

Research
Based
Curricula



**What is the Biggest
Danger That We Face?
International Relations**

Key Stage 4
Citizenship Studies
Resource 5

2019



Resource Five

Overview



Topic	Issues in International Relations: The 2003 United States Invasion of Iraq
GCSE Modules	Rights and responsibilities.
Objectives	<p>After completing this Resource, you should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ Be able to summarise the 2003 Iraq invasion✓ Be able to summarise the justifications given for the invasion✓ Be able to recognise the importance of how language was used to justify the invasion✓ Be able to identify debates about the invasion✓ Have an opinion about which points or arguments about the invasion are more persuasive✓ Be able to summarise what happened in Iraq after the aftermath of the invasion
Instructions	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Read the data source2. Complete the activities3. Explore the further reading
Context	<p>This Resource is concerned with issues in the discipline of International Relations: 'military intervention in another state' or going to war against a different state.</p> <p>The Resource will look at a key event in international relations- the 2003 invasion of Iraq by the United States of America (the United States or the US) and its partners. It will look at the justifications given for the invasion, the aftermath of the war, and debates about it.</p> <p>The Resource will also ask key questions in the discipline of international relations such as: Can invasion by a state into another state be justified? and, Should political leaders gain the approval of their citizens before going to war? In this Resource, we will also consider how language and persuasion are used by political leaders.</p>

Resource Five

Data Source



Background Information

In 2003 the United States of America (the US) led an invasion to Iraq, along with states such as the United Kingdom (called 'the Coalition of the Willing'), to remove President Saddam Hussein from power. The invasion and war was called 'Operation Iraqi Freedom.'

President George W. Bush was the President of the United States of America at the time of the Iraq War. Saddam Hussein was the President of Iraq from 1979–2003. Iraq is a state in the Middle East.

The invasion of Iraq was justified by President Bush for three main reasons:

- Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction (WMD) which threatened the safety and security of people in Iraq and people in other countries.
- Saddam Hussein had links to terrorists. The 2003 War came in the aftermath of the United States being the victim of an act of terror on September 11th 2001.
- Saddam Hussein was a brutal dictator who caused suffering to a lot of people in Iraq and under his rule their lives were not free. Removing Saddam Hussein from power in the war would liberate Iraqi people from oppression and tyranny.

After the invasion, no weapons of mass destruction were found. No clear links between Saddam Hussein and terrorists were found. And, when Saddam Hussein fled from power, the Iraqi people would suffer from other forms of violence and oppression.

After the invasion, President Bush and people in his government have been accused of making up claims and lies to provide an excuse to go to war. They had other reasons for invading Iraq.

Resource Five

Data Source



Section A

President George Bush's speech at the start of the 2003 Iraq invasion'

Full Text: George Bush's address on the start of war,' 20th March 2003

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2003/mar/20/iraq.georgebush>

"My fellow citizens. At this hour, American and coalition forces are in the early stages of military operations to disarm Iraq, to free its people and to defend the world from **grave** danger.

On my orders, coalition forces have begun striking selected targets of military importance to undermine Saddam Hussein's ability to wage war. These are opening stages of what will be a broad (wide) and **concerted** campaign.

More than 35 countries are giving crucial support from the use of naval and air bases to help with intelligence and logistics to **deployment** of **combat** units.

Every nation in this coalition has chosen to bear the duty and share the honour of serving in our common defence. To all the men and women of the United States armed forces now in the Middle East, the peace of a troubled world and the hopes of an oppressed people now depend on you. That trust is well placed.

The enemies you confront will come to know your skill and bravery. The people you liberate (free) will witness the honourable and decent spirit of the American military.

In this conflict America faces an enemy that has no regard for **conventions** of war or rules of morality. Saddam Hussein has placed Iraqi troops and equipment in civilian areas, attempting to use innocent men, women and children as shields for his own military. A final **atrocity** against his people.

I want Americans and all the world to know that coalition forces will make every effort to spare innocent civilians from harm. A campaign on the harsh terrain of the nation as large as California could be longer and more difficult than some predict and helping Iraqis achieve a united, stable and free country will require our **sustained** commitment.

Resource Five

Data Source



We come to Iraq with respect for its citizens, for their great civilisation and for the religious faiths they practise. We have no ambition in Iraq except to remove a threat and restore control of that country to its own people.

I know that the families of our military are praying that all those who serve will return safely and soon. Millions of Americans are praying with you for the safety of your loved ones and for the protection of the innocent. For your sacrifice you have the **gratitude** and respect of the American people and you can know that our forces will be coming home as soon as their work is done.

Our nation enters this conflict **reluctantly**, yet our purpose is sure. The people of the United States and our friends and allies will not live at the mercy of an **outlaw** regime that threatens the peace with weapons of mass murder.

We will meet that threat now with our army, air force, navy, coastguard and marines so that we do not have to meet it later with armies of firefighters and police and doctors on the streets of our cities. Now that conflict has come, the only way to limit its **duration** is to apply decisive force and I assure you this will not be a campaign of half measures and we will accept no outcome but victory.

My fellow citizens, the dangers to our country and the world will be overcome. We will pass through this time of **peril** and carry on the work of peace. We will defend our freedom. We will bring freedom to others and we will **prevail**.

May God bless our country and all who defend her."

Section B

A statue of Saddam Hussein is pulled down in Iraq during the 2003 US-led invasion as a soldier looks on

(photo accessed <https://nationalpost.com/full-comment/about-that-toppling-of-the-saddam-hussein-statue-in-Baghdad>)



Resource Five

Data Source



Section C

Airstrikes in Iraq during the US-led invasion in 2003

Photo accessed <https://www.ibtimes.com/ten-years-baghdad-how-iraq-has-changed-saddam-1138161>



Section D

Foreign soldiers in Iraq during the US-led invasion in 2003

Photo accessed <https://edition.cnn.com/2013/03/18/opinion/iraq-war-hans-blix/index.html>



Section E

15 years after the invasion of Iraq

Stephanie Savell, '15 years After the Iraq Invasion, What are the Costs?' Foreign Policy in Focus, 21 March 2018, <https://fpif.org/15-years-after-the-iraq-invasion-what-are-the-costs/>

This source is reflecting on the United State' actions in Iraq and elsewhere 15 years later:

This March marked the 15th anniversary of the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq.

In 2003, President George W. Bush and his advisers based their case for war on the idea that Saddam Hussein, then dictator of Iraq, possessed weapons of mass destruction – weapons that have never been found. Nevertheless, all these years later, Bush's "Global War on Terror" continues – in Iraq and in many other countries. It's a good time to reflect on what this war – the longest in U.S. history – has cost Americans and others around the world.

Resource Five

Data Source



First, the economic costs: According to estimates, the war on terror has cost Americans a staggering \$5.6 trillion since 2001, when the U.S. invaded Afghanistan (a country which the US invaded before Iraq in 2003). It means Americans spend \$32 million per hour.

As of 2015, when the Costs of War project made its latest tallies, up to 165,000 Iraqi civilians had died as a direct consequence of U.S. war, plus around 8,000 U.S. soldiers and military contractors in Iraq. Those numbers have only continued to rise. In addition to those direct deaths, at least four times as many people in Iraq have died from the side effects of war, such as [malnutrition](#), [environmental degradation](#), and [deteriorated](#) infrastructure.

Since the 2003 invasion, for instance, Iraqi health care has [plummeted](#) – with hospitals and clinics bombed, supplies of medicine and electricity jeopardized, and thousands of physicians and healthcare workers fleeing the country.

Meanwhile, the war continues to spread, no longer limited to Afghanistan, Iraq, or Syria, as many Americans think. Indeed, the U.S. military is escalating a network of anti-terror operations all across the world – in at least 76 nations, or 40 percent of countries on the planet.

U.S. activity in Iraq and the Middle East has only spurred greater political [upheaval](#) and unrest. The U.S.-led coalition is seen not as a liberating force, but as an aggressor. there are now more terrorist groups in the Middle East than ever before. After Saddam Hussein was removed from power, violence occurred throughout Iraq as different groups fought against each other and sought to gain power. This caused further destruction and death in the country.

Resource Five

Data Source



Section F

The Iraq war: ten years on, was it worth it?

Emma Nicholson and Simon Jenkins, 'The Iraq war: ten years on, was it worth it?',

The Spectator, 16 March 2013, <https://www.spectator.co.uk/2013/03/was-iraq-worth-it/>

Ten years after the 2003 Iraq War began, the war still divides opinion. Here are two different points of view. Emma Nicholson believes that the war was justified. Simon Jenkins believes the war was not justified. Here are their arguments:

YES- EMMA NICHOLSON

Saddam and his wicked henchmen (people who worked for Saddam) were guilty of war crimes – arguably **genocide** – and **consigning** such evil to the dustbin of history along with the likes of Adolf Hitler and Pol Pot is, in my opinion, justification enough for the US-led invasion of 2003.

But ten years on – and to fully explore the question 'Was it worth it?' – we must examine the post-Saddam era. The high quality of the commanders of US forces, including General Peter W. Chiarelli, right up until America's withdrawal from Iraq last year, was superb, and they achieved amazing results. But generally, the years immediately after 2003 were no credit to governments in either Washington or London.

In 2005 a general election was held in Iraq where the Iraqi people were able to vote for a new parliament. For the first time during the region's 6,000-year history Iraqis were able to vote in a free and fair election. True democracy had arrived because Saddam had been toppled. What a stunning **triumph** for freedom and the human spirit which had for so long been crushed by a madman in Baghdad! Surely people cannot deny this basic human right and say the invasion was not worth it?

During my visits to Iraq, I have witnessed the rebirth of a nation where at least a trillion US dollars is being spent on reconstruction. Planned or actually under way are thousands of kilometres of new roads, ports, schools, hospitals and airports. Work has started on at least three million homes.

Resource Five

Data Source



I must also mention the amazing revival of Iraq's oil industry. Iraq wants and needs foreign investment, and cash from overseas is starting to flood in. Last year it attracted \$56 billion from foreign companies, a 40 per cent increase on 2011. Meanwhile Iraqi banks generally are awash (full) with cash as wages quadruple from a decade ago when Saddam was in power. There are other signs of a true economic [revival](#).

The Iraqi people deserve the best and a decade from the US-led invasion they are seeking assistance from nations, particularly Britain. I believe it is our duty to ensure that after the dark days under Saddam, the steady light of freedom and democracy burns in Iraq.

So was it worth it? Yes, a thousand times yes!

NO- SIMON JENKINS

The 2003 Iraq war was an act of state aggression that had no basis in law or national or international security. It not only [violated](#) Iraq's [sovereignty](#) and toppled its government – which had not been its declared intention – it devastated its economy and traumatised its people, in a way from which they have yet to recover. Some 200,000 Iraqis died, as did some 5,000 foreign troops. Huge sums of money were spent on the fighting and the reconstruction.

As from any disaster, a ragbag of 'good things' can be said to have resulted, but the conflict did nothing to stabilise the region or stop terrorism, much the opposite. Iraq was a country brutally led and a mess, though the mess was in part due to western [sanctions](#). A decade later, the streets of Baghdad (the capital city of Iraq) are reportedly less safe and the civilian death rate higher than before the invasion.

Resource Five

Data Source



After the assault (sanctions), Saddam was no threat to anyone except his more rebellious citizens, despite the **frantic** efforts of the CIA and MI6 to prove otherwise.

Domestically, Saddam was a brutal and sadistic leader. However, for more than a decade, the West had regarded him as an **ally**.

The violence that the United States and its Partners unleashed on Iraq was appalling to any who witnessed the aftermath. It shattered the social structure of the state and communities alike. Neighbourhoods were **plagued** by killings, kidnappings and **vendettas**, with some two million people driving into **exile**. Few have returned. Professional institutions, such as hospitals, universities, the army and government, have collapsed.

An estimated 90 per cent of Iraq's Christian population, resident in Baghdad for a millennium, were driven to Syria by the resulting violence, and still dare not return. Baghdad museum is still not open and archaeological sites are wrecked. Iraqi women are more **repressed** than ever. Militia killings and car bombings continue by the week.

My Iraqi acquaintances are clear. Saddam was bad, but nothing can forgive the violence inflicted (caused) on their country by ten years of the 'coalition of the willing'"

Section G

Protests against the
2003 Iraq invasion

BBC News, "Million'
march against Iraq war',
16th February 2003,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/2765041.stm>

Hundreds of thousands of people have taken to the streets of London to voice their opposition to military action against Iraq. Police said it was the UK's biggest ever demonstration with at least 750,000 taking part, although organisers put the figure closer to two million. There were also anti-war gatherings in Glasgow and Belfast – all part of a worldwide weekend of protest with hundreds of rallies and marches in up to 60 countries.

Resource Five

Data Source



They came as UK Prime Minister Tony Blair, in a speech warning of "bloody consequences" if Iraq was not confronted, directly addressed those marching. He did not "seek unpopularity as a badge of honour", he said, "but sometimes it is the price of leadership and the cost of conviction".

Shortly after he spoke, at around midday, a tide of banner-waving protesters began surging (marching) through central London. They cheered, shouted, sounded horns and banged drums, waving signs with slogans 'No War On Iraq' and 'Make Tea, Not War'. The police estimate of 750,000 people could be an underestimation due to people bypassing official routes or going straight to Hyde Park without joining the main march.

At the rally, Liberal Democrat leader Charles Kennedy told the crowd he was not persuaded by the case for war. With "misleading" evidence provided by the government, "it's no wonder that people are scared and confused", he said.

Former US presidential candidate the Rev Jesse Jackson also spoke and led the crowd chanting "give peace a chance, keep hope alive".

Playwright Harold Pinter made a rare public speech, saying America was "a country run by a bunch of criminal lunatics with Tony Blair as a hired Christian thug". Hollywood actor Tim Robbins, also attending, told BBC News the crowds were "what democracy looks like". If Mr Bush and Mr Blair ignored them "they are not rightful leaders of a democracy", he said.

There was one gesture of support for military action to remove Saddam Hussein elsewhere in London during the rally. Writer Jacques More, 44, from Croydon, south London, stood with a placard outside the Iraqi section of the Jordanian embassy in central London, saying that although a last resort war was necessary "when evil dictators rule and murder their own people".

Resource Five

Data Source



Section H

image of protests
against the 2003 Iraq
invasion

Photo accessed
<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2008/feb/15/iraq>



Resource Five

Activities



Activities

1) In Source A, list the three goals which President Bush gave for military operations in Iraq.

2) How many countries were supporting the United States in the War? Select the answer below and provide an example of a way that these countries supported the United States

a- 15 b- 20 c- 25 d- 30 e- 35 f- 40



3) In Source A, paraphrase (or summarise) the message which President Bush gave to the armed forces fighting in the Coalition against Saddam Hussein in Iraq (such as American forces). How would you describe the message which President Bush was presenting?

4) Look at Sources B, C and D which are all images from the 2003 Iraq War. What do these Sources tell you about what the invasion entailed? Aim to write at least 1 paragraph for your answer.

5) Read Source A. Assess who the speech was addressed to or who the target audience or audiences were. Use quotes from the text to support your answer. Aim to write at least 1 paragraph for your answer.

6) Evaluate how President Bush justified the invasion or war. Consider also the language which he used to explain and justify the war and use quotes from Source A in your answer. For your answer, aim to write 2 paragraphs.

7) Read Source E. In what ways do this assessment of 15 years after the Iraq invasion undermine what President George Bush said in his speech in Source A. For your answer, aim to write 2 paragraphs.

8) Read Source F. Which writer do you think makes the strongest argument about whether the Iraq 'was worth it'? Use information from the source to support your view. Try to write 3 paragraphs or more. If you want to challenge yourself, do some independent research about the Iraq invasion and the situation in Iraq after the 2003 invasion. Extend your answer to a short essay of 5-6 paragraphs.

Resource Five Activities



Activities

9) Read Source G. What reasons are given for why people protested against the war? Aim to write 3-4 sentences for your answer.



10) 'State leaders should only go to war if their citizens support the war.' To what extent do you agree or disagree with this? Express your own argument and use information from the Sources to support your case. Try to write 3 paragraphs or more. If you want to challenge yourself, do some independent research regarding this question and issues of democracy and the consent. Extend your answer to a short essay of 5-6 paragraphs.

Resource Five

Further Reading



Explore

Speech by President Bush after the Iraq invasion-
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/americas/2994345.stm>



[Documentary about the Iraq War](#)

Video of Iraq 15 years on after the 2003 invasion:
https://www.democracynow.org/2018/3/20/a_criminal_war_15_years_after



www.researchbasedcurricula.com



www.access-ed.ngo



[@_AccessEd](https://twitter.com/_AccessEd)



hello@access-ed.ngo



100 Black Prince Road
London, SE1 7SJ



AccessEd is a non-profit company
registered in England (#10383890)