

Brian Frantz
Mr. -----
History
3/11/03

An American Invasion of Iraq is Justified

A point of utmost concern to many Americans at this time in history is whether or not America is justified in going to war with Iraq. There are multitudes of people who believe strongly on each side. Although most agree that Saddam Hussein is evil, not all believe that an invasion follows the criteria of just war. To do so, it must be shown as charitable, a last resort, for a just cause and with a just intent, between sovereign governments, not targeting non-combatants, a proportional response, and having reasonable expectation of success. The problem with Just War Theory is that it is an ideal. No war will pass each of these tests perfectly. There is always the possibility of something going wrong. Inspectors can always be given one more day. Attempts that haven't worked for twelve years can always be made again. The decision to finally invade and start a war cannot be delayed until every requirement of just war is completely met, for that is next to impossible. Thus, the doves can always argue that a war isn't justified enough, and the hawks can always say that a war is sufficiently justified. It cannot be "proven" that a war is just, like an equality can be proven in mathematics. The following is an attempt not to *prove* that an invasion of Iraq is just, but to show why it is follows Just War Theory sufficiently and is now the best choice.

Saddam Hussein has a long history of crimes against innocent civilians. It cannot be argued that he is not an evil man who hasn't had the slightest qualms about committing murder. The Gulf War was fought because Saddam was murdering civilians. In 1988, Saddam Hussein wiped out 5,000 non-combatants with the chemical weapon Mustard gas. In addition to his despicable acts in '88 and '89 against the Kurds, wiping out 2,000 villages and

committing mass-murder, Saddam has since been known to be behind other murderous deeds. He is responsible for the ordering of assassinations, including those of anyone who defects from his military and government. It has been found that, through the terrorist organization Arab Liberation Front, Saddam helps pay the families of Palestinian suicide bombers (a connection to terrorism). He has murdered the Shi'a Iraqis inside his own country. He receives one hundred percent of his people's votes not because they love him, but because they know what will happen if they dare to dissent. Saddam is evil in every sense of the word, and evil cannot go unpunished.

Saddam, however, is not merely a murderous dictator in the Middle East who fights with his neighbors. He has aspirations for even worse crimes. Ever since Saddam was removed from Kuwait and the UN passed resolutions prohibiting him from developing weapons of mass destruction, he has failed to comply with the international community's demands. After years of failing to give UN officials unfettered access to his country, the Iraqi government finally kicked the UN out of Iraq in 1998. When the UN inspectors left Iraq, they compiled a list of the weapons they knew Iraq had at the time. Among these weapons were at least 8,500 liters of anthrax, 550 artillery shells armed with mustard gas, 500 tons of chemical agents (including 4 tons of the VX nerve agent), and 6,500 bombs. This does not even include the other biological weapons he is known to have had and his work toward nuclear weapons. The quantity of weapons that Saddam was known to possess was capable of killing the entire population of the earth several times over. After the UN passed resolution 1441, Iraq produced a weapons declaration that described what Iraq claimed was all of the weapons it currently possessed, as well as the weapons it had destroyed. Nowhere in this declaration was

mentioned the weapons listed above. If Iraq no longer had them, it should be able to show how they were removed or destroyed.

In addition to Iraq's past failure to meet UN demands, Iraq is currently known to be evading UN weapons inspectors. Resolution 1441 demands Iraq to come forth and show us the undeclared weapons. Instead, inspectors are having to find the weapons themselves. And with intelligence obtained by the American government and others, including intercepted Iraqi phone conversations, it is clear that Iraq is doing all it can to hide its weapons. Included in Colin Powell's presentation to the UN Security Council in February were several intercepted conversations between Iraqi officials. One included specific instructions to not mention nerve gas in wireless communication for fear of us hearing it. Others included mention of weapon "evacuations". It is clear that Iraq has been working overtime, even establishing a committee dedicated to watching the movements of inspectors, to evade detection. In addition to the fact that Saddam has not answered for weapons we know he had, we have also found weapons that exceed UN limits. The Al-Samoud 2 missiles discovered by UN inspectors (not pointed out by Iraq) have a range of more than double what is allowed by the UN resolutions agreed to by Iraq. Iraq has also been very uncooperative in allowing private interviews with its scientists, and has frequently complained about the very inspectors it has pledged to cooperate with. Iraq has not disarmed and thus still has the weapons listed previously. But the possession of weapons of mass destruction, although forbidden Iraq by the UN and the international community, is not in and of itself a threat to us.

While it is important to make sure Saddam destroys his weapons (something that America as the strongest country in the world should fully support), he is no real threat without a means to deliver them. And while inspectors have found missiles that exceed allowable

range, Saddam does not currently have the capability of sending a missile to Western Europe, much less America. So the question must then be asked, is a unilateral¹ American war a proportional response to a madman who's threat is confined to a small region and who could possibly be prevented from launching missiles against his neighbors? Not if Saddam had to rely on his own weapons delivery systems. The fact is, however, that Saddam has other means of making use of his weapons: namely, terrorism.

Saddam's connection to terrorism has been one of great debate. Many have suggested that Bush is pushing for war with Iraq merely to "finish his daddy's war" or to gain control of Iraqi oil. They have claimed that Bush should stay focused on Osama bin Laden and not hawkishly try to wage war with countries that seemingly have no connection to terrorism. It is no secret that Saddam's primary reason for developing weapons of mass destruction is to gain regional domination, not to fight in the same jihad (holy war) as Osama bin Laden. Saddam's version of terrorism is secular, and he and bin Laden see eye-to-eye on very few things. But one area where they do agree is that they hate the West. While Saddam may not be personally involved in Al-Qaeda, he has harbored and helped them and other similar organizations. Currently, a terrorist network headed up by a collaborator of bin Laden's, Abu Musab Al-Zarqawi, is harbored by Saddam in Northwest Iraq. While much of their operations go on in Kurdish areas outside of Saddam's direct control, Saddam has an agent in the organization that controls this specific area where Al-Zarqawi's poison and training camps are. This same agent offered to harbor Al-Qaeda members when they fled Afghanistan (and currently does). Al-Zarqawi received medical attention in Baghdad, and currently in Baghdad work nearly two dozen Al-Qaeda affiliates who coordinate the movement of money, people, and supplies in Iraq

¹ Our proposed war against Iraq is not unilateral, for we have many allies, chiefly Britain. However, the point of this paper is whether or not it would be right for America to go alone were it necessary.

for Al-Zarqawi's organization. It has been discovered by a foreign security service that Osama bin Laden himself has met senior Iraqi intelligence officials. Saddam has sent agents to Afghanistan to help train Al-Qaeda troops, according to a senior Iraqi defector. Hamas set up an office in Baghdad in 1999. Iraq hosted conferences which were attended by terrorist groups such as Palestinian Islamic Jihad. According to a detained senior Iraqi operative, Al-Qaeda came to Saddam for help in obtaining chemical and biological weapons. In response, Saddam provided two Al-Qaeda associates with training in these areas, and also helped the terrorists obtain poisons and gases.

While the link between Saddam and Osama bin Laden may not be very close, Saddam has certainly had a past of helping terrorist organizations, Al-Qaeda included. With a common hatred for the West and for America in particular, it is not at all unlikely that Saddam will continue to aid terrorists. And should terrorists get access to his vast quantities of chemical and biological weapons, they would not hesitate to bring them over to America and use them on Americans. The problem is that we cannot know for sure if and when this might happen. That is why President Bush's policy of acting preemptively against nations that help terrorists is necessary. We cannot afford to wait for an Iraqi-manufactured, terrorist-delivered weapon to take the lives of hundreds and thousands of Americans before we go after him. We know he is evil and willing to use his weapons to murder. We know he has not had a problem with helping terrorists in the past. It is highly possible that he might use them to deliver his weapons, especially now that the UN is back in his country making it hard to use them himself.

Thus, while an American war might not be a proportional response to a remote evil man who can be successfully confined, that is not the case here. Iraq might not be able to send his weapons over here via a missile, but he can use terrorists to deliver them. A war is a

proportional response to those who help terrorists, and Saddam has been found to do so. This war has a just cause: the prevention of murder and the elimination of a tyrant willing and capable of indirectly attacking America. This war also has a just intent. Not oil or revenge, as some have claimed, but the destruction of an evil and dangerous regime and the liberation of the Iraqis. Although America has no business coming into a lawful country and setting up a new government for them, Iraq is anything but lawful and has committed international crimes that cannot go unanswered. Weapons inspectors have not worked for twelve years, so why should they work now? Practically every diplomatic option has been attempted, and all have failed. So what if Iraq destroys a few missiles, it is clearly a façade with the intent of buying more time.

Not only is an American war against Iraq just, it is charitable. In addition to getting rid of a mass-murderer who has wiped out defenseless villages in the past, we will be liberating the oppressed Iraqis. The “elections” in Iraq are a clear demonstration of their lack of freedom. People can’t vote against their ruler for fear of losing their life. People can’t voice their opinion against him for fear of having drills driven into their hands or their tongue cut out. By freeing these poor people and helping them set up a government that gives them freedom of speech, freedom to choose their leaders, and the opportunity to better their lives through capitalism, an American war will not only serve a great humanitarian purpose, but will help the Iraqis transform their country into one that creates wealth, all because of freedom. It’s happening in Afghanistan. A man with \$10,000 in his bank account under the Taliban is now the owner of many hotels and Internet Cafés. And he’s not the only one. These results are possible in Iraq. While in and of itself this is not sufficient reason for a war, it is one of the significant perquisites and shows this war to be charitable.

Finally, there is plenty of expectation for success. On the military side, America has the most powerful military in the world, and although there will inevitably be American and civilian casualties, the loser will most definitely be Saddam Hussein and his government. On the humanitarian side, there has been a great victory in Afghanistan, and these same wonderful results are possible in Iraq.

Before the conclusion of this paper, it is important to point out why Saddam Hussein should be the first to go, and not any of the other anti-American leaders out there. If the whole reason for war is to eliminate those who help terrorists, shouldn't we go after those countries with a clearer tie? For example, most of the 911 terrorists were from Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia, while technically our ally, has been known to financially aid and harbor terrorists to a much greater extent than Iraq. Shouldn't they be our first target? The primary difference here is danger. Money isn't going to kill thousands of people, but weapons of mass destruction can. The argument has been made that if we go after Iraq, we have opened a can of worms and thus need to go after every other country with even the slightest connection to terrorism. But actually, this argument can be made to explain why the opposite is true. Yes, we need to cut off funding and aid to terrorism. But there are far more countries and organizations that help fund and harbor terrorists than there are that help supply them with weapons. Thus, it is opening a can of worms to attack countries like Saudi Arabia first, but it's not to attack Iraq. Iraq is unique in its ability to help terrorists in ways that practically no other country can. They have the ability (and as we have seen, the willingness) to give terrorists not just money, but weapons too. And these weapons aren't conventional guns that can kill a few people, but weapons of mass destruction that can kill thousands of people. This is why Iraq should be our first priority.

For the reasons given, it is time for Saddam Hussein to go. It doesn't matter if we do not have UN approval or even if we have to go it completely alone. Conformity to the world has never helped better the people of the earth, and America cannot fail to do what it knows is right just because our allies can't see past their oil contracts and past deals. There have always been and will always be protestors for peace. There will never be a war that is a one-hundred-percent cut and dried and easy decision. Sending thousands of young men to fight should never be an easy decision. But having the guts to do so when circumstances warrant does not constitute hawkish warmongering. 911 was the 21st century's Pearl Harbor. We are at war, and not just against Osama bin Laden and his minions. Terrorism in every shape and size must be fought to prevent future 911s. And as President Bush said after that day which will live in infamy, "you're either with us, or you're with the terrorists." Saddam Hussein is with the terrorists.