

## Pre-War Arguments For and Against the War

Pre-War Args in Favor of War	Pre-War Args Against War
1. Iraq violated 16 U.N. Security Council resolutions.	1. Israel has violated 32 resolutions, and Turkey and Morocco have each violated more than 16 UN resolutions. If we really cared about the UN resolutions, then we should enforce the resolutions that Israel, Turkey and Morocco have all violated, and THEN worry about Iraq. It is arbitrary/inconsistent to pick and choose which countries we will pursue, and which resolutions are more important than others.
2. Iraq violated resolution 1441 which authorizes US military force to be used.	2. The resolution threatens that "serious consequences as a result of its continued violations of its obligations" (13) will occur if Iraq doesn't comply, but military action is not specifically outlined in that resolution.
3. Iraq has weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and have used some of them on Iran and Iraqis in the past.	3. (a) Powell said that we had evidence that there were weapons of mass destruction, but that if he told us how he knew that, it would endanger our sources of information. They had artist's renderings of mobile chemical labs, which is not the same as seeing actual mobile chemical labs. (b) This argument is too broad; it justifies war with many other countries (e.g. Pakistan). If we're concerned about WMD consistently, then do we not need to rid the world of these weapons, including our own WMD? (c) Even if one grants that Iraq has WMD, war is not the only acceptable solution.
4. Iraqi citizens need to be liberated [not officially made before the war, but right before war (at best)].  (b) If we really cared about the citizens, why did we let the citizens suffer so much under the UN sanctions?	4.(a) If we were really concerned about Iraqi citizens, why did we not stick up for the Kurds in 1988, when Hussein used chemical weapons on them? In fact, we continued to support Hussein for at least a year and a half after that attack (for another example, see 4(b) below). (b) In 1991, Shiites in South Iraq were directly encouraged by the U.S. to rise up against Hussein, and the U.S. then abandoned them and their cause. (c) If we really cared about the citizens, why did we let the citizens suffer so much under the UN sanctions? (d) If human rights is really our cause, the U.S. and "the coalition of the willing" would be busy for a long time, if not indefinitely.
5. Hussein used chemical weapons on Iraqi citizens in 1988 (in Halabja); he's evil, and needs to be removed (part I).	5. (a) We (i.e., members of the Republican party) supported Hussein's regime while this was happening, and continued to support him and sought to work with him for at least a year and a half after he did this. So how could this be the primary or best reason to go to war now, since it bothered no one before? (b) How could this issue be the main reason for going to war, when some of the same people were in the Reagan administration when this was going on (e.g., Cheney) or were hired as an envoy to Iraq (e.g., Rumsfeld, then CEO of Searle pharmaceuticals).

## Pre-War Arguments For and Against the War

Pre-War Args in Favor of War	Pre-War Args Against War
<p>6. (a) We cannot wait for Hussein to invade his neighbors or use his weapons on Iraqi citizens (a pre-emptive strike is necessary).</p> <p>(b) Clinton used pre-emptive strikes against Sudan, Iraq, and Afghanistan during his presidency in order to deal with varied threats therefrom; if no one complained about these attacks due to their pre-emptive nature, then these kinds of attacks are acceptable now.</p>	<p>6.(a) If this is a good rationale for going to war, we can make this argument of every single nation that we don't feel comfortable with; in other words, this argument is too broad - it justifies much more war than just war with Iraq. Also, this argument justifies other countries' going to war with any other country virtually anytime for pretty much any reason.</p> <p>(b) The current Iraq case is going to war to remove a leader; the Clinton attacks were retaliatory strikes in response to different events that occurred or originated in these countries. The premise of pre-emption is false; these attacks were not pre-emptive.</p>
<p>7. First, the UN is not moving fast enough, so we need to act alone to enforce Res. 1441. Second, the UN is irrelevant, and we should pull out of the UN (Possible response).</p>	<p>7. We're using the UN to argue that we should go to war (because Iraq has violated resolutions, and Res. 1441 authorizes military force - acc. to the pro-war side); but we're also arguing that we don't need to get approval from the UN in order to go to war. First, if we are a part of the UN, we should come to a consensus about which actions to take. Second, if we think the UN is not valuable, then why should we remain a part of it?</p>
<p>8. (a) Hussein is evil; he deserves to be executed (part II).</p> <p>(b) [Reply to 8(a)] The executive order does not include military leaders, so since Hussein is a military leader, it is permissible to kill him (i.e., he doesn't fit the criteria of the executive order).</p> <p>(c) ?</p>	<p>8. (a) We have an executive order that states that we cannot execute a head of state.</p> <p>(b) If this is a good argument, then the executive order means almost nothing, since every leader of his or her country is either actually or effectively in charge of the military.</p> <p>(c) If this is a good argument, then many other leaders should be removed immediately.</p>
<p>9. If we achieve the objective(s) of the war quickly, we'll be able to smooth over our relations with the Allies who are not in favor of the war. Also, some of our Allies are actually in favor of the war (Britain, Spain, Israel, and lots of other tinier countries).</p>	<p>9. Many of our allies do not support the war; going to war could ruin our relations with our allies for an unforeseen amount of time and potentially significant damage in those relations.</p>
<p>10. If we get attacked by terrorists after we go to war, we'll just have to seek them out and handle that situation if and when that happens.</p>	<p>10. Going to war could breed even more hostility in the Arab and/or Muslim minds; it may be construed as an attack against Islam instead of a liberation of Iraq.</p>
<p>11. (a) We've given the inspections 12+ years and we haven't found what we're sure is there.</p> <p>(b) We still know that Iraq has some major weapons, and we cannot wait until they use them.</p>	<p>11. (a) Let the inspections work; continue inspections and try to find all the weapons that the U.S. claims they have.</p> <p>(b) Iraq has lost 94% of their weapons since 1990, so there can't be that much there. And the inspections of the years between 1991 - 2000 were not really well done. It was only around 2002 that the inspections really started bearing fruit, because the terms and conditions were more stringent.</p>

## Pre-War Arguments For and Against the War

<b>Pre-War Args in Favor of War</b>	<b>Pre-War Args Against War</b>
12. The war is not about oil.	12. "No blood for oil." There is evidence that Rumsfeld even in the Reagan/Bush years was negotiating with Hussein in order to have a pipeline be set up and leave Iraq. Cheney was the VP of Halliburton, which stands to gain a lot of money from Bechtel, the company that has recently been awarded the post-war oil contract.
13. We need to finish what we started in Iraq, and then we'll deal with North Korea.	13. If we should go to war with any country, it might be North Korea, because they actually have nuclear weapons, as they have admitted.

I would like to thank Kerry Leibowitz, who made some very helpful suggestions.