we will secure the peace, and lead the world to a better day.

May God bless America.

Bush, George W. (07 October 2002). *President Bush Outlines Iraqi Threat*. Accessed October 1st, 2006 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/print/20021007-8.html>

DATA SET 6

"Why We Know Iraq is Lying" A Column by Dr. Condoleezza Rice

By Condoleezza Rice

Originally appeared in the New York Times on January 23, 2003

WASHINGTON. Eleven weeks after the United Nations Security Council unanimously passed a resolution demanding yet again that Iraq disclose and disarm all its nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs, it is appropriate to ask, "Has Saddam Hussein finally decided to voluntarily disarm?" Unfortunately, the answer is a clear and resounding no.

There is no mystery to voluntary disarmament. Countries that decide to disarm lead inspectors to weapons and production sites, answer questions before they are asked, state publicly and often the intention to disarm and urge their citizens to cooperate. The world knows from examples set by South Africa, Ukraine and Kazakhstan what it looks like when a government decides that it will cooperatively give up its weapons of mass destruction. The critical common elements of these efforts include a high-level political commitment to disarm, national initiatives to dismantle weapons programs, and full cooperation and transparency.

In 1989 South Africa made the strategic decision to dismantle its covert nuclear weapons program. It destroyed its arsenal of seven weapons and later submitted to rigorous verification by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Inspectors were given complete access to all nuclear facilities (operating and defunct) and the people who worked there. They were also presented with thousands of documents detailing, for example, the daily operation of uranium enrichment facilities as well as the construction and dismantling of specific weapons.

Ukraine and Kazakhstan demonstrated a similar pattern of cooperation when they decided to rid themselves of the nuclear weapons, intercontinental ballistic missiles and heavy bombers inherited from the Soviet Union. With significant assistance from the United States warmly accepted by both countries disarmament was orderly, open and fast. Nuclear warheads were returned to Russia. Missile silos and heavy bombers were destroyed or dismantled once in a ceremony attended by the American and Russian defense chiefs. In one instance, Kazakhstan revealed the existence of a ton of highly enriched uranium and asked the United States to remove it, lest it fall into the wrong hands.

Iraq's behavior could not offer a starker contrast. Instead of a commitment to disarm, Iraq has a high-level political commitment to maintain and conceal its weapons, led by Saddam Hussein and his son Qusay, who controls the Special Security Organization, which runs Iraq's concealment activities. Instead of implementing national initiatives to disarm, Iraq maintains institutions whose sole purpose is to thwart the work of the inspectors. And instead of full cooperation and transparency, Iraq has filed a false declaration to the United Nations that amounts to a 12,200-page lie.

For example, the declaration fails to account for or explain Iraq's efforts to get uranium from abroad, its manufacture of specific fuel for ballistic missiles it claims not to have, and the gaps previously identified by the United Nations in Iraq's accounting for more than two tons of the raw materials needed to produce thousands of gallons of anthrax and other biological weapons.

Iraq's declaration even resorted to unabashed plagiarism, with lengthy passages of United Nations reports copied word-for-word (or edited to remove any criticism of Iraq) and presented as original text. Far from informing, the declaration is intended to cloud and confuse the true picture of Iraq's arsenal. It is a reflection of the regime's well-earned reputation for dishonesty and constitutes a material breach of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441, which set up the current inspections program.

Unlike other nations that have voluntarily disarmed and in defiance of Resolution 1441 Iraq is not allowing inspectors "immediate, unimpeded, unrestricted access" to facilities and people involved in its weapons program. As a recent inspection at the home of an Iraqi nuclear scientist demonstrated, and other

sources confirm, material and documents are still being moved around in farcical shell games. The regime has blocked free and unrestricted use of aerial reconnaissance.

The list of people involved with weapons of mass destruction programs, which the United Nations required Iraq to provide, ends with those who worked in 1991 even though the United Nations had previously established that the programs continued after that date. Interviews with scientists and weapons officials identified by inspectors have taken place only in the watchful presence of the regime's agents. Given the duplicitous record of the regime, its recent promises to do better can only be seen as an attempt to stall for time.

Last week's finding by inspectors of 12 chemical warheads not included in Iraq's declaration was particularly troubling. In the past, Iraq has filled this type of warhead with sarin a deadly nerve agent used by Japanese terrorists in 1995 to kill 12 Tokyo subway passengers and sicken thousands of others. Richard Butler, the former chief United Nations arms inspector, estimates that if a larger type of warhead that Iraq has made and used in the past were filled with VX (an even deadlier nerve agent) and launched at a major city, it could kill up to one million people. Iraq has also failed to provide United Nations inspectors with documentation of its claim to have destroyed its VX stockpiles.

Many questions remain about Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programs and arsenal and it is Iraq's obligation to provide answers. It is failing in spectacular fashion. By both its actions and its inactions, Iraq is proving not that it is a nation bent on disarmament, but that it is a nation with something to hide. Iraq is still treating inspections as a game. It should know that time is running out.

Condoleezza Rice is the National Security Adviser.

Rice, Condoleezza. (23 January 2003). *Why We Know Iraq is Lying*. Accessed October 1st, 2006 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/print/20030123-1.html>

DATA SET 7

President: Iraqi Regime Danger to America is "Grave and Growing"

Radio Address by the President to the Nation

 [Audio](#)
 [en Español](#)

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. This week leaders of the Congress agreed on a strong bipartisan resolution authorizing the use of force if necessary to disarm Saddam Hussein and to defend the peace. Now both the House and the Senate will have an important debate and an historic vote. Speaker Hastert and Leader Gephardt and Leader Lott did tremendous work in building bipartisan support on this vital issue.

The danger to America from the Iraqi regime is grave and growing. The regime is guilty of beginning two wars. It has a horrible history of striking without warning. In defiance of pledges to the United Nations, Iraq has stockpiled biological and chemical weapons, and is rebuilding the facilities used to make more of those weapons. Saddam Hussein has used these weapons of death against innocent Iraqi people, and we have every reason to believe he will use them again.

Iraq has longstanding ties to terrorist groups, which are capable of and willing to deliver weapons of mass death. And Iraq is ruled by perhaps the world's most brutal dictator who has already committed genocide with chemical weapons, ordered the torture of children, and instituted the systematic rape of the wives and daughters of his political opponents.

We cannot leave the future of peace and the security of America in the hands of this cruel and dangerous man. This dictator must be disarmed. And all the United Nations resolutions against his brutality and support for terrorism must be enforced.

The United States does not desire military conflict, because we know the awful nature of war. Our country values life, and we will never seek war unless it is essential to security and justice. We hope that Iraq complies with the world's demands. If, however, the Iraqi regime persists in its defiance, the use of force may become unavoidable. Delay, indecision, and inaction are not options for America, because they could lead to massive and sudden horror.

Should force be required to bring Saddam to account, the United States will work with other nations to help the Iraqi people rebuild and form a just government. We have no quarrel with the Iraqi people. They are the daily victims of Saddam Hussein's oppression, and they will be the first to benefit when the world's demands are met.

American security, the safety of our friends, and the values of our country lead us to confront this gathering threat. By supporting the resolution now before them, members of Congress will send a clear message to Saddam: His only choice is to fully comply with the demands of the world. And the time for that choice is limited. Supporting this resolution will also show the resolve of the United States, and will help spur the United Nations to act.

I urge Americans to call their members of Congress to make sure your voice is heard. The decision before Congress cannot be more consequential. I'm confident that members of both political parties will choose wisely.

Thank you for listening.

Bush, George W. *President: Iraqi Regime Danger to America is "Grave and Growing."* (5th October 2002). Accessed October 1st, 2006 from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/10/print/20021005.html>

DATA SET 8

Congress OKs force in Iraq

By CRAIG GILBERT
cgilbert@journalsentinel.com

Posted: Oct. 11, 2002

Washington - Over the misgivings of many Democrats, Congress voted by large margins Thursday and early Friday to give President Bush the power and military mandate he asked for against Saddam Hussein.

After the House vote, Bush hailed the outcome, saying it "sends a clear message to the Iraqi regime: It must disarm and comply with all existing U.N. resolutions or it will be forced to comply."

Said Bush: "There are no other options for the Iraqi regime. There can be no negotiations. The days of Iraq acting as an outlaw state are coming to an end."

In a 296-133 vote Thursday, House members approved a resolution that empowers the president to use U.S. forces against Iraq - either in concert with the international community, or alone if Bush deems it necessary to "defend the national security of the United States against the continuing threat posed by Iraq."

The Senate vote early Friday was 77-23.

Before choking up with emotion on the House floor, outgoing GOP Majority Leader Dick Armey of Texas addressed himself to Bush, saying Congress was placing the lives of American soldiers in his hands and handing him "a great trust."

It was also a freer hand than some members could endorse.

The House vote for the use-of-force resolution backed by the White House was 215-6 among Republicans. But Democrats opposed the measure by a margin of 126-81. Independent Bernie Sanders of Vermont also voted no.

All four Wisconsin Republicans - and La Crosse Democrat Ron Kind - voted for the resolution. The state's other four House Democrats voted no.

Most House Democrats supported an alternative use-of-force resolution that was defeated. That measure authorized the president to use force, pursuant to action by the United Nations Security Council, to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction.

But it would have required Bush to come back to Congress for authority later to "go it alone" militarily against Iraq.

Wisconsin's two Senate Democrats split on today's vote, with Herb Kohl voting for the authority Bush wanted and Russ Feingold voting against it.

Voting was preceded by several days of occasionally emotional but suspense-free debate, with the outcome forecast weeks in advance. Supporters said broad authority was needed to strengthen Bush's hand in pressuring the Security Council to act and Iraq to disarm. Opponents called the resolution a "blank check" and argued that any U.S. action against Hussein should be in conjunction with the U.N. and allies, not unilateral.

"No Congress should give any president a blank check to launch a unilateral first strike for any reason, any time, with or without allies," said House Democrat Jay Inslee of Washington.

But supporters of the resolution argued that a no vote would undercut Bush and send the wrong message to Iraq and the United Nations. House GOP Whip Tom DeLay of Texas urged colleagues to take "the bold path of action, not the hollow comfort of appeasement."

Those supporters also included House Democratic leader Dick Gephardt of Missouri, the last in his party to speak, who argued that authorizing force against Iraq was not an invitation for Bush to act unilaterally and not an endorsement of a new American doctrine of striking first to pre-empt threats.

But Gephardt argued that Iraq under Hussein posed an unacceptable hostile threat in today's world.

"September 11 has made all the difference," Gephardt said. "We must now do everything in our power to prevent further terrorist attacks and ensure that an attack with a weapon of mass destruction cannot happen."

California Democrat Howard Berman put it this way: "Saddam with a nuclear weapon is too horrifying to contemplate, too terrifying to tolerate."

Experts have said Iraq is pursuing nuclear weapons but would need to obtain nuclear material from outside sources to build a bomb in the near future.

Ohio Democrat Dennis Kucinich, who has led an anti-war coalition in the House, argued that attacking Iraq without being directly provoked would be immoral.

"It is fear which leads us to war," he said. "It is fear which leads us to believe we must kill or be killed. It is fear which leads us to believe we must attack those who have not attacked us."

Shortly before the House vote, two women in the gallery overlooking the chamber cried out, "Americans don't want this war," "No war" and "No blood for oil." They were led out.

Democratic Sen. Robert Byrd of West Virginia complained bitterly that the measure was an unconstitutional abdication of congressional authority and said its "preordained" passage would do a "grave disservice to the nation." He voiced biting skepticism about the imminence of the Iraqi threat.

But Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle of South Dakota, who had reservations of his own about the resolution, threw his support behind it Thursday, joining the other party leaders in both houses.

"We do know . . . that Iraq has weaponized thousands of gallons of anthrax and other deadly biological agents," Daschle said.

"We know that Iraq maintains stockpiles of some of the world's deadliest chemical weapons, including VX, sarin and mustard gas. We know that Iraq is developing deadlier ways to deliver these horrible weapons, including unmanned drones and long-range ballistic missiles. And we know that Saddam Hussein is committed to one day possessing nuclear weapons.

"If that should happen, instead of simply bullying the Gulf region, he could dominate it. Instead of threatening only his neighbors, he would become a grave threat to U.S. security and to global security. The threat posed by Saddam Hussein may not be imminent. But it is real. It is growing. And it cannot be ignored," Daschle said.

He and other Democrats said the resolution that won approval was better and narrower than the one initially proposed by Bush.

With Thursday's action, Bush carried more support than his father did when he was granted war powers prior to driving Iraq out of Kuwait in early 1991.

The House approved the use of force on that occasion by a vote of 250-183. In that instance, Democrats voted against force 179-86.

Of the 54 House Democrats still serving who voted no on the use of force against Iraq in 1991, 15 of them voted yes this time on the broad force resolution supported by the White House. Some cited the impact of Sept. 11 and a sense of urgency about America's vulnerability.

But the movement wasn't entirely in one direction. Five Democrats who voted yes on force 11 years ago voted no Thursday, an indication that some lawmakers found the argument for military action weaker now than it was after Iraq's 1990 invasion of Kuwait.

Alternatives rejected

Prior to approving the use-of-force resolution, the House rejected two Democratic alternatives.

One urged the U.S. to pursue diplomatic solutions but did not authorize the use of force. It was rejected 355-72. Madison Democrat Tammy Baldwin was the only House member from Wisconsin to vote for it.

The other resolution authorized the president to use force in conjunction with U.N. action, but it required a later vote if Bush wanted to use force unilaterally. It lost 270-155. Wisconsin House members split along party lines, with Democrats supporting and Republicans opposed.

The resolution that won approval encourages Bush to work with the U.N. Security Council to enforce that body's own resolutions dealing with Iraq's weapons programs, human rights abuses and other conduct.

But it also authorizes him to use force "as he determines it to be necessary and appropriate" to defend national security and enforce "all relevant" Security Council resolutions.

Should the president exercise that authority, he is required to make a determination to Congress that diplomatic efforts have been exhausted and that any action is consistent with prosecuting the war on terrorism.

Gilbert, Craig. (2002). Congress OKs force in Iraq [Electronic Version]. Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel. Accessed October 1st, 2006 from <http://www.jsonline.com/story/index.aspx?id=86834>

Data Set 9

CIA Key Judgments

Iraq's Weapons of Mass Destruction Programs

Iraq has continued its weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs in defiance of UN resolutions and restrictions. Baghdad has chemical and biological weapons as well as missiles with ranges in excess of UN restrictions; if left unchecked, it probably will have a nuclear weapon during this decade.

Baghdad hides large portions of Iraq's WMD efforts. Revelations after the Gulf war starkly demonstrate the extensive efforts undertaken by Iraq to deny information.

Since inspections ended in 1998, Iraq has maintained its chemical weapons effort, energized its missile program, and invested more heavily in biological weapons; most analysts assess Iraq is reconstituting its nuclear weapons program.

- Iraq's growing ability to sell oil illicitly increases Baghdad's capabilities to finance WMD programs; annual earnings in cash and goods have more than quadrupled.
- Iraq largely has rebuilt missile and biological weapons facilities damaged during Operation Desert Fox and has expanded its chemical and biological infrastructure under the cover of civilian production.
- Baghdad has exceeded UN range limits of 150 km with its ballistic missiles and is working with unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), which allow for a more lethal means to deliver biological and, less likely, chemical warfare agents.
- Although Saddam probably does not yet have nuclear weapons or sufficient material to make any, he remains intent on acquiring them.

How quickly Iraq will obtain its first nuclear weapon depends on when it acquires sufficient weapons-grade fissile material.

- If Baghdad acquires sufficient weapons-grade fissile material from abroad, it could make a nuclear weapon within a year.
- Without such material from abroad, Iraq probably would not be able to make a weapon until the last half of the decade.
- Iraq's aggressive attempts to obtain proscribed high-strength aluminum tubes are of significant concern. All intelligence experts agree that Iraq is seeking nuclear weapons and that these tubes could be used in a centrifuge enrichment program. Most intelligence specialists assess this to be the intended use, but some believe that these tubes are probably intended for conventional weapons programs.
- Based on tubes of the size Iraq is trying to acquire, a few tens of thousands of centrifuges would be capable of producing enough highly enriched uranium for a couple of weapons per year.

Baghdad has begun renewed production of chemical warfare agents, probably including mustard, sarin, cyclosarin, and VX. Its capability was reduced during the UNSCOM inspections and is probably more limited now than it was at the time of the Gulf war, although VX production and agent storage life probably have been improved.

- Saddam probably has stocked a few hundred metric tons of CW agents.
- The Iraqis have experience in manufacturing CW bombs, artillery rockets, and projectiles, and probably possess CW bulk fills for SRBM warheads, including for a limited number of covertly stored, extended-range Scuds.

All key aspects—R&D, production, and weaponization—of Iraq's offensive BW program are active and most elements are larger and more advanced than they were before the Gulf war.

- Iraq has some lethal and incapacitating BW agents and is capable of quickly producing and weaponizing a variety of such agents, including anthrax, for delivery by bombs, missiles, aerial sprayers, and covert operatives, including potentially against the US Homeland.
- Baghdad has established a large-scale, redundant, and concealed BW agent production capability, which includes mobile facilities; these facilities can evade detection, are highly survivable, and can exceed the production rates Iraq had prior to the Gulf war.

Iraq maintains a small missile force and several development programs, including for a UAV that most analysts believe probably is intended to deliver biological warfare agents.

- Gaps in Iraqi accounting to UNSCOM suggest that Saddam retains a covert force of up to a few dozen Scud-variant SRBMs with ranges of 650 to 900 km.
- Iraq is deploying its new al-Samoud and Ababil-100 SRBMs, which are capable of flying beyond the UN-authorized 150-km range limit.
- Baghdad's UAVs—especially if used for delivery of chemical and biological warfare (CBW) agents—could threaten Iraq's neighbors, US forces in the Persian Gulf, and the United States if brought close to, or into, the US Homeland.
- Iraq is developing medium-range ballistic missile capabilities, largely through foreign assistance in building specialized facilities.

DATA SET 10

Selected United States Crude Oil and Petroleum Imports (200-2005)

Iraq Crude Oil and Petroleum Exports to US (2000-2005)

2000's	226,804	289,998	167,638	175,663	240,191	193,987
---------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Venezuela Crude Oil and Petroleum Exports to US (2000-2005)

2000's	565,865	566,996	510,362	502,328	568,944	558,157
---------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Saudi Arabia Crude Oil and Petroleum Exports to US (2000-2005)

2000's	575,274	606,753	566,512	647,666	570,137	560,823
---------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Angola Crude Oil and Petroleum Exports to US (2000-2005)

2000's	110,321	119,710	121,185	135,559	115,708	172,609
---------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Canada Crude Oil and Petroleum Exports to US (2000-2005)

2000's	661,351	667,374	719,334	756,354	782,598	796,219
---------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Ecuador Crude Oil and Petroleum Exports to US (2000-2005)

2000's	46,821	43,676	40,262	52,752	89,640	103,153
---------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------

Ecuador Crude Oil and Petroleum Exports to US (2000-2005)

2000's	502,509	525,557	564,497	592,466	609,225	606,751
---------------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------

Russia Crude Oil and Petroleum Exports to US (2000-2005)

2000's	26,382	32,783	76,690	92,711	109,151	149,681
---------------	--------	--------	--------	--------	---------	---------

US Virgin Islands Crude Oil and Petroleum Exports to US (2000-2005)

2000's	106,681	97,672	86,022	104,981	120,860	119,544
---------------	---------	--------	--------	---------	---------	---------

US All Grades All Formulations Retail Gasoline Prices (Cents per Gallon) 2000-2006

2000's	152.3	146.0	138.6	160.3	189.5	231.4	261.8
---------------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Energy Information Administration. *US Imports by Country of Origin*. Accessed Online October 1st, 2006 from http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/dnav/pet/pet_move_impcus_a2_nus_ep00_im0_mbbl_a.htm

Energy Information Administration. *US All Grades All Formulations Retail Gas Price..* Accessed Online October 1st, 2006 from http://tonto.eia.doe.gov/dnav/pet/pet_pri_gnd_dcus_nus_a.htm

DATA SET 11

Halliburton job bigger than thought

Army says \$7 B contract to repair Iraq's oil fields includes operations and oil distribution.

May 7, 2003: 3:12 PM EDT

WASHINGTON (CNN) - Halliburton Co.'s \$7 billion contract, awarded without competition, to make emergency repairs to Iraq's oil infrastructure also gives it the power to run all phases of Iraq's oil industry, according to U.S. Rep. Henry Waxman, D-Calif.

Waxman said, based on a letter he received May 2 from the Army, that "the contract with Halliburton -- a company with close ties to the administration -- can include 'operation' of Iraqi oil fields and 'distribution' of Iraqi oil."

Officials previously had said the contract dealt only with putting out oil well fires and performing emergency repairs as needed.

"These new disclosures are significant, and they seem at odds with the [Bush] administration's repeated assurances that the Iraqi oil belongs to the Iraqi people," Waxman said in a May 6 letter to the Army.

Halliburton said these duties are not inconsistent with its previous statements that it was hired to "provide services for the continuity of operations of the Iraqi oil infrastructure."

"As directed by the US Army Corps of Engineers, KBR is assisting the Iraqi oil workers in the operation of their facilities," Halliburton spokeswoman Wendy Hall said. She deferred questions about the possible length of the contract to the Army.

The awarding of the contract in March prompted some lawmakers, along with watchdog groups, to question whether the administration's deep ties with Halliburton helped secure the contract.

"There don't seem to be any criteria [for picking the contractor], other than the close connections a company might have with the administration," said Charlie Cray, director of the corporate reform campaign at Citizen Works, a Washington watchdog group founded by Ralph Nader. "The fact that the contracts are secret enhances the appearance of handing out contracts to cronies."

The White House has denied any accusations of favoritism, and the Army said Halliburton was chosen because it won a competitive bid last year to prepare a contingency plan for shoring up Iraq's oil production after the war.

A Cheney spokeswoman denied the Vice President, who was CEO of Halliburton from 1995-2000, had anything to do with the contract.

Cheney sold all his Halliburton shares during the presidential election of 2000, and he has promised to give to charity any profit from Halliburton stock options he still owns. He still is paid a set amount by Halliburton every year, but he's guaranteed that money even if Halliburton goes bankrupt.

The Army has promised it will soon issue a new contract, subject to an open bidding process, for longer-term work in Iraq.

This opportunity for future work could be one reason why Halliburton's competitors, such as [Schlumberger Ltd. \(SLB: Research, Estimates\)](#), [Baker Hughes Inc. \(BHI: Research, Estimates\)](#), [GlobalSantaFe Corp. \(GSF: Research, Estimates\)](#), [Nabors Industries Ltd. \(NBR: Research, Estimates\)](#) and [Weatherford International \(WFT: Research, Estimates\)](#), have chosen not to join the chorus of critics accusing the Bush administration of favoritism.

"Because the companies haven't complained is not to say they are not well positioned," said Prabhas Panigrahi, director of research at Kevin Dann & Partners. "They will get involved later. To complain right now would sound like sour grapes."

Panigrahi and other analysts say there are many stages still to come in boosting Iraq's oil production back to its pre-war capacity of about 2 million barrels per day and to its potential capacity of more than 3 million bpd.

So, even if they're shut out of the work now, they still could have plenty to do in the months and years to come.

"We're still interested in any work that ends up being put out for bid," said [Fluor Corp. \(FLR: Research, Estimates\)](#), which also could be in line to work on Iraq's oil fields.

Schlumberger and Baker Hughes had no comment about the Halliburton contract or their potential roles in Iraq. The other companies mentioned in this article could not be reached for comment.

Waxman had written to Lt. Gen. Robert B. Flowers of the Army Corps of Engineers seeking answers as to why the contract, which could be worth up to \$7 billion over two years, netting Halliburton a \$490 million profit, "is apparently structured in such a way as to encourage the contractor to increase its costs and, consequently, the costs to the taxpayer."

Flowers responded that the sum was based on the "worst scenario" that a large proportion of Iraq's 1,500 wells would be set ablaze, and that there would be "massive intentional oil spills and pollution resulting from the fires." It turned out only a few oil wells were set ablaze during the war.

Flowers said "task orders are placed only for work that is required in the near term." He did not give an overall dollar amount on the contract. ■

-- Additional reporting by CNN/Money Staff Writers Mark Gongloff and Andrew Stein

DATA SET 12

US President George W Bush has explicitly stated for the first time that there is no evidence that Saddam Hussein was involved in the 11 September attacks.

Mr Bush has never directly accused the former Iraqi leader of having a hand in the attacks on New York and Washington, but he has repeatedly associated the two in keynote addresses delivered since 11 September. Senior members of his administration have similarly conflated the two.

A recent opinion poll suggests that 70% of Americans believe the Iraqi leader was personally involved in the attacks.



Bush maintains Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda are connected

Despite his stated rejection of any clear link between Saddam Hussein and the events of that day, Mr Bush continues to assert that the deposed president had ties with al-Qaeda, the terrorist network blamed for the 11 September attacks.

BBC News Online looks at some of the remarks made by Mr Bush and members of his administration both in the run-up to war and after hostilities had officially ended.

Iraq continues to flaunt its hostility toward America and to support terror.

President Bush in his State of the Union address, January 2002. The speech was primarily concerned with how the US was coping in the aftermath of 11 September.

We also must never forget the most vivid events of recent history. On 11 September, 2001, America felt its vulnerability - even to threats that gather on the other side of the earth. We resolved then, and we are resolved today, to confront every threat, from any source, that could bring sudden terror and suffering to America.

President Bush speaking in Cincinnati, Ohio, in October, 2002, in which he laid out the threat he believed Iraq posed.

Before 11 September 2001, many in the world believed that Saddam Hussein could be contained. But chemical agents and lethal viruses and shadowy terrorist networks are not easily contained. Imagine those 19 hijackers with other weapons, and other plans - this time armed by Saddam Hussein. It would take just one vial, one canister, one crate slipped into this country to bring a day of horror like none we have ever known.

President Bush in his State of the Union address, January 2003. He made these comments in the context of the links he perceived between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda.

The terrorists have lost a sponsor in Iraq. And no terrorist networks will ever gain weapons of mass destruction from Saddam Hussein's regime.

President Bush in his speech to the FBI Academy in Quantico, Virginia, September, 2003.

For America, there will be no going back to the era before 11 September 2001, to false comfort in a dangerous world. We have learned that terrorist attacks are not caused by the use of strength.

They are invited by the perception of weakness. And the surest way to avoid attacks on our own people is to engage the enemy where he lives and plans.

We are fighting that enemy in Iraq and Afghanistan today so that we do not meet him again on our own streets, in our own cities.

President Bush in a televised address to defend his administration's policy on Iraq, September 2003.

We've learned that Iraq has trained al-Qaeda members in bomb-making and poisons and deadly gases. And we know that after 11 September, Saddam Hussein's regime gleefully celebrated the terrorist attacks on America.

Some citizens wonder, after 11 years of living with this problem, why do we need to confront it now? And there's a reason. We've experienced the horror of 11 September.

US Secretary of State Colin Powell in a presentation to the UN Security Council, setting out the US case against the Iraqi regime, February 2003.

We don't know.

Vice-President Dick Cheney when pressed on whether there was a link between Iraq and 11 September during a TV interview, September 2003.

We will have struck a major blow right at the heart of the base, if you will, the geographic base of the terrorists who've had us under assault now for many years, but most especially on 9/11.

Mr Cheney in the same interview, commenting on the war against Iraq.

We've never been able to develop any more of that yet, either in terms of confirming it or discrediting it.

Mr Cheney in the same interview, while recounting the controversial claim that one of the hijackers, Mohammed Atta, met an Iraqi official in Prague before the attacks.

[Saddam Hussein posed a risk in] a region from which the 9/11 threat emerged.

National Security Adviser Condoleezza Rice defending the reasons why the US went to war against Iraq, September, 2003.

DATA SET 13

CIA's final report: No WMD found in Iraq

(Agencies)

Updated: 2005-04-26 08:53

In his final word, the CIA's top weapons inspector in Iraq said Monday that the hunt for weapons of mass destruction has "gone as far as feasible" and has found nothing, closing an investigation into the purported programs of Saddam Hussein that were used to justify the 2003 invasion.

"After more than 18 months, the WMD investigation and debriefing of the WMD-related detainees has been exhausted," wrote Charles Duelfer, head of the Iraq Survey Group, in an addendum to the final report he issued last fall.

"As matters now stand, the WMD investigation has gone as far as feasible."

In 92 pages posted online Monday evening, Duelfer provides a final look at an investigation that occupied over 1,000 military and civilian translators, weapons specialists and other experts at its peak. His latest addenda conclude a roughly 1,500-page report released last fall.

On Monday, Duelfer said there is no purpose in keeping many of the detainees who are in custody because of their knowledge on Iraq's weapons, although he did not provide any details about the current number. A U.S. official, who spoke on condition of anonymity, said the ultimate decision on their release will be made by the Iraqi authorities.

The survey group also provided warnings.

The addenda conclude that Saddam's programs created a pool of experts now available to develop and produce weapons and many will be seeking work. While most will probably turn to the "benign civil sector," the danger remains that "hostile foreign governments, terrorists or insurgents may seek Iraqi expertise."

"Because a single individual can advance certain WMD activities, it remains an important concern," one addendum said.

Another addendum also noted that military forces in Iraq may continue to find small numbers of degraded chemical weapons — most likely misplaced or improperly destroyed before the 1991 Gulf War. In an insurgent's hands, "the use of a single even ineffectual chemical weapon would likely cause more terror than deadlier conventional explosives," another addendum said.

And still another said the survey group found some potential nuclear-related equipment was "missing from heavily damaged and looted sites." Yet, because of the deteriorating security situation in Iraq, the survey group was unable to determine what happened to the equipment, which also had alternate civilian uses.

"Some of it probably has been sold for its scrap value. Other pieces might have been disassembled" and converted into motors or condensers, an addendum said. "Still others could have been taken intact to preserve their function."

Leaving the door to the investigation open just a crack, the U.S. official said a small team still operates under the U.S.-led multinational force in Iraq, although the survey group officially disbanded earlier this month. Those staying on continue to examine documents and follow up on any reports of weapons of mass destruction.

In a statement accompanying the final installment, Duelfer said a surprise discovery would most likely be in the biological weapons area because clues, such as the size of the facilities used to develop them, would be comparatively small.

Among unanswered questions, Duelfer said a group formed to investigate whether WMD-related material was shipped out of Iraq before the invasion wasn't able to reach firm conclusions because the security situation limited and later halted their work. Investigators were focusing on transfers from Iraq to Syria.

No information gleaned from questioning Iraqis supported the possibility, one addendum said. The Iraq Survey Group believes "it was unlikely that an official transfer of WMD material from Iraq to Syria took place. However, ISG was unable to rule out unofficial movement of limited WMD-related materials."

DATA SET 14

MEET THE PRESS

Guests: Secretary Colin Powell, Department of State; Senator Joseph Biden, D-DE, Ranking Member, Foreign Relations Committee; Senator John McCain, R-AZ, Armed Services Committee

Moderator/Panelist: Tim Russert - NBC News

This is a rush transcript provided for the information and convenience of the press. Accuracy is not guaranteed. In case of doubt, please check with:

MEET THE PRESS - NBC NEWS

(202) 885-4598

(Sundays: (202) 885-4200)

Meet the Press (NBC News) - Sunday, May 16, 2004

Tim Russert: Our issues this Sunday: Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld talks to the troops in Iraq about prison abuse.

(Videotape):

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld: In recent months, we've seen abuses here under our responsibility and it's been a body blow for all of us, but it doesn't represent America.

(End videotape)

Russert: An American civilian is beheaded.

(Videotape):

President George W. Bush: There is no justification for the brutal execution of Nicholas Berg-- no justification whatsoever.

(End videotape)

Russert: And the president asked Congress for more money for Iraq. What now?

With us: the Secretary of State, Colin Powell.

Will Iraq be the most important issue in the Bush-Kerry race? With us: former POW, now Republican senator from Arizona, John McCain, and the ranking Democrat of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Joe Biden of Delaware.

Powell, McCain, Biden, only on Meet the Press.

And in our Meet the Press Minute, a wartime secretary of Defense admits mistakes and miscalculations.

(Videotape):

Secretary Robert McNamara: I don't think any of us predicted seven years ago or 15 years ago the climate of 500,000 men in Vietnam. I know I didn't.

(End videotape)

Russert: But first: Earlier this morning, I spoke to Secretary of State Colin Powell, who is in Jordan.

Secretary Powell, good morning.

Let me show you the headline that greeted Americans and people around the world yesterday. "Powell Says Troops Would Leave Iraq if New Leaders Asked." What happened to staying the course?

Secretary of State Colin Powell: We are planning to stay the course and we expect that the Iraqi interim government that will come into place on the 1st of July, would certainly ask us to remain and help them stay the course. Excuse me, Tim. But, basically, what we are anxious to do is return sovereignty, but it's a long way between that initial return of sovereignty and national elections. And we're confident that we will stay the course. This was in response to a specific question as to what sovereignty meant.

Russert: But, Mr. Secretary, if you look at a poll taken by our own government, the Coalition Provisional Authority, it says, "Four out of five Iraqis report holding a negative view of the U.S. occupation authority and of coalition forces, according to a new poll conducted for the occupation authority. In the poll ... 82 percent said they disapprove of the U.S. and allied militaries in Iraq."

This was before the allegations of prison abuse. If a government is in power in Iraq, is responsive to its people, why wouldn't they say to the U.S, "Get out"?

Powell: Because there's still a need for the U.S. to remain. They need our financial support. They need the reconstruction effort that is under way. And, frankly, they need the U.S. armed

forces and the other coalition forces that are present to help create an environment of security and stability so they can get on with the process of rebuilding their country and preparing themselves for national elections. We don't want to stay one day longer than we have to, but we know they want us to remain long enough so that they have their own security forces built up and in place and that'll take some time.

Russert: John McCain said this the other day, Mr. Secretary: "If we fail in Iraq, we will have taught our enemies the lesson of Mogadishu, only one hundredfold: If you inflict enough pain, America will leave. Iraq will then descend into chaos and civil war. Warlords will reign. There will be bloodletting. We will have energized the extremists and created a breeding ground for terrorists, dooming the Arab world."

Do you agree?

Powell: We certainly are not going to cut and run. The president's made that clear. And quite the contrary, as you see from what Secretary Rumsfeld and General John Abizaid have done, we are stabilizing our force at a higher level than we thought we would at this point? Why? Because there is still danger there. Why? Because the work is not finished. Why? Because we need to help the Iraqi interim government as it is established create an environment of security.

So we're not going to walk away. We're not going to cut and run. We're going to stay and help the Iraqis do what we know the Iraqi people want and that is to have a democracy based on free elections. It takes time to get there and we are on our way with the creation of an Iraqi interim government.

Over the past several weeks, we've set up 11 Iraqi ministries that are now free-standing, not connected to the Coalition Provisional Authority. Of course, the Iraqis want the occupation to end. They want the Coalition Provisional Authority to cease its work and that's going to happen when this Iraqi interim government is established, but they need our troops there for some considerable period of time in the future to provide the security environment needed so that they can have free, open and fair election and have the time to build up their own security forces.

Russert: In those free, open and fair elections, if the Iraqi people choose an Islamic theocracy similar to what we have in Iran, we would accept that?

Powell: We will have to accept what the Iraqi people decide upon. But right now, I think most Iraqis understand that in order to live together in peace as a single nation, they have to have a nation which understands the role of the majority but respects the role of minorities within a country. And they know they have to have, for international acceptability, a country that preserves human rights, that is founded on democracy, that respects the rights of all individuals and respects the rights of women, that respects basic tenets with respect to open speech and

meeting fundamental needs of the people and the fundamental standards of human rights that all of us believe in.

Russert: But, Mr. Secretary, if the Iraqis opt for an Islamic theocracy, which could easily become a haven for terrorists, how then do we explain to the 782 who died or the nearly over 4,000 who were wounded or injured that this was worth the fight?

Powell: I don't think that's going to be the case. I think that those who have given their lives in the cause of freedom for the Iraqi people will see that the Iraqi people are interested in creating a democracy. If you look at the same kind of polling that you mentioned earlier, that's what they are interested in, that's what they're looking for.

If you talk to some of the Shia leaders, such as Mr. Sistani and others, Ayatollah Sistani, they are talking about openness and freedom. Surely everybody understands it is a nation that rests on the faith of Islam, but they also know that in order to be successful as a 21st-century country, they have to respect the rights of all individuals and not allow a purely fundamentalist regime to arise in the country. And my sensing of what the Iraqi people want is a democracy with a majority, but with respect for all the minorities, all working together to create the kind of country they'll be proud of.

Russert: Bob Woodruff reports that on August 5, 2002, you met with the president and warned him about Iraq; that, in your words, "You break it, you bought it." In light of the fact that we have miscalculated being greeted as liberators, miscalculated the number of troops needed, miscalculated the extent of weapons of mass destruction, do you wish the president had followed your advice?

Powell: My advice to the president was that we had to be sure that we understood the difficulties of managing this country once we took it over, if that's what it came to. The advice I gave to the president was that we should take it to the international community, to the United Nations, to see if there was a diplomatic solution before we resorted to the use of force. And if we had to resort to the use of force, we had made the efforts with the United Nations so that we could get coalition partners to join us. And the president followed that advice.

My advice to the president was to make sure that we understood all the consequences of the actions that we're about to take. And he took that advice, and he responded to that advice by going to the United Nations. And we went to the United Nations. We knew that it would either be solved diplomatically or through of use of force. And we knew that if it was the use of force, we would be in for a challenging time. We would be responsible for the fate of 25 million Iraqis. The president understood that. And we are acting on that responsibility.

We have 138,000 troops there providing security. We have provided \$18 billion for reconstruction and we're helping now the Iraqi people develop a democratic system. We are

putting in place ministries that are functioning and we're going to be moving forward to elections. And so, yes, the place was broken after the war. And we're well on our way to fixing it.

Russert: Let me show you the video of Nicholas Berg, with the terrorists behind him who are about to behead him. When you see that picture and then what happened to Mr. Berg, are you satisfied with the level of outrage that exists in the Arab world, the level of outrage that has been formally announced by Arab leaders?

Powell: I think that should be a higher level of outrage. Notwithstanding what people think, what we did at the prison, there can be no comparison to the actions of a few who are going to be punished and brought to justice as a result of what happened at Abu Ghraib. But what we saw with this horrible, horrible, horrible, horrible murder of Mr. Berg should be deplored throughout the world. It is an outrage and the terrible thing about it is these individuals are yet to be brought to justice. They have no concept of justice. They have no concept of right. What a horrible thing for them to have done. But as the president said, we will do everything we can to bring all of these people to justice so they can pay for this horrendous crime.

Russert: Why the silence from the Arab world about Mr. Berg?

Powell: Well, I don't know, Tim. I wish I could explain that. There ought to be outrage. There is anger in the Arab world about some of our actions, but that is no excuse for any silence on the part of any Arab leader for this kind of murder. This kind of murder is unacceptable in anyone's religion, in anybody's political system, that is a political system based on any kind of understanding and respect for human rights. And so I would like to have seen a much higher level of outrage throughout the world, and especially the Arab world, for this kind of action.

Russert: Let me show you a picture of a United States soldier holding an Iraqi prisoner by a dog leash. That, too, is seen around the world. This morning, Seymour Hersh reports, "The roots of the Abu Ghraib prison scandal lie not in the criminal inclinations of a few Army reservists but in a decision, approved last year by Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, to expand a highly secret operation, which had been focussed on the hunt for Al Qaeda, to the interrogation of prisoners in Iraq. ... According to interviews with several past and present American intelligence officials, the Pentagon's operations, known inside the intelligence community by several code words, including Copper Green, encouraged physical coercion and sexual humiliation of Iraqi prisoners in an effort to generate more intelligence about the growing insurgency in Iraq."

Your reaction.

Powell: I haven't read the article and I don't know anything about the substance of the article. I've just seen a quick summary of it, so I will have to yield to the Defense Department to

respond. And I think the initial response from the Defense Department is that there is no substance to the article, but I will have to yield to the Defense Department to handle any further comment, Tim.

Russert: But, Mr. Secretary, Newsweek reports that on January 25, 2002, the White House counsel, Alberto Gonzales, wrote a memo to your department which said, "In my judgment, this new paradigm of terrorism renders obsolete Geneva's strict limitation on questioning of enemy prisoners and renders quaint some of its provisions, the Geneva Accords." And it is reported that you hit the roof when you saw that memo to scale back, in effect, on the rules governing the treatment of prisoners. Is that accurate?

Powell: I don't recall the specific memo and I wouldn't comment on the specific memo without rereading it again. But I think I have always said that the Geneva Accord is an important standard in international law, and we have to comply with it, either by the letter, if it's appropriate to those individuals in our custody that they are really directly under the Geneva Convention, or if they're illegal non-combatants and not directly under the convention, we should treat them nevertheless in a humane manner in accordance with what is expected of us by international law and the Geneva Convention.

Russert: Mr. Secretary, you met with the International Red Cross on January 15. In February, they released their report which said that, amongst the other allegations, male prisoners were forced to wear women's underwear; prisoners were beaten by coalition forces, in one case leading to death; coalition forces firing on unarmed prisoners. And then in May, you and others in the administration said you were "shocked" by the allegations about U.S. forces' treatment of Iraqi prisoners. Didn't you have a heads-up on this whole problem?

Powell: In January, when I met with the head of the International Committee for the Red Cross, Mr. Kellenberger, he said to me that a report would be coming and it would outline some serious problems with respect to the treatment of prisoners in Iraq. We were aware of that within the administration. He also met with Dr. Rice and with Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz.

And then in early February, the actual report was presented to our authorities out in Baghdad, both to Ambassador Bremer's office and to General Sanchez's office. By then, of course, an investigation was already under way as a result of a soldier coming forward in the middle of January and outlining specific cases of abuse, and so an investigation was well under way by time the report was made available in February to the command. I first saw the report in March when it was made available eventually to us in Washington.

Russert: But you're a military man. Do you believe that national reservists would go to Baghdad with hoods or dog leashes and actually undertake that kind of activity without it being devised by someone higher up?

Powell: I wouldn't have believed that any American soldiers would have done any such thing, either on their own volition or even if someone higher up had told them. I'm not aware of anybody higher up telling them. But that's why Secretary Rumsfeld has commissioned all of these inquiries to get to the bottom of it.

What these individuals did was wrong, was against rules and regulations. It was against anything they should have learned in their home, in their community, in their upbringing. So we have a terrible collapse of order that took place in that prison cell block. Let's not use this to contaminate the wonderful work being done by tens of thousands of other young American soldiers in Iraq. We'll get to the bottom of this. Justice will be served.

The command responded promptly. Court-martials are already scheduled. And I know that the president wants to make sure that we follow the chain of accountability up to see if there was anybody above these soldiers who knew what was going on, or in any way created a command climate in which such activities might in some bizarre way be found acceptable. They were not acceptable in any way. And one soldier stood up and said, "I know this is wrong," reported it to his chain of command, and the chain of command responded the very next day with the launching of an investigation that became the General Taguba investigation.

Russert: Finally, Mr. Secretary, in February of 2003, you placed your enormous personal credibility before the United Nations and laid out a case against Saddam Hussein citing...

Powell: Not off.

Emily: No. They can't use it. They're editing it. They (unintelligible).

Powell: He's still asking me questions. Tim.

Emily: He was not...

Powell: Tim, I'm sorry, I lost you.

Russert: I'm right here, Mr. Secretary. I would hope they would put you back on camera. I don't know who did that.

Powell: We really...

Russert: I think that was one of your staff, Mr. Secretary. I don't think that's appropriate.

Powell: Emily, get out of the way.

Emily: OK.

Powell: Bring the camera back, please. I think we're back on, Tim. Go ahead with your last question.

Russert: Thank you very much, sir. In February of 2003, you put your enormous personal reputation on the line before the United Nations and said that you had solid sources for the case against Saddam Hussein. It now appears that an agent called Curveball had misled the CIA by suggesting that Saddam had trucks and trains that were delivering biological and chemical weapons. How concerned are you that some of the information you shared with the world is now inaccurate and discredited?

Powell: I'm very concerned. When I made that presentation in February 2003, it was based on the best information that the Central Intelligence Agency made available to me. We studied it carefully; we looked at the sourcing in the case of the mobile trucks and trains. There was multiple sourcing for that. Unfortunately, that multiple sourcing over time has turned out to be not accurate. And so I'm deeply disappointed. But I'm also comfortable that at the time that I made the presentation, it reflected the collective judgment, the sound judgment of the intelligence community. But it turned out that the sourcing was inaccurate and wrong and in some cases, deliberately misleading. And for that, I am disappointed and I regret it.

Russert: Mr. Secretary, we thank you very much for joining us again and sharing your views with us today.

DATA SET 15

Bush keeps revising war justification

(AP)

Updated: 2006-10-15 09:02

WASHINGTON - US President Bush keeps revising his explanation for why the U.S. is in Iraq, moving from narrow military objectives at first to history-of-civilization stakes now.



President Bush speaks during a news conference in the White House in this October 11, 2006, file photo. Bush said "We can't tolerate a new terrorist state in the heart of the Middle East, with large oil reserves that could be used to fund its radical ambitions, or used to inflict economic damage on the West. [AP]"

Initially, the rationale was specific: to stop Saddam Hussein from using what Bush claimed were the Iraqi leader's weapons of mass destruction or from selling them to al-Qaida or other terrorist groups.

But 3 1/2 years later, with no weapons found, still no end in sight and the war a liability for nearly all Republicans on the ballot Nov. 7, the justification has become far broader and now includes the expansive "struggle between good and evil."

Republicans seized on North Korea's reported nuclear test last week as further evidence that the need for strong U.S. leadership extends beyond Iraq.

Bush's changing rhetoric reflects increasing administration efforts to tie the war, increasingly unpopular at home, with the global fight against terrorism, still the president's strongest suit politically.

"We can't tolerate a new terrorist state in the heart of the Middle East, with large oil reserves that could be used to fund its radical ambitions, or used to inflict economic damage on the West," Bush

said in a news conference last week in the Rose Garden.

When no weapons of mass destruction were found in Iraq, Bush shifted his war justification to one of liberating Iraqis from a brutal ruler.

After Saddam's capture in December 2003, the rationale became helping to spread democracy through the Middle East. Then it was confronting terrorists in Iraq "so we do not have to face them here at home," and "making America safer," themes Bush pounds today.

"We're in the ideological struggle of the 21st century," he told a California audience this month. "It's a struggle between good and evil."

Vice President Dick Cheney takes it even further: "The hopes of the civilized world ride with us," Cheney tells audiences.

Except for the weapons of mass destruction argument, there is some validity in each of Bush's shifting rationales, said Michael O'Hanlon, a foreign policy scholar at the Brookings Institution who initially supported the war effort.

"And I don't have any big problems with any of them, analytically. The problem is they can't change the realities on the ground in Iraq, which is that we're in the process of beginning to lose," O'Hanlon said. "It is taking us a long time to realize that, but the war is not headed the way it should be."

Andrew Card, Bush's first chief of staff, said Bush's evolving rhetoric, including his insistence that Iraq is a crucial part of the fight against terrorism, is part of an attempt to put the war in better perspective for Americans.

The administration recently has been "doing a much better job" in explaining the stakes, Card said in an interview. "We never said it was going to be easy. The president always told us it would be long and tough."

"I'm trying to do everything I can to remind people that the war on terror has the war in Iraq as a subset. It's critical we succeed in Iraq as part of the war on terror," said Card, who left the White House in March.

Bush at first sought to explain increasing insurgent and sectarian violence as a lead-up to Iraqi elections. But elections came and went, and a democratically elected government took over, and the sectarian violence increased.

Bush has insisted U.S. soldiers will stand down as Iraqis stand up. He has likened the war to the 20th century struggles against fascism, Nazism and communism. He has called Iraq the "central front" in a global fight against radical jihadists.

Having jettisoned most of the earlier, upbeat claims of progress, Bush these days emphasizes consequences of setting even a limited withdrawal timetable: abandonment of the Iraqi people, destabilizing the Middle East and emboldening terrorists around the world.

The more ominous and determined his words, the more skeptical the American public appears, polls show, both on the war itself and over whether it is part of the larger fight against terrorism, as the administration insists.

Bush's approval rating, reflected by AP-Ipsos polls, has slid from the mid 60s at the outset of the U.S.-led invasion in March 2003 to the high 30s now. There were light jumps upward after the December 2003 capture of Saddam, Bush's re-election in November 2004 and each of three series of aggressive speeches over the past year. Those gains tended to vanish quickly.

With the war intruding on the fall elections, both parties have stepped up their rhetoric.

Republicans, who are also reeling from the congressional page scandal, are casting Democrats as seeking to "cut and run" and appease terrorists.

Democrats accuse Bush of failed leadership with his "stay the course" strategy. They cite a government intelligence assessment suggesting the Iraq war has helped recruit more terrorists, and a book by journalist Bob Woodward that portrays Bush as intransigent in his defense of the Iraq war and his advisers as bitterly divided.

Democrats say Iraq has become a distraction from the war against terrorism ^{is} not a central front. But they are divided among themselves on what strategy to pursue.

Republicans, too, increasingly are growing divided as U.S. casualties rise.

"I struggle with the fact that President Bush said, 'As the Iraqis stand up, we will stand down.' But the fact is, this has not happened," said Rep. Christopher Shays, R-Conn., a war supporter turned war skeptic.

The Republican chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Sen. John Warner of Virginia, said after a recent visit to Iraq that Iraq was "drifting sideways." He urged consideration of a "change of course" if the Iraq government fails to restore order over the next two or three months.

More than 2,750 members of the U.S. military have died since the beginning of the war, most of them since Bush's May 2003 "mission accomplished" aircraft carrier speech. Tens of thousands of Iraqis have died.

Recent events have been dispiriting.

The United States now has about 141,000 troops in Iraq, up from about 127,000 in July. Some military experts have suggested at least one additional U.S. division, or around 20,000 troops, is needed in western Iraq alone.

Dan Benjamin, a former Middle East specialist with the National Security Council in the Clinton administration, said the administration is overemphasizing the nature of the threat in an effort to bolster support.

"I think the administration has oversold the case that Iraq could become a jihadist state," said Benjamin, now with the Center for Strategic and International Studies. "If the U.S. were to leave Iraq tomorrow, the result would be a bloodbath in which Sunnis and Shiites fight it out. But the jihadists would not be able to seek power."

Not all of Bush's rhetorical flourishes have had the intended consequences.

When the history of Iraq is finally written, the recent surge in sectarian violence is "going to be a comma," Bush said in several recent appearances.

Critics immediately complained that the remark appeared unsympathetic and dismissive of U.S. and Iraqi casualties, an assertion the White House disputed.

For a while last summer, Bush depicted the war as one against "Islamic fascism," borrowing a phrase from conservative commentators. The strategy backfired, further fanning anti-American sentiment across the Muslim world.

The "fascism" phrase abruptly disappeared from Bush's speeches, reportedly after he was talked out of it by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Karen Hughes, a longtime Bush confidant now with the State Department.

Hughes said she would not disclose private conversations with the president. But, she told the AP, she did not use the "fascism" phrase herself. "I use 'violent extremist,'" she said.

Associated Press. (15 October 2006). *Bush keeps revising war justification*. Accessed online on October 3rd, 2006 from http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/world/2006-10/15/content_708298.htm

THE 2003 IRAQ WAR: INQUIRY LESSON REFLECTION

APPROPRIATENESS OF THE LESSON

This inquiry lesson is especially appropriate for the grade level, students, school, and community in which it will be taught for a number of reasons. This lesson is appropriate for high school students, especially upper-level students due to the necessity to evaluate complex documents and engage in substantive, critical analysis and debate that younger students might not yet have the capabilities to do. However, as mentioned in the previous section, this inquiry lesson could be used in freshman and sophomore classes because it will help the students to learn to engage in higher order thinking. This lesson is also appropriate for the students, school, and community because the Iraq war is current and many students or members of the community may have been affected in some way by the war. Due to the war's controversial nature and its subsequent media attention, many media pundits, parents, relatives, and friends may have influenced the students' opinions, albeit without having accurate information. Thus, this lesson is important because it will allow the students to examine these opinions in the context of factual information. This in turn will allow the students to form an educated opinion and participate in substantive debate on the matter at hand.

PASS STANDARD I: HIGHER ORDER THINKING

SCORE: 5

This lesson met PASS Standard I by having the students engaged in higher order thinking. The students accomplished this by evaluating various data sets and then using that information to arrive at a conclusion. The students had to critically analyze new data sets and engage in substantive conversation regarding their legitimacy and value. The students' responses to the data sets were not predictable; thus, the teacher did not have an opportunity to script the discussion. As a result, the students were able to engage in unhindered, authentic inquiry. The teacher's main task was to create an environment for the students to engage in higher order thinking. This was accomplished because almost all of the students, almost all the time performed higher order thinking through their data analysis, debate, essays, and presentations.

PASS STANDARD II: DEEP KNOWLEDGE

SCORE: 5

This inquiry lesson is especially effective in providing the students with the opportunity to gain deep knowledge. The students are given the opportunity to explore the Iraq war thoroughly by engaging in debate and discussion based on the data sets. The students are able to critique a number of different data sets and make connections between them in order to arrive at a well-reasoned, supported conclusion. The data sets include intelligence information leading up to the war, a number of speeches by President Bush, news articles from American, British, and Middle Eastern sources, interview transcripts from officials and Saddam Hussein as well as statistics, charts, and graphs, and data information discovered after the war began. Because the data sets reflect a number of different perspectives and findings, the students are equipped with the information necessary to understand the complexity of the issue. Thorough student explanations, arguments, and conclusions are reflective of their deep knowledge.

PASS STANDARD III: SUBSTANTIVE CONVERSATION**SCORE: 5**

Substantive conversation is the heart of this inquiry lesson. Due to the controversial nature of some of the information contained in the data sets, there is much to debate about their legitimacy. Students are able to engage in a substantive conversation on a number of different levels. By evaluating the data sets in an effort to answer the inquiry questions, students are able to question the data sets, make statements on their validity and relevance, critique the content of the data, and ask questions that arise as a result of the data and its relation to other information gathered. The students bring their questions, comments, and understanding of the data to the discussion which prevents the teacher from leading and scripting the discussion. As a result, the students are engaged in conversation amongst each other, with the teacher acting as a guide and facilitator only when discussion breaks down. The conversation in the class is effective because if one student brings his or her understanding to the discussion, other students are able to question his or her understanding of the data, often giving their own interpretation. The dialog results in a breakdown of the data and engages the students in substantive conversation which, after all data sets have been critiqued, improves collective understanding of the inquiry question.

PASS STANDARD IV: CONNECTIONS BEYOND THE CLASS**SCORE: 5**

This inquiry lesson is especially effective in providing students with an opportunity to make connections to the world beyond the classroom. First, this lesson allows the students to understand a complex, hotly debated current event in the Iraq war. Second, this lesson allows the students to examine various approaches to foreign policy in the post 9-11 environment, including those of other states and international organizations. Third, and possibly most important, is that the students are able to use their newly acquired knowledge on this issue to form a reasoned opinion on the issue and be able to support it with factual evidence to others outside of the classroom. Students are able to engage in debate and discussion on the issue with family members, friends, and others in their community in an effort to influence a larger audience beyond the classroom.

PASS STANDARD V: ETHICAL VALUING**SCORE: 5**

This inquiry lesson is rich in providing students the opportunity to engage in ethical valuing. The Iraq war has its supporters and opponents, both with reasons to support their beliefs. The students are given the opportunity to evaluate information on their own and with the class in order to evaluate, discuss, debate, clarify, and develop opinions on the data sets and the decision to go to war. The students are able to contemplate a variety of ethical values including principles of freedom, democracy, equality, morality, and the duties of government. The teacher does not attempt to influence the class by inserting his or her own personal beliefs while the students are constructing their knowledge. The students are able to develop well-reasoned positions that are consistent with democratic values free from the influence of outside forces including parents, the media, and even the teacher. In this way, students are able to construct knowledge in a way that allows for personal discovery. In addition, the students are able to discuss not only reasons why the United States invaded Iraq but also whether they feel it was justifiable or not. This allows the students to hear multiple perspectives on the issue and decide for themselves what they believe.

This lesson integrates history, political science, and to a lesser degree, economics, geography and the behavioral sciences. Although the Iraq war is a contemporary issue, the students evaluate data sets that, while relatively new, are historical in nature and, in many cases, are supported or undermined by more recent information. Political Science is integrated seamlessly because the Iraq war is a geopolitical issue involving citizens, congress, the president, other countries, and international organizations. Economics is touched on lightly by the data sets pertaining to oil imports and exports and the price of gas over time. Geography is indirectly related to the inquiry lesson because the students learn about a different region in Iraq and information about the country's natural resources. Behavioral sciences are touched on in discussion about the motivations for 9-11 and the terrorist mindset. The primary social studies disciplines utilized, however, are history and political science. In terms of subject area integration, this lesson does not include connections to ideas from other subject areas in terms of content. Thus, the relationship between the Iraq war and ideas from other subject areas are not included. However, the lesson does help students learn to write an effective, factually supported essay that includes a thesis. As a result, the students will be better able to use critical thinking skills to write a fluid, well-supported formal essay. To a lesser degree, the inquiry lesson includes language arts integration through the short presentation the students give on their opinions of the Iraq war and their discussions in general. In terms of time or place integration, the students are able to make connections between the previous foreign policy making environment and the post 9-11 environment. In addition, connections between the Middle East and the United States can be made. The North Korean issue could also be compared to the Iraq war, integrating the present and the future.

CHANGES AND IMPROVEMENTS

In retrospect, there are a number of changes and improvements that could be made to make this inquiry lesson more effective. Due to the controversial nature of the issue, I would like to incorporate more data sets and cut down on the editing that I made to the ones I did use. I believe some of my data sets were less powerful due to the fact that I was restricted to a "few" page limit. Some of the information pertained would have been beneficial to the students, but a ten or twelve page transcript is admittedly long, especially when there are limits to the time I can devote to this inquiry lesson. In terms of utilizing more data sets, I believe that one can never have too much information. I am aware that despite gathering data from a variety of sources, I was unable to paint the complete picture, especially in terms of recent data sets still supporting the war. I would also like to find a way to integrate time and place more effectively. With more time I could gear the discussion to comparing how the Iraq war was handled to previous wars. In addition, I could discuss how Iraq is similar to and different from the North Korea conundrum, which is very much a current and future issue. Furthermore, I would like to use the filamentality website to post all of the data sets so that students can access them at home or in other areas outside the classroom. In this way, the students will have more time to read the data and can access the unedited data sets. Overall, I am pleased with the way the lesson turned out and I look forward to using it as a teacher.

TRANSCENDENT TEACHING AND LEARNING ISSUES

Writing this inquiry lesson plan has helped me in a number of ways. First, I learned how time consuming it is to find good data sets and write a lesson plan. Now I am much more aware of the time I will need to put in if I plan to be a successful teacher. Second, I realized that teaching a controversial subject that is fresh in the minds of many students can be difficult, especially due to the fact that the students bring prior knowledge and opinions into the classroom that might not be accurate. Parents, relatives, friends, and the media have saturated the minds of many people throughout the country and students, especially impressionable high school students, might have a hard time objectively evaluating the data sets and discussing the issue. As a result, when teaching subject matter that is current and controversial it is important to remind the students that not everything they have been told is factual. Unlike other lessons and topics, I would ask my students to suspend their integration of prior knowledge during the first part of the inquiry (where facts known prior to the war are discussed) in order to allow them to objectively evaluate the data. Thus, writing a lesson plan on a current, controversial, and well-known topic has helped me to understand the complex teaching and learning issues inherent in such subject matter.

Name: _____

Hypothesis/Evaluation Worksheet

Hypothesis	Supporting/Undermining Evidence

The Iraq War Formal Essay Rubric

	Criteria					Score
	0	1	2	3	4	
Ideas and Content	<p>Opening paragraph lacks grabber and/or thesis</p> <p>Closing paragraph does not correlate with opening argument</p> <p>Thesis is not present or is unintelligible</p>	<p>Either a grabber or thesis is present, but it is not clear or engaging</p> <p>Closing paragraph is present but is unclear, loosely connected to the overall essay, and does not leave the reader with a sense of completion</p>	<p>Opening paragraph utilizes a grabber, but it is not engaging</p> <p>Thesis is present, but not well-written or clear</p> <p>Closing paragraph is present, but not completely clear and does not completely connect to the opening paragraph or body, leaving the reader without a sense of completion</p>	<p>Opening paragraph utilizes a strong opening sentence or thesis, but not both</p> <p>Thesis is present and clear, but not masterfully written or thoughtful</p> <p>Closing paragraph connects to the opening paragraph and body and leaves reader with a sense of completion</p>	<p>Opening paragraph utilizes a strong opening sentence/grabber</p> <p>Thesis is present, clear, well-written and thoughtful</p> <p>Closing paragraph clearly reiterates the opening paragraph and content within the body</p> <p>Conclusion is clear and brings reader to a sense of completion which requires the reader to legitimately reflect on the argument</p>	
Organization and Body	<p>Thesis is supported by 2 or less logical, persuasive facts</p> <p>Body paragraphs do not begin with primary sentences and are not supported by factual evidence</p> <p>Opinions are not differentiated from facts</p> <p>Sources are not cited</p> <p>Essay does not reflect any deliberate organization</p> <p>Paper utilized no/unconnected transitions</p>	<p>Thesis is supported by at least 3-4 logical, persuasive facts</p> <p>Not all body paragraphs begin with a primary sentence and those that do are supported by only 1 fact</p> <p>Supported facts are not all connected to opinion/argument and are poorly articulated</p> <p>Sources are not cited properly making it difficult to differentiate the students' writing from that of the source</p> <p>Essay is poorly organized and incoherent</p> <p>Few transitions present and are poorly worded</p>	<p>Thesis is supported by at least 4-5 logical, persuasive facts</p> <p>Not all body paragraphs begin with a primary sentence; those present are supported by at least 2 facts</p> <p>Supported facts are logically connected to opinion/argument but connection is not articulated well</p> <p>Sources are cited properly, but lack student analysis/interpretation</p> <p>Essay is organized, but lacks flow</p> <p>Some transitions are smooth and appropriate</p>	<p>Thesis supported by at least 6-7 logical, persuasive facts</p> <p>All body paragraphs begin with a primary sentence supported by at least 2 facts each</p> <p>Supported facts are logically connected to opinion/argument</p> <p>All sources are cited properly and, while not overused, some are not analyzed by the student</p> <p>Essay is well organized, though some content could be reorganized to make the work flow better</p> <p>Most transitions are smooth and appropriate</p>	<p>Thesis is supported by at least 8 logical, persuasive facts</p> <p>All body paragraphs begin with a primary sentence supported by at least 3 facts each</p> <p>Opinions are clearly differentiated from fact and are supported by factual evidence</p> <p>Supported facts are logically connected to opinion/argument and well argued</p> <p>All sources are cited properly and clearly developed/analyzed by student</p> <p>Essay is well organized according to subtopics revealed in primary sentences</p> <p>All transitions are smooth and appropriate</p>	
Mechanics and Grammar	<p>Words and sentences are not clear, precise, or professional</p> <p>The vocabulary does not suit the purpose, subject, or audience</p> <p>Essay contains 4 grammatical errors per page and requires extensive reworking</p>	<p>Essay reads unprofessionally, but is intelligible</p> <p>The vocabulary meets the purpose, but is not appropriate for the subject matter or audience</p> <p>Essay contains 3 grammatical errors on average per page; some errors require major reworking</p>	<p>Most word choices and sentences are appropriate but some are either unprofessional, unclear, or imprecise</p> <p>Most, but not all vocabulary is appropriate</p> <p>Essay contains 2-3 minor grammatical errors on average per page</p>	<p>Word choice and sentences are appropriate, but not professional</p> <p>The vocabulary is suitable for the subject matter and audience</p> <p>Essay contains 1-2 minor grammatical/structural errors on average per page</p>	<p>Word choice and sentences are highly appropriate, professional, precise, and clear</p> <p>The vocabulary is clearly geared toward the audience and is fitting for the subject matter</p> <p>Essay contains 0-1 grammatical/structural errors on average per page</p>	
						/12