**DOCUMENT #1:**

 **The President's Ultimatum to Iraq and Opposition to It
Speech by President George W. Bush**

*On March 17, 2003, President George W. Bush issued an ultimatum to Iraqi President Saddam Hussein. Following is an excerpt of the speech Bush made explaining the ultimatum.*

For more than a decade, the United States and other nations have pursued patient and honorable efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime without war. That regime pledged to reveal and destroy all its weapons of mass destruction as a condition for ending the Persian Gulf war in 1991....Peaceful efforts to disarm the Iraqi regime have failed again and again because we are not dealing with peaceful men. Intelligence gathered by this and other governments leaves no doubt that the Iraq regime continues to possess and conceal some of the most lethal weapons ever devised....

The danger is clear. Using chemical, biological or, one day, nuclear weapons, obtained with the help of Iraq, the terrorists could fulfill their stated ambitions and kill thousands or hundreds of thousands of innocent people in our country or any other....For the last four and a half months, the United States and our allies have worked within the Security Council to enforce that council's longstanding demands. Yet some permanent members of the Security Council have publicly announced that they will veto any resolution that compels the disarmament of Iraq. These governments share our assessment of the danger, but not our resolve to meet it....The United Nations Security Council has not lived up to its responsibilities, so we will rise to ours....

Saddam Hussein and his sons must leave Iraq within 48 hours. Their refusal to do so will result in military conflict, commenced at a time of our choosing... Many Iraqis can hear me tonight in a translated radio broadcast. And I have a message for them. If we must begin a military campaign, it will be directed against the lawless men who rule your country and not against you. As our coalition takes away their power we will deliver the food and medicine you need. We will tear down the apparatus of terror. And we will help you to build a new Iraq that is prosperous and free....

The terrorist threat to America and the world will be diminished the moment that Saddam Hussein is disarmed. Our government is on heightened watch against these dangers. Just as we are preparing to ensure victory in Iraq, we are taking further actions to protect our homeland....

The cause of peace requires all free nations to recognize new and undeniable realities. In the 20th century some chose to appease murderous dictators whose threats were allowed to grow into genocide and global war. In this century when evil men plot chemical, biological and nuclear terror, a policy of appeasement could bring destruction of a kind never before seen on this earth. Terrorists and terrorist states do not reveal these threats with fair notice in formal declarations. And responding to such enemies only after they have struck first is not self-defense, it is suicide. The security of the world requires disarming Saddam Hussein now....

Unlike Saddam Hussein, we believe the Iraqi people are deserving and capable of human liberty. And when the dictator has departed, they can set an example to all the Middle East of a vital and peaceful and self-governing nation....The power and appeal of human liberty is felt in every life and every land. And the greatest power of freedom is to overcome hatred and violence, and turn the creative gifts of men and women to the pursuits of peace. That is the future we choose. Free nations have a duty to defend our people by uniting against the violent. And tonight, as we have done before, America and our allies accept that responsibility.

**Document #2**

**Speech by Senator Robert Byrd**

*On March 19, 2003, Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia delivered a speech on the floor of the U.S. Senate that opposed the march to war.*
I have watched the events of recent months with a heavy, heavy heart. No more is the image of America one of strong, yet benevolent peacekeeper. The image of America has changed. Around the globe, our friends mistrust us, our word is disputed, our intentions are questioned.

Instead of reasoning with those with whom we disagree, we demand obedience or threaten recrimination. Instead of isolating Saddam Hussein, we seem to have isolated ourselves. We proclaim a new doctrine of preemption which is understood by few and feared by many. We say that the United States has the right to turn its firepower on any corner of the globe which might be suspect in the war on terrorism. We assert that right without the sanction of any international body. As a result, the world has become a much more dangerous place. We flaunt our superpower status with arrogance. We treat UN Security Council members like ingrates who offend our princely dignity by lifting their heads from the carpet. Valuable alliances are splitÖ

The case this Administration tries to make to justify its fixation with war is tainted by charges of falsified documents and circumstantial evidence. We cannot convince the world of the necessity of this war for one simple reason. This is a war of choice.

There is no credible information to connect Saddam Hussein to 9/11. The twin towers fell because a world-wide terrorist group, Al Qaeda, with cells in over 60 nations, struck at our wealth and our influence by turning our own planes into missiles, one of which would likely have slammed into the dome of this beautiful Capitol except for the brave sacrifice of the passengers on boardÖ

But, this Administration has directed all of the anger, fear, and grief which emerged from the ashes of the twin towers and the twisted metal of the Pentagon towards a tangible villain, one we can see and hate and attack. And villain he is. But, he is the wrong villain. And this is the wrong war.... The general unease surrounding this war is not just due to "orange alert." There is a pervasive sense of rush and risk and too many questions unanswered. How long will we be in Iraq? What will be the cost? What is the ultimate mission? How great is the danger at home?.

What is happening to this country? When did we become a nation which ignores and berates our friends? When did we decide to risk undermining international order by adopting a radical and doctrinaire approach to using our awesome military might? How can we abandon diplomatic efforts when the turmoil in the world cries out for diplomacy?

Why can this President not seem to see that America's true power lies not in its will to intimidate, but in its ability to inspire?

**Document #*3***

**Statements From Other Nations**

*Many governments around the world opposed Bush's declaration, and the United Nations refused to back it, arguing that the disarming of Iraq could be achieved through peaceful means.
Excerpts from a joint statement on March 5 of the foreign ministers of France, Germany, and Russia:*

Our common objective remains the full and effective disarmament of Iraq....We consider that this objective can be achieved by the peaceful means of inspections. We moreover observe that these inspections are producing increasingly encouraging results: The destruction of the Al Samoud missiles has started and is making progress. Iraqis are providing biological and chemical information. The interviews with Iraqi scientists are continuing.... We firmly call for the Iraqi authorities to cooperate more actively with the inspectors to fully disarm their country. These inspections cannot continue indefinitely. We consequently ask that the inspections now be speeded up....the inspectors have to present without any delay their work program accompanied by regular progress reports to the Security Council. This program could provide for a meeting clause to enable the Council to evaluate the overall results of this process. In these circumstances we will not let a proposed resolution pass that would authorize the use of force.

*Excerpt from a statement by French President Jacques Chirac on March 18:*The United States has just issued an ultimatum to Iraq. Whether...it's a matter of necessary disarmament of Iraq or of the desirable change of regime in that country , there is no justification for a unilateral decision to resort to war....It is a grave decision, at a time when Iraq's disarmament is under way and the inspections have proved to be a credible alternative method of disarming that country. It is also a decision that jeopardizes future use of methods to resolve peacefully crises linked to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Iraq does not today present an immediate threat warranting an immediate war.

**Document #*4***

 **Iraq, Weapons of Mass Destruction, the U.S. and the UN**

After the Gulf War in 1991, the United Nations required Iraq to destroy its remaining weapons of mass destruction and missiles with a range greater than 93 miles. The UN also created the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) to carry out inspections in Iraq to verify compliance. The inspectors believed they were successful in dismantling Iraq's nuclear facilities and in finding almost all ballistic missiles.

UNSCOM also found and destroyed stocks of Iraq's biological and chemical weapons, but not all of them. Late in 1998 after the chief inspector said that Iraq was interfering with UNSCOM's work, the U.S. threatened Iraq with force, the inspectors left the country and American planes bombed Baghdad. Iraq had claimed for some time that UNSCOM included American spies, an accusation the U.S. admitted to in January 1999. Iraq refused to allow any further inspections and insisted it had no additional weapons of mass destruction. The economic sanctions continued.

But Iraq's record of making and using weapons of mass destruction under Saddam Hussein continued to raise questions. Clearly, he had had scientists working to build nuclear weapons until Israel destroyed the Osirak nuclear reactor near Baghdad in 1981. He had used chemical weapons, including mustard gas and nerve agents like sarin, against the Iranians in a war from 1980-1988. And toward the end of that period he had unleashed a series of chemical bombings against Iraq's rebellious Kurdish population in the north. Human Rights Watch, an international human rights organization, says these attacks killed 50,000 to 100,000 and left as many as 150,000 with such afflictions as abnormal births, cleft palates, blindness, and cancers.

According to Gary Mihollin, the director of a U.S. arms control organization that monitors Iraq's weapons capabilities, UNSCOM had not accounted for "almost four tons of the nerve agent VX; 600 tons of ingredients for VX; as much as 3,000 tons of other poison gas agents; and at least 550 artillery shells filled with mustard gas."

Since early in 2002 President Bush warned repeatedly that Iraq was part of an "axis of evil" and a great danger to world peace and U.S. security because of its weapons of mass destruction. Such weapons, he declared, could kill tens of thousands of people, even hundreds of thousands, at one blow. And Saddam Hussein had proved that he was aggressive and untrustworthy.

Repeatedly over the following months, President Bush demanded the overthrow of Saddam Hussein and his government, which he called "regime change."

Reports appeared in the media about American military planning for an assault on Iraq. With tensions rising, members of Congress called for debate and American allies called for United Nations deliberations. At first reluctant, President Bush decided to place a resolution before Congress and to bring the issue before the UN.

In October the House of Representatives (by a vote of 296-133) and the Senate (by a vote of 77-23) authorized the President "to use the Armed Forces of the United States as he determines to be necessary and appropriate in order to (1) defend the national security interests of the United States against the threat posed by Iraq and (2) enforce all relevant United Nation Security Council resolutions regarding Iraq. (These resolutions called on Iraq to eliminate its weapons of mass destruction and admit inspectors to be certain it had done so.)

In a September 12 speech at the UN, the President Bush detailed Iraq's violations of many Security Council resolutions and concluded, "We will work with the UN Security Council for the necessary resolutions. But the purposes of the United States should not be doubted. The Security Council's resolutions will be enforced. The just demands of peace and security will be met, or action will be unavoidable."

After two months of intense discussions, the Security Council adopted Resolution 1441 by a 15-0 vote. The resolution required Iraq to produce an accurate and complete list of its biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons programs and its ballistic missile developments and to admit UN inspectors to verify compliance. Soon after, UN inspectors returned to Iraq, and the chief inspectors began making regular reports to the Security Council on the progress of the work.

There were significant disagreements among Security Council members over Resolution 1441. U.S. officials said it gave Washington the legal support it needed to go to war against Iraq if the Security Council did not agree about how to respond to any new Iraqi violations. But three of the five permanent Council members--France, Russia, and China--insisted that this was not the case, that it was up to the inspectors to report violations and then up to the Council to decide what, if anything to do about them.

In the second half of March 2003 the Iraq crisis came to a head. American and British leaders were convinced that Iraq was not complying fully with Security Council demands--despite some action by Iraq toward compliance, including turning over some 100 missiles for destruction. Iraq insisted it had no weapons of mass destruction to produce. The U.S. and Britain maintained that Iraqi leaders were lying. French, Russian, and Chinese leaders believed that inspectors were making progress and that there was no reason to approve a second resolution authorizing force. Not having the votes in the Security Council for such a resolution, the Bush administration and Britain determined to go to war on Iraq without it.

The leaders of most nations of the world and most of their peoples opposed this decision. There were huge demonstrations in many cities around the world, including in countries whose leaders backed the Bush administration. Before the war began, polls showed that most Americans opposed the U.S. going to war without the support of the UN. Once war began, a majority of Americans said they supported the Bush administration. However, hundreds of thousands of people demonstrated against the war in cities and towns across the U.S., both before and after the war began. These protests were among the largest this nation has seen.

Senator Robert Byrd of West Virginia said in a February speech on the Senate floor: "The idea that the United States or any other nation can legitimately attack a nation that is not imminently threatening but may be threatening in the future is a radical new twist on the traditional idea of self-defense.

\*Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter says that "All members shall refrain in their interrelations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

On March 19 the attack on Iraq began.

**Document #*5***

 **Two Views of War on Iraq**

*Excerpt from the White House report to Congress on its reasons for war on Iraq*

"Iraq both poses a continuing threat to the national security of the United States and international peace and security in the Persian Gulf region and remains in material and unacceptable breach of its international obligations by, among other things, continuing to possess and develop a significant chemical and biological weapons capability, actively seeking a nuclear weapons capability, and supporting and harboring terrorist organizations....

Further delay in taking action against Iraq will only serve to give Saddam Hussein's regime additional time to further develop weapons of mass destruction to use against the United States, its citizens, and its allies. The United States and the UN have long demanded immediate, active, and unconditional cooperation by Iraq in the disarmament of its weapons of mass destruction. There is no reason to believe that Iraq will disarm and cooperate with inspections to verify such disarmament, if the U.S. and the UN employ only diplomacy and other peaceful means....

The use of force against Iraq will directly advance the war on terror, and will be consistent with continuing efforts against international terrorists residing and operating elsewhere in the world....

In the circumstances described above, the President of the United States has the authority--indeed, given the dangers involved, the duty--to use force against Iraq to protect the security of the American people and to compel compliance with Security Council resolutions."

*Excerpt from John Brady Kiesling's letter of resignation to Secretary of State Colin Powell. Kiesling is a career diplomat who has served in U. S. embassies in such places as Tel Aviv, Casablanca, and Athens.*

"....until this administration it had been possible to believe that by upholding the policies of my President I was also upholding the interests of the American people and the world. I believe it no longer. The policies we are now asked to advance are incompatible not only with American values but also with American interests. Our fervent pursuit of war with Iraq is driving us to squander the international legitimacy that has been America's most potent weapons of both offense and defense since the days of Woodrow Wilson. We have begun to dismantle the largest and most effective web of international relationships the world has ever known. Our current course will bring instability and danger, not security....

This administration has chosen to make terrorism a domestic political tool....We spread ...terror and confusion in the public mind, arbitrarily linking unrelated problems of terrorism and Iraq....We should ask ourselves why we have failed to persuade more of the world that a war with Iraq is necessary....Have we indeed become blind, as Russia is blind in Chechnya, as Israel is blind in the Occupied Territories, to our own advice, that overwhelming military power is not the answer to terrorism?....Why does our President condone the swaggering, contemptuous approach to our friends and allies this administration is fostering, including among its most senior officials? ... I am resigning because I have tried and failed to reconcile my conscience with my ability to represent the current U.S. administration.

**Document #*6***

The 1998 Fatwa was signed by Osama bin Laden, Ayman al-Zawahiri and others.

It lists three grievances:

**1. U.S. occupation of the Arabian Peninsula.**

"First, for over seven years the United States has been occupying the lands of Islam in the holiest of places, the Arabian Peninsula, plundering its riches, dictating to its rulers, humiliating its people, terrorizing its neighbors, and turning its bases in the Peninsula into a spearhead through which to fight the neighboring Muslim peoples.
If some people have in the past argued about the fact of the occupation, all the people of the Peninsula have now acknowledged it. The best proof of this is the Americans' continuing aggression against the Iraqi people using the Peninsula as a staging post, even though all its rulers are against their territories being used to that end, but they are helpless."

**2. U.S. aggression against the Iraqi people.**

"Second, despite the great devastation inflicted on the Iraqi people by the crusader-Zionist alliance, and despite the huge number of those killed, which has exceeded 1 million... despite all this, the Americans are once against trying to repeat the horrific massacres, as though they are not content with the protracted blockade imposed after the ferocious war or the fragmentation and devastation. So here they come to annihilate what is left of this people and to humiliate their Muslim neighbors."

**3. U.S. support of Israel.**

"Third, if the Americans' aims behind these wars are religious and economic, the aim is also to serve the Jews' petty state and divert attention from its occupation of Jerusalem and murder of Muslims there. The best proof of this is their eagerness to destroy Iraq, the strongest neighboring Arab state, and their endeavor to fragment all the states of the region such as Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Sudan into paper statelets and through their disunion and weakness to guarantee Israel's survival and the continuation of the brutal crusade occupation of the Peninsula."

**These three grievances are the motives for al-Qaeda's attacks.**

All these crimes and sins committed by the Americans are a clear declaration of war on God, his messenger, and Muslims. And ulema have throughout Islamic history unanimously agreed that the jihad is an individual duty if the enemy destroys the Muslim countries.

The fatwa quotes shaykh of al-Islam, "As for the fighting ***to* repulse [an enemy]**, it is aimed at defending sanctity and religion, and it is a duty as agreed [by the ulema]. Nothing is more sacred than belief except repulsing an enemy who is attacking religion and life." ***On that basis***, and in compliance with God's order, **we issue the following fatwa to all Muslims:**