

United States & Iraq Timeline

- 1980s** — The United States supported Iraq during the Iran-Iraq War.
- 1990** — August 2: Under President Saddam Hussein, Iraq invaded Kuwait.
- 1991** — January 17 – February 28: A military coalition led by the U.S. drove Iraqi forces out of Kuwait. The coalition did not attempt to remove Hussein from power.
- 1991** — April: United Nations Security Council established a commission to conduct inspections to ensure that Iraq destroyed all chemical and biological weapons and long-range missiles.
- 1998** — October 31: President Bill Clinton signed the Iraq Liberation Act, which made it the policy of the U.S. to support the removal of Hussein's regime.
- 1998** — December 16-19: In response to Iraqi interference with UN weapons inspectors, the U.S. and the U.K. bombed Iraq.
- 2001** — September 11: Hijacked planes crashed into the World Trade Center in New York, the Pentagon (headquarters of the U.S. military), and a field in Pennsylvania. 2,996 people were killed during the attack.
- 2002** — January 29: During his State of the Union address, President George W. Bush referred to Iraq as part of an "axis of evil" and stated, "The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons." In the following months, President Bush's administration began to push for military action to disarm Iraq of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs). Bush argued that not only might Hussein use the WMDs, he might also give them to terrorists. He frequently referenced the terrorist attacks of 9/11 as a reason for action against Iraq.
- 2002** — September 26: Senator Tom Daschle, Democrat from South Dakota, and Senator Trent Lott, Republican from Mississippi, introduced a resolution, based on a White House proposal, to authorize the use of force in Iraq.
- 2002** — October 16: President Bush signed the resolution into law after it was approved by the House (on October 10) and the Senate (on October 11).
- 2003** — A coalition force led by the U.S. invaded Iraq.
- 2011** — U.S. forces withdrew from Iraq. 4,486 U.S. soldiers died during the war. Estimates of Iraqi deaths range from approximately 100,000 to more than 500,000. WMDs were never found in Iraq.

Document A: Senator Clinton

If left unchecked, Saddam Hussein will continue to increase his capability to wage biological and chemical warfare and will keep trying to develop nuclear weapons. . . . The question is how do we do our best to both **defuse** the threat Saddam Hussein poses to his people, the region, including Israel, and the United States, and at the same time, work to maximize our international support and strengthen the United Nations. . . . I believe the best course is to go to the United Nations for a strong resolution that scraps the 1998 restrictions on inspections and calls for complete, unlimited inspections, with cooperation expected and demanded from Iraq. I know the administration wants more, including an explicit authorization to use force, but we may not be able to secure that now, perhaps even later. . . .

Even though the resolution before the Senate is not as strong as I would like in requiring the diplomatic route first and placing highest priority on a simple, clear requirement for unlimited inspections, I take the President at his word that he will try hard to pass a United Nations resolution and seek to avoid war, if possible.

Because bipartisan support for this resolution makes success in the United Nations more likely and war less likely, and because a good faith effort by the United States, even if it fails, will bring more allies and legitimacy to our cause, I have concluded, after careful and serious consideration, that a vote for the resolution best serves the security of our Nation. If we were to defeat this resolution or pass it with only a few Democrats, I am concerned that those who want to pretend this problem will go away with delay will oppose any United Nations resolution calling for unrestricted inspections. . . .

I come to this decision from the perspective of a Senator from New York who has seen all too closely the consequences of last year's terrible attacks on our Nation [on September 11]. In balancing the risks of action versus inaction, I think New Yorkers, who have gone through the fires of hell, may be more attuned to the risk of not acting. I know I am.

So it is with **conviction** that I support this resolution as being in the best interests of our Nation. A vote for it is not a vote to rush to war; it is a vote that puts awesome responsibility in the hands of our President. And we say to him: Use these powers wisely and as a last resort. And it is a vote that says clearly to Saddam Hussein: This is your last chance; disarm or be disarmed.

Source: *Senator Hillary Clinton, Democrat from New York, October 10, 2002.*

Vocabulary:

defuse: to make less dangerous

conviction: certainty

Document B: Senator Byrd

38 years ago I, Robert C. Byrd, voted on the Tonkin Gulf Resolution—the resolution that authorized the President to use military force to “repel armed attacks” and “to prevent further Communist aggression” in Southeast Asia. It was this resolution that provided the basis for American involvement in the war in Vietnam. It was the resolution that led to the longest war in American history. It led to the deaths of 58,000 Americans, and 150,000 Americans being wounded in action. . . .

After all that **carnage**, we began to learn that, in voting for the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, we were basing our votes on bad information. We learned that the claims the administration made on the need for the Tonkin Gulf Resolution were simply not true, and history is repeating itself. . . .

For all those spouting **jingoism** about going to war with Iraq, about the urgent need for regime change no matter what the cost, about the need to take out the evil dictator—and make no mistakes, I know and understand that Saddam Hussein is an evil dictator—I urge Senators to go down on The Capital Mall and look at the Vietnam memorial. Nearly every day you will find someone at that wall weeping for a loved one, a father, a son, a brother, a friend, whose name is on that wall. . . .

Congress is again being asked to vote on the use of force without hard evidence that the country poses an immediate threat to the national security of the United States. We are being asked to vote on a resolution authorizing the use of force in a hyped up, politically charged atmosphere in an election year. Congress is again being rushed into a judgment.

This is why I stand here today, before this Chamber, and before this Nation, urging, pleading for some sanity, for more time to consider this resolution, for more hard evidence on the need for this resolution. If the need for taking military action against Iraq is so obvious and so needed and so urgent, then why are nearly every one of our allies opposed to it? . . . People are correct to point out that September 11 changed everything. We need to be more careful. We need to build up our intelligence efforts and our homeland security. But do we go around pounding everybody, anybody, who might pose a threat to our security?

Source: *Senator Robert Byrd, Democrat from West Virginia, October 10, 2002.*

Vocabulary:

carnage: bloodshed

jingoism: strong support for war, particularly based on patriotism

Document C: Senator Santorum

I believe President Bush will do everything possible before deciding to commit U.S. military forces against Saddam Hussein's regime. The President has not decided to employ military force, nor does this resolution demand that he do so. Rather, the resolution signals to the President that Congress stands behind his decision to employ military force if Saddam Hussein fails to disarm or **abide** by all relevant United Nations Security Council resolutions. . . .

In plain terms, the threat posed by Saddam Hussein is **analogous** to the threat posed by a drunk driver. The drunk driver is a threat to all on and in close proximity to the road. . . . Saddam is this drunk driver **careening** along the road, a threat to all those innocents who have the misfortune to cross his path. It is time to get Saddam off the road before he can kill or injure innocents who cross his path. . . .

Looking the other way will not and cannot improve the situation in Iraq and the threat Saddam Hussein poses to the world. There is a parallel between today's situation and the situation that confronted the civilized Western World of the 1930s. In that era, democratic leaders sought to **appease** the ambitions of Adolph Hitler and the Third Reich. World War II, the Holocaust and millions of military and civilian casualties are the outcome of that deferral of action.

In conclusion, given the events of September 11th, given the past **transgressions** of Saddam Hussein, and given the threat posed to the world by his weapons of mass destruction programs, it is imperative that we provide President Bush with the strongest hand possible to seek compliance with all applicable U.N. Security Council resolutions. The attacks of September 11th and the fateful decisions not taken in the 1930s illustrate that there is a cost to not taking corrective action in a prompt and decisive fashion.

It is my sincere hope that this resolution will rally the United Nations Security Council to draft a strong resolution forcing the disarmament of Saddam Hussein and his regime of terror. If the U.N. fails to act, the U.S. must do what is in the best interest of our national security interests and disarm Saddam Hussein. . . . To do or expect anything less is to **shirk** our moral obligation to meet the national security obligations of our country.

Source: *Senator Rick Santorum, Republican from Pennsylvania, October 10, 2002.*

Vocabulary:

abide: accept or follow

analogous: similar or comparable

careening: going forward while moving

side to side

appease: to concede to demands, especially

transgressions: breakign the law

shirk: avoid or neglect a responsibility

Speech	Close reading: According to this speech, what were reasons to support or oppose the resolution?	Historical context: According to this speech, what historical events influenced the senator's decision about whether to support the resolution?
A: Clinton		
B: Byrd		
C: Santorum		

Speech	How did this senator disagree with the other two senators?	
A: Clinton	Byrd	Santorum
B: Byrd	Clinton	Santorum
C: Santorum	Clinton	Byrd