

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 477 749

SO 034 935

TITLE War in Iraq.  
INSTITUTION Constitutional Rights Foundation, Los Angeles, CA.  
PUB DATE 2003-00-00  
NOTE 40p.  
AVAILABLE FROM Constitutional Rights Foundation, 601 South Kingsley Drive, Los Angeles, CA 90005. Tel: 213-487-5590; Fax: 213-386-0459; Web site: <http://www.crf-usa.org/>. For full text: [http://www.crf.usa.org/Iraqwar\\_html/iraqwar\\_home.html](http://www.crf.usa.org/Iraqwar_html/iraqwar_home.html).  
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom - Teacher (052)  
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Censorship; Conflict Resolution; Discussion (Teaching Technique); Foreign Countries; \*Foreign Policy; \*International Law; Law Related Education; \*Mass Media Role; Social Studies; Student Projects; \*War; World Problems  
IDENTIFIERS \*Iraq

## ABSTRACT

The roots of international law are long and ancient. Archaeologists have unearthed treaties between two Mesopotamian rulers dating back to 3100 B.C. Of all the ancient peoples, the development of modern international law owes the most to the Romans. The 20th century saw two attempts to bring world order through the use of international organizations, the League of Nations and the United Nations. Both were designed as a forum for settling international conflict, a source for international law, and to provide a peacekeeping function through collective security. For the United States, one of the most difficult issues in foreign policy is deciding when the U.S. should exercise military force, as it did in Iraq. This teaching guide on the war in Iraq is divided into four sections: (1) "War and International Law" (A Brief History of the Law of War; America's Foreign Policy: A Brief History; America's Foreign Policy: Military Intervention); (2) "War and the Media" (Fact Finders The Media in Times of Crisis; Press Freedom vs. Military Censorship); (3) "Helping Students Cope" (Suggestions for Teachers; War in Iraq--How Do You Feel? What Do You Think?; Handling Controversy; Project Suggestions); and (4) "Web Links" (Statistics and Information; Web Directories; Maps; Encyclopedias; Gulf War (1980-88); Hussein; Humanitarian Groups; Anti-War Movement; Doves Who Became Hawks; Weblogs; Analyses of Media Coverage; Bush Doctrine; Reporters in the Field; Other Links). The guide contains many types of activities. (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made  
from the original document.



# War in Iraq

**Constitutional Rights Foundation  
601 South Kingsley Drive  
Los Angeles, CA 90005  
(213) 487-5590**

[http://www.crf-usa.org/iraqwar\\_html/iraqwar\\_home.html](http://www.crf-usa.org/iraqwar_html/iraqwar_home.html)

SO 034 935

**2003**

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND  
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS  
BEEN GRANTED BY

*M. Croddy*

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE**

2

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.



## Table of Contents

### **War and International Law**

- A Brief History of the Law of War
- America's Foreign Policy: A Brief History
- America's Foreign Policy: Military Intervention

### **War and the Media**

- Fact Finders—The Media In Times of Crisis
- Press Freedom vs. Military Censorship

### **Helping Students Cope**

- Suggestions for Teachers
- War in Iraq—How Do You Feel? What Do You Think?
- Handling Controversy
- Project Suggestions

### **Web Links**

- Statistics and Information
- Web Directories
- Maps
- Encyclopedias
- Gulf War (1991)
- Iran-Iraq War (1980-88)
- Hussein
- Humanitarian Groups
- Anti-War Movement
- Doves Who Became Hawks
- Weblogs
- Analyses of Media Coverage
- Bush Doctrine
- Reporters in the Field
- Other Links



# War and International Law

## A Brief History of the Law of War

The roots of international law are long and ancient. Archaeologists have unearthed treaties between two Mesopotamian rulers dating back to 3100 B.C. Egyptian pharaohs also left records of treaties in effect with neighboring peoples. The ancient Chinese created what might be called international law as early as 2500 B.C. Of all ancient peoples, however, the development of modern international law owes the most to the Romans.

### **Pax Romana**

From about 31 B.C. to the fifth century A.D., almost the entire civilized Western world was politically united under the Roman Empire. To accomplish the feat of controlling the lands conquered by its mighty armies, Rome developed a powerful central administration. Organization, military power, government and law kept the empire at relative peace and so the whole era has been called Pax Romana (Pax means peace in Latin).

To administer justice to diverse peoples, the Romans needed laws that reflected the needs of the empire. Roman judges had to settle disputes among people with different beliefs and languages. To do this, the Romans borrowed from Greek philosophers and applied what has been called “universal law.” It is based on the idea that there is a law that applies to all humans regardless of their culture or origin. The Romans believed all people could discover principles of universal law through the use of reason.

On the basis of universal law, the Romans developed a system of law called jus gentium (law of nations). It was international law used throughout the empire. The power of Rome enforced the law.

### **The Middle Ages**

With the fall of Rome and its empire, Pax Romana ended and what had been Roman Europe fell into a period of upheaval and political instability. Threatened by foes from the north and east, people looked for protection by forming alliances on the local level. These unstable political conditions gave rise to the early versions of feudalism, with kings and nobles exercising control over relatively small areas. The local population swore loyalty to a noble or king in exchange for protection and security. During this period, people sought a stabilizing force for bringing order to what, in comparison to Pax Romana, must have seemed a brutal and chaotic time. Of all the institutions of the Middle Ages, the Roman Catholic Church offered the best chance to fulfill the role once held by Rome. It could provide a moral voice, even if it were unable in any ongoing way to

provide the military and political muscle to impose order.

In addition, drawing on Greek and Roman ideas, medieval philosophers contended that there existed a body of legal principles and a sense of right that applied to all peoples everywhere. They called this “natural law.” Its rules could be discovered through the processes of pure reasoning. In effect, natural law existed “in the air,” merely waiting for the embrace of right-thinking men, no matter what their position in life might be. In addition, since the church’s law applied to all Christians, it too had an international force. The sanctity of treaties, the right to make war, and arbitration of disputes all came under the authority of the pope.

In this era, Christian theologians such as Saint Augustine of Hippo, and later St. Thomas Aquinas, developed ideas about what made a war just or unjust. Augustine argued that only legitimate rulers could make war and that it must be fought for the right reasons, mainly the desire to bring about peace. Aquinas built on the ideas of Augustine. He held that war could only be just if three conditions were met. A war must be waged by a lawful authority with the power to wage war. A war must have a just cause. A war must be intended to accomplish good or avoid evil. These concepts had great influence on later thinkers.

### **The Early Modern Era**

The Thirty Years War ushered in a new era. What began as a religious feud among medieval societies ended with the birth of modern states. The Roman Catholic Church and its Holy Roman Empire became less important in political affairs. To meet the new realities, the doctrine of sovereignty developed. It held that the highest authority possible rested in the hands of the heads of theoretically equal states. Each monarch, within his or her domain, held the mantle that once cloaked popes and Roman emperors.

Although the notion of sovereignty did address the new political reality in Europe, it also raised some thorny questions. If no higher authority than that of individual states existed, what authority could regulate them domestically or internationally? If quarrels arose among them, who would settle them? Would mankind face a cycle of endless war with nothing to determine who was right or wrong? Certainly, each monarch was answerable to his own god, through the divine right of kings, but what if the same god gave different messages? The first hint of an answer, philosophically at least, came from the work of Hugo Grotius and other thinkers.

Grotius, a 17th century Dutch scholar, again approached the problem of war. Like Augustine and Aquinas before him, he argued that wars were “just” or “unjust.” Unlike his Christian predecessors, he based his theories on the ideas of the Enlightenment. He identified factors such as the motivation of the states and the cause involved to judge whether a war was “just” or “unjust.” More importantly, he argued for the principle that the actions of states were not above law. Instead, just as individuals were bound by a natural law, so were states. From this early “law of nations” evolved some of our modern ideas about international law.

## **The Concert of Europe**

Essential to the political system between 1818 and 1914 was the concept of the balance of power. After the Napoleonic Wars, the Europeans set up the Concert of Europe. Using alliances, they aligned themselves so that no group of nations was clearly militarily stronger than any other group of nations. By balancing the power between groups, stability was reached and all-out wars were avoided for almost a hundred years. Because of the resulting political stability on the continent, Europe was able to dictate policy to the rest of the world. International politics, and for that matter laws, became Europeanized in a way never before possible. Nations outside of Europe often found themselves at a political and legal disadvantage when dealing with European powers.

At the same time, the rise of nationalism fostered the emergence of the concept of consent. The European nations held fast to the belief that no state, at least no powerful state, was responsible to any higher authority than itself. The applicability of international law became limited to situations in which a state agreed to limit its options through treaty, accord, or international agreement.

Ultimately, the Concert of Europe, relatively stable for so long, failed when the European powers found themselves dragged into the First World War by their entangling alliances.

## **Collective Security**

The 20th century saw two attempts to bring world order through the use of international organizations, the League of Nations and the United Nations. In both cases, membership was extended to nations all over the world. Both were designed to be a forum for settling international conflict, a source for international law, and to provide a peacekeeping function through collective security. Under collective security, nations give up the use of force in international disputes and pledge to come to the aid of nations who are attacked by aggressors. In both cases, problems arose in defining “aggression” and in getting member nations to agree to act. The rule of law could not escape the reality of politics.

Until the fall of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact of Eastern European vassal states, collective security operated under the realities of a bipolar world. The United States and its allies countered the Soviet bloc. The threat of mutually assured destruction by each bloc’s nuclear weapons promoted rough political stability throughout the Cold War. Both of the superpowers had veto powers over the use of the collective security powers of the Security Council of the United Nations. The U.N. could intervene only when both superpowers agreed. (In one notable exception, the Security Council voted to send forces to counter northern aggression in the Korean Conflict after the Soviet representatives had walked out in protest.)

With the end of the Cold War, only one superpower remained. Questions arose about the role of the alliances and collective security arrangements that had been built up to address the needs of a bipolar world. Further complicating the issue has been the increase of worldwide terrorism. Terrorist groups are not nation states and they operate across national borders. As such, many of the assumptions of collective security and laws among nations do not apply. Since the terrible destruction stemming from the events of

September 11, 2001, the United States under the Bush administration has been grappling with a different world reality. How this will affect existing institutions and doctrines of international law remains to be seen.

### **For Discussion and Writing**

1. Many scholars argue that international law is mainly the product of Western thinking. What evidence can you find in the brief history that supports this argument?
  2. Who was Hugo Grotius? Why was he important?
  3. Do you believe there are universal or natural laws? If so, what are they?
  4. What is a “just war?” With which of the definitions in the reading do you most agree? Why?
  5. Does a country ever have the right to ignore international law or act outside the United Nations collective security process? If so, under what circumstances?
- 

### **ACTIVITY**

#### **The International Law of War Commission**

Imagine you have been appointed to an international commission. Its mission is to study the issue of a “just war” and make recommendations about a definition of it for the 21st century. To complete your task, follow these steps:

1. Divide into groups of three or four students and appoint a chairperson to lead your discussions and a spokesperson to give your report to the whole commission.
2. Review the material in the reading about previous definitions of a just war including the work of St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas and Hugo Grotius. Also, review the material concerning collective security.
3. Conduct a discussion using these questions:
  - What are legitimate reasons for a just war? (For example, self-defense or immediate threat of attack)
  - What goals must a country have to conduct a just war? (For example, to create stability in a region or gain lost territory.)
  - Must a just war be approved by the United Nations or some other international body? Why or why not?



- Is a just war ever possible? Why or why not?
4. Prepare a statement describing the elements necessary for a just war and prepare to present it to the entire commission.
  5. Present your recommendations and answer any questions other commission members may have.
  6. Discuss and choose the best ideas presented by all the groups and create a commission recommendation.
- 

## **America's Foreign Policy: A Brief History**

A central function of the U.S. government is to conduct relations with the almost 200 other nations in the world. A nation is a sovereign country, and as such, possesses the highest authority over its territories. All sovereign states are theoretically equal.

Foreign policy determines how America conducts relations with other countries. It is designed to further certain goals. It seeks to assure America's security and defense. It seeks the power to protect and project America's national interests around the world. National interest shapes foreign policy and covers a wide range of political, economic, military, ideological, and humanitarian concerns.

America's foreign policy has changed over time reflecting the change in its national interest. As a new nation after the Revolutionary War, America's prime national interest was to maintain its independence from more powerful European countries. Protected by the Atlantic Ocean, its major foreign policy, as typified by the Monroe Doctrine, was to limit European attempts of further colonization of the Western Hemisphere.

Through the 19th century, America concentrated on creating a nation that spanned the continent, and it avoided foreign entanglements. Once industrialized and more prosperous, it began looking for foreign markets and colonies.

By the turn of the 20th century, the United States had become a minor imperial power, fighting a war with Spain for Cuba and the Philippines and annexing Hawaii and several other territories. World War I engaged the United States in European affairs, but after the war, a wave of isolationist feeling swept the country. Refusing membership in the League of Nations, America turned inward once again. Absorbed by the prosperity of the 1920s and the Great Depression of the 1930s, America let its military strength erode. It was not prepared for war when the Japanese struck the U.S. fleet at Pearl Harbor in late 1941.

Emerging from World War II as the most powerful economic power on Earth, the United States changed its foreign policy dramatically. It took the lead in founding the United



Nations. It invested billions of dollars through the Marshall Plan to help strengthen war-devastated European democracies. It created a system of alliances, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Central to America's foreign policy in the post-war period was the containment of the Soviet Union and communism. During the Cold War, the United States and its allies competed with the Soviet Union and its allies militarily, economically, and ideologically. Both sides created massive military forces and huge stockpiles of nuclear weapons. Although the two superpowers never went to war, the policy of containment led the United States into the bloody Korean and Vietnam wars.

The Cold War ended when the Soviet Union, economically exhausted from competing with the West, disintegrated. This left the United States the only remaining superpower in a world no longer ruled by the logic of containing the Soviet Union.

Through time, various constitutional principles and values have shaped American foreign policy. American foreign policy has favored the self-determination of nations for independence. Based on our commitment to constitutional government, we often favor and support nations that practice democracy. These principles, however, sometimes have conflicted with the goals of national security, economics, or the realities of international politics. In certain cases, America has supported dictatorial governments or intervened to curtail popular political movements.

### **Making and Carrying Out Foreign Policy**

America's foreign policy today covers a wide range of functions and issues. It includes establishing and maintaining diplomatic relations with other countries and international organizations such as the United Nations and the Organization of American States. It includes peacekeeping functions such as working with allies to assure regional and international security and arms-control efforts. It covers a range of international economic issues including trade, travel, and business. It involves foreign aid and disaster relief. As a superpower, the United States has also taken a leadership role in peacemaking around the globe by trying to negotiate treaties and agreements to end regional conflicts. Also, as a world leader, the United States has a longstanding role in trying to address international economic and environmental problems.

The making and carrying out of America's foreign policy involve all three branches of government and a complex array of governmental institutions and agencies.

The president and the executive branch have the most significant role in making foreign policy and are responsible for carrying it out. With the advice and consent of the Senate, the president makes treaties and appoints ambassadors. The president can hold summit meetings with world leaders. As commander in chief of the military, the president can, by executive order, rapidly project U.S. power around the globe.

In forming U.S. foreign policy, the president relies on advice from the National Security Council. This group is made up of the vice-president, secretary of state, secretary of defense, head of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and chair of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff (the nation's highest military adviser).

The secretary of state heads the U.S. State Department and often represents the president abroad. The State Department carries out foreign policy decisions and helps develop foreign policy for every region of the world. Attached to the State Department is the U.S. Foreign Service, or diplomatic corps. It is made up of ambassadors (who represent America's political interests in every country), consuls (who represent America's business interests), and other officials who specialize in technical matters and issues of foreign aid.

Congress also plays a role in America's foreign policy through its power to set duties and tariffs on foreign exports and imports, regulate foreign commerce and immigration, and declare war. It sets quotas on immigration, chooses which countries will benefit for most-favored-nation status in trade agreements, votes on foreign aid, and sets the defense budget. But Congress is usually in the role of accepting, changing, or rejecting policies proposed by the president.

The Supreme Court plays a limited role in foreign policy. It has jurisdiction over cases involving treaties, admiralty and maritime law, and ambassadors and other public ministers. It also is charged with deciding disputes between states and foreign states and their citizens and subjects.

At different times, tensions have arisen between the branches in the conduct of foreign policy. Presidents sometimes favor treaties that the Senate does not want to approve. President Woodrow Wilson promoted treaties establishing the League of Nations after World War I, but the Senate opposed the League and refused to ratify the treaties. Other times, tensions have arisen between the Congress' power to declare war and the president's role as commander in chief. Presidents have committed American armed forces to major conflicts such as the Korean, Vietnam, and Gulf wars without a declaration of war by Congress.

The public also plays a role in influencing foreign policy. Advocacy groups for foreign countries often try to influence Congress and the president about issues. Business associations lobby the government about international economic and trade issues. Groups and individuals with strong views on certain foreign policy issues, especially military intervention, often organize protests or other political actions to influence decisions.

### **For Discussion**

1. What is foreign policy? How would you characterize American foreign policy during most of the 19th century? At the beginning of the 20th century? Following World War II? Today? What do you think accounts for the differences?
2. What role do the three branches of government have in creating American foreign policy? What tensions sometimes arise between the branches over foreign policy? Who else influences foreign policy?

3. What principles and values have helped shaped American foreign policy?
- 

## **America's Foreign Policy: Military Intervention**

One of the most difficult issues in foreign policy is deciding when the United States should exercise military force. Most people think that military force may be used if a vital national interest of the United States is threatened. The difficulty lies in getting people to agree on what constitutes a vital national interest.

Almost everyone would agree that an attack by a foreign country on the United States threatens a vital interest. Many also would think a vital interest threatened if a country attacked a nation that we had signed a security agreement with. Disagreements emerge when the threat involves the free flow of a precious commodity, such as oil. They also surface over situations that do not pose an immediate threat to U.S. security but could imperil it in the future, such as when a region becomes unstable and the instability may lead to wider conflicts. Another area of debate opens over human rights and humanitarian efforts. The United States is the most powerful democratic nation on Earth. Does that mean we always have a vital interest in promoting human rights and democracy? Or, should we stay out of the affairs of other nations unless they threaten other of our national interests?

Another issue arises over how the United States should exercise military force. Some argue that America should never act unilaterally, but should only act with others, allies or particularly with the United Nations. They believe America has a strong interest in upholding international law. Others agree that it is appropriate to act in coalitions, but they think demanding it in every circumstance would paralyze America's role as a world leader.

Debates over intervention have arisen often. Below are a few situations in which American presidents decided to use military force in recent years.

### **The Invasion of Panama in 1989**

The Panama Canal is a strategic waterway connecting the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. In 1977, the United States, which had controlled the canal zone since the canal was built, agreed to return control to Panama by 1999.

In the 1980s, Panama was led by the head of the military, Manuel Noriega. He had permitted elections, but allegations of his wrongdoing—voter fraud, intimidation, murder, drug dealing—were widely believed. In 1988, the United States indicted Noriega for drug trafficking and racketeering. That same year, Panama's president tried to dismiss Noriega. But the Noriega-backed legislature dismissed the president instead. The Reagan administration refused to recognize Noriega's choice for president and imposed economic sanctions on Panama. Noriega held new presidential elections in May 1989, but when a Noriega opponent won, Noriega voided the election. He placed a new president in office

in September. In October, military leaders tried to overthrow the regime, but Noriega put down the coup. In December, the legislature named Noriega chief executive officer of the government. It also declared that Panama was in a state of war with the United States. The following day, a U.S. soldier in civilian clothes was killed by Panamanian soldiers. Four days later, President George Bush ordered the invasion of Panama. The U.S. Marines quickly took the country. Noriega was taken to the United States, tried, and convicted. The winner of the May 1989 election was inaugurated as the new president of Panama.

### **The Persian Gulf War of 1991**

In August 1990, Iraq invaded and occupied its small, but oil-rich neighbor, Kuwait. The U.N. Security Council called for Iraq's immediate withdrawal and imposed a trade embargo on Iraq. With 300,000 troops in Kuwait, Iraq seemed to pose a threat against Saudi Arabia, a militarily weak neighboring country with huge oil reserves. The United States, its NATO allies, Egypt, and a few other Arab countries sent about 700,000 troops to Saudi Arabia. (More than 500,000 of these troops were American.) In September, the U.N. Security Council authorized the use of force against Iraq unless it withdrew from Kuwait by January 15, 1991. On January 16, the United States and its NATO allies started bombarding Iraq from the air. For several weeks, they pounded its air defense networks, oil refineries, communications systems, bridges and roads, government buildings, and weapons plants. Then they attacked Iraqi troops in Kuwait and southern Iraq. On February 24, troops under American command invaded Kuwait. Within three days, the troops had retaken Kuwait and driven deep into Iraq. With the coalition's mission accomplished, U.S. President George Bush declared a cease fire. Kuwait's independence was restored, and the trade embargo on Iraq remained in force.

### **The Invasion of Haiti in 1994**

Haiti is a poor Caribbean nation on the island of Hispaniola. Half of the island belongs to Haiti; the other half is another country—the Dominican Republic. For most of its history, Haiti has been ruled by brutal military dictators. In 1990, the nation's first free elections were held. Jean-Bertrand Aristide, a Roman Catholic priest, won election as president. In 1991, after seven months in office, the military overthrew Aristide. While the United States, United Nations, and the Organization of American States negotiated with the military government to get Aristide returned to power, thousands of refugees fled the island in small boats. Negotiations made little progress and boat people kept arriving in America. In 1993, the military government finally agreed to let Aristide return, but failed to keep its promise. In 1994, the United Nations authorized the use of force to remove the dictatorship. President Bill Clinton announced that the U.S. military would invade if Haiti's military leaders did not leave the country. With the U.S. fleet approaching Haiti, Clinton sent a delegation led by former President Jimmy Carter to Haiti's capital. After round-the-clock negotiations, Haiti's military leader agreed to leave and to order his military not to resist American troops. Aristide returned to power. U.S. troops occupied the island for six years. Democracy in Haiti remains unstable.

### **The Kosovo Conflict in 1999**

Following the fall of the Soviet Union, the Eastern European nation of Yugoslavia started

disintegrating. Four of the six republics making up Yugoslavia declared independence. Serbia, the largest of the republics, refused to recognize their independence. A bloody civil war erupted. Particularly disturbing were incidents of “ethnic cleansing,” when one side would drive members of the other group from their territory and sometimes even commit mass murder. In 1995, a peace agreement was brokered by the United States.

Amid this chaos, a crisis was growing in Kosovo, a region in Southern Serbia. More than 90 percent of its inhabitants are ethnic Albanians. (Albania is a neighboring country.) Kosovo had traditionally been treated almost as a seventh republic in Yugoslavia, but in 1989 Serbian rule was imposed. In 1997, a radical group, the Kosovo Liberation Army, demanded independence and started carrying out guerilla attacks on Serbian police. In 1998, the Serbian military responded with brutal force, driving thousands from their homes. The Clinton administration worked to get NATO involved. NATO demanded that Serbia withdraw its troops. Both sides negotiated, but Serbia refused to sign an agreement that would place NATO troops in Kosovo. NATO threatened air strikes, and when Serbia didn’t back down, air strikes began in late March 1999. For two months, NATO pounded Serbian targets. Finally, Serbia relented and signed a peace treaty. Almost 800,000 refugees returned to their homes in Kosovo under NATO protection. In 2000, the president of Serbia, who had been indicted by the United Nations as a war criminal, was defeated in an election and stepped down.

### **For Discussion**

1. How do you think domestic politics might impose restraints or obligations in the way the United States acts in the world?
2. In each of the situations described, what might be some reasons against intervening? What reasons were there for intervening?
3. What do you think are vital national interests of the United States? Why?
4. When do you think it is justified for the United States to use military force? Explain.
5. Do you think the United States should ever use military force unilaterally? Explain.

---

### **ACTIVITY**

#### **Small-Group Activity: Crisis!**

Step 1. Divide the class into groups of three or four students.

Step 2. Distribute Handout—Crisis! Should the United States Intervene Militarily? to each student. Review the handout’s assignment, answer any questions, and tell students how much time they have.

Step 3. Call on a group to report on what it decided to do about Country A and why. Ask if other groups agreed or disagreed with this group and why. Hold a class discussion.

Step 4. Repeat this process for Country B.

Step 5. Debrief the activity by asking under what circumstances they believe it is proper for the United States to intervene militarily in the world.

---

## **Handout: Crisis! Should the United States Intervene Militarily?**

You are members of the National Security Council. You advise the U.S. president on matters of national security. The president has asked for your advice on whether the United States should intervene militarily in the following situations. For each situation, you should do the following:

1. Discuss reasons for intervening and reasons against intervening.
2. Decide whether to intervene.
3. Assign different members of your group to report your decision in each situation and the reasons for your decision.

### **Country A**

This is a small country in the Caribbean. Its economy depends on tourism. For many years, dictators ruled it. In 1990, the country became democratic and held its first elections. Unfortunately, in recent years, tourism has declined dramatically, causing an economic crisis in the country. In recent weeks, a military coup took place. Protests have taken place, and disorder reigns in the streets. The military leaders have threatened to nationalize the tourist industry, jeopardizing privately owned American investments. A small contingent of American medical students live on the island. Their safety is in question. The Organization of East Caribbean States has called on the United States to intervene militarily and restore order.

### **Country B**

This is a poor African country near the equator. Two major ethnic groups live in the country and have a long history of not getting along. When the country became independent in the 1960s, a dictatorship began. Its leader favored members of one ethnic group over the other. Many members of the oppressed group left the country and lived as refugees. In 1990, an army of these refugees invaded and forced the dictator to allow refugees to return and share power in the government. The two groups lived in peace, but tension remained high. Recently, extremists overthrew the government. They want to rid the country of all members of the oppressed ethnic group by killing them. Their carefully planned extermination has begun. If this army is not stopped, more than 1 million persons will die. This would be one of the largest genocides since World War II. A United Nations resolution has condemned the killing, but the United Nations has no armed force prepared to enter to the country. No neighboring country has the ability to intervene. Members of the fallen government have called on the United States to intervene militarily. The United States has no alliance with this country or with any countries bordering it. But several countries that have harbored refugees have offered the United States the use of their airports and facilities. No U.S. military force is nearby.



# War and the Media

## Fact Finders: The Media in Times of Crisis

During times of crisis, people want information. They turn to news sources to find out what is happening and to help them figure out what might happen. At the same time, news sources are working at full capacity on short deadlines. Under these circumstances, false reports are sometimes circulated and believed.

In some cases, rumors spread and are taken as fact. This can add to the public's fear or contribute to people drawing wrong conclusions. This activity provides an opportunity for your students to discuss the role media plays during times of crisis and the need for them to evaluate information they receive.

Minute-by-minute, the media receives news from around the world. On a normal day, news editors and reporters have some time to sort through information and decide what they will report, and how they will report it. But when a major event happens, just as the public's normal routine is disrupted, so is that of the media. Imagine the vast amount of information the media is dealing with during the war with Iraq.

Sometimes split-second decisions are made to report breaking news. People around the world tune in to radio and television broadcasts to get up-to-the-minute reports. Once in a while, information is received by the media, then reported to the public, then found to be inaccurate. Other times, accurate information is reported, but misinterpreted and spread by viewers and listeners.

### Discussion

1. What sources do you trust? What sources do you not trust? Why?
2. Have you seen or heard any reports that you think are motivated by a particular point of view or set of beliefs? Why is it important to get both sides to a story?
3. Where do you get your news? (Television and radio stations, newspapers, Internet, people you know, etc.)
4. Where would you go to use the two-source test?

---

### ACTIVITY

#### Fact Finding in the Information Age

Read and discuss "Fact Finding in the Information Age." The SMART paradigm can be used to analyze information in a variety of settings and situations.

## Fact Finding in the Information-Age

Like journalists, you depend on sources for information. You may read a story in the newspaper, see it on televisions, or hear it from a friend. To judge the reliability of the story, you should always consider the source. Use the following SMART test to check your sources:

**S**ource. For you to evaluate a source, you have to know who or what the source is. Where does the story come from? Is the person reporting the story an eyewitness to the story? Did the person get the story from others? From eyewitnesses? From officials? Trace the source down. If the source is unclear, be skeptical about the story.

**M**otive. Why do they say so? Sources often have a special interest or particular point of view that may cause them to slant information to suit their beliefs or causes. Biased sources can be accurate, but you need to check them carefully. Get all sides to a story.

**A**uthority. How good is the source? Eyewitnesses can be wrong. Was the witness in a good position? If the source isn't an eyewitness, make sure it is a source you can trust -- e.g. an expert on the subject, a newspaper with good fact checking. Be wary of any source that is repeating hearsay and rumors.

**R**evue. Go over the story carefully. Does it make sense? Is it logically consistent? Are there any notable errors in facts or conclusions? Make a list of questionable facts. Develop questions about the story.

**T**wo-source test. Double-check everything, if possible. Talk to a second party or tune-in to other newscasts to see if they are also reporting the same story. Research the subject in the library, by interviewing others, and search on the Internet. Does your two-source test confirm or contradict the story?

### Discussion

1. Have you heard any inaccurate information from the media or from other people?
2. If so, what was the information?
3. Why do you think that mistake was made?
4. How does misinformation impact the media?
5. How does this impact the public?
6. What can people do to keep themselves informed of the truth?

---

## **D. Additional Resources**

Invite members of the local news media to the classroom to answer students' questions and share information about the challenges of reporting accurate information during times of crisis.

Visit Constitutional Rights Foundations website at [www.crf-usa.org](http://www.crf-usa.org). Click on "Links" and then "Research," to access additional resources including media, disinformation, and government sites and other CRF lessons and curriculum materials, such as *The Challenge of Information*, that can provide more in-depth lessons for your students on this, and other social studies and law-related education topics.

Constitutional Rights Foundation's website provides Research Links to many sites, including broadcast media, government, and sites that help people evaluate rumors, urban legends, and myths.

---

## **Press Freedom vs. Military Censorship**

News about every war, including the 2003 war in Iraq, involves gathering highly sensitive information. There has been considerable discussion about what information should—or should not—be released to the press in wartime. Is it important for people in a democracy to know what the government is doing? Can the media print or broadcast all information they receive? What press policy should the military use in wartime?

Throughout the Persian Gulf War of 1991, Iraqi President Saddam Hussein permitted only one foreign journalist to remain in Baghdad—CNN's veteran war correspondent Peter Arnett. Arnett had to obey Iraqi press-censorship rules. "From the beginning," Arnett later revealed, "I accepted the constraints that the Iraqis laid down. They said, 'Anything you do, you put on paper. We go over it, and we alter it. We change it if we wish to, and that's what you're going to use.'" Once the war began, the Iraqi government selected Arnett's reporting locations and monitored his interviews. As a result, many of Arnett's stories dwelled on bombing damage to civilian areas and the suffering of the Iraqi people.

Many Americans, including members of Congress and even fellow journalists, severely criticized Arnett for reporting material provided or censored by Iraq. But at the same time, hundreds of American reporters sent to Saudi Arabia had to deal with attempts by the U.S. military to control information.

## **Press vs. Military**

During the Spanish-American War of 1898, reporters, if anything, led cheers for the military. Throughout World War I, journalists considered themselves part of the war effort, not independent observers. This pattern of press and military cooperation continued through World War II.

But starting with the Korean War and then Vietnam, the press took an increasingly independent and critical view of the military. In Vietnam, more than 2,000 accredited reporters roamed freely throughout battle zones interviewing ordinary soldiers rather than relying on the often rosy picture of the war presented by the Pentagon. There were few incidents of news stories endangering U.S. troops or military operations. But negative press accounts fueled anti-war feelings back home.

When the war in Southeast Asia finally ended, many in the military blamed the press for "losing Vietnam." Some Pentagon officials resolved to restrict press coverage of future American wars. In 1983, the Pentagon barred all journalists from the initial invasion of Grenada. Then in 1989, the Pentagon selected a dozen reporters to cover the invasion of Panama and restricted them to an airport in Panama until nearly all fighting ended.

### **Policy #1: Press Pools**

When U.S. military units went to Saudi Arabia in the fall of 1990, about 1,000 journalists eventually joined them. The Pentagon set ground rules for the press. It authorized about a dozen "pools," of up to 18 reporters each, to visit U.S. military units in the field. News organizations selected reporters for each pool and military escorts accompanied them into the field. Pool reporters distributed their dispatches to their news organizations and to all other non-pool reporters who were required to remain in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, near the Kuwait border, or in Riyadh, the capital of Saudi Arabia.

The Pentagon accredited all American journalists and required them to observe the following battlefield press rules:

1. No reporters could visit any U.S. military unit or travel outside of Dhahran or Riyadh except in a press pool.
2. No pool was permitted in the field without an escort, usually a U.S. military public-affairs officer (PAO).
3. No interviews of U.S. military personnel were permitted without an escort present.
4. All pool dispatches must first pass through the "military security review system." (PAOs at each pool location reviewed all dispatches and could delete or change any "military sensitive information." Reporters could appeal any censorship to the military pool coordinating office in Dhahran and then to the Pentagon.)

5. Violations of the above rules could result in arrest, detention, revocation of press credentials, and expulsion from the combat zone.

The Pentagon explained that these rules protected American troops, military operations, and the journalists themselves. One high Navy official, Rear Admiral John Bitoff, remarked: "There is a clear and present danger in today's instant-communications age, which may put our troops at risk. Our enemies are watching CNN-TV."

Most news organizations and journalists complied with the Pentagon's pool-and-review system. But the Pentagon heard many complaints—not about outright censorship, but about the military's strict control of the press. Reporters protested that escorts intimidated soldiers being interviewed, sometimes even speaking for them. The media objected when the military kept pool reporters from visiting scenes where Americans had been killed.

The press complained most often about delays in getting dispatches from the field through the military-review system. Many pool reporters writing late-breaking stories found their stories hopelessly out-of-date by the time they finally reached the United States. In some instances, stories were lost by the military-communications network.

Soon after the Pentagon's pool-and-review system went into operation, some news organizations filed a lawsuit charging the military with violating the First Amendment guarantee of freedom of the press. They argued that a free press should have access to a war zone, because the people have a right to know what is happening. In previous cases, the Supreme Court has refused to allow the press access to prisons, but has granted the press a right to cover trials. The right of access to a war zone has never been decided by the court.

The news organizations also contended that the Pentagon's press-reporting rules constituted an illegal "prior restraint" and therefore should be eliminated. Prior restraint occurs when the government censors material before its publication or broadcast. Except in rare cases, the First Amendment prohibits prior restraint. One exception recognizes the necessity of imposing government censorship when a "clear and present danger" threatens the country. In 1931 in the case of *Near v. Minnesota*, the U.S. Supreme Court cited an example of permissible military censorship: "No one would question but that a government might prevent . . . the publication of the sailing dates of transports or the location of troops." Before the lawsuit against Gulf War press restrictions could come before a judge, however, Desert Storm had ended.

During the war, a few reporters, called "unilaterals," broke away from the military's press pools and struck out on their own. Using cellular phones, they filed uncensored reports. These reports were not necessarily more critical of the military than pool reports. But they often seemed more realistic, because independent journalists usually reached battle scenes before pool reporters. Sometimes unilaterals were arrested, detained, and sent back to Dhahran by military authorities. But many managed to elude discovery, often with the help of American soldiers and officers.

When the ground war started, Secretary of Defense Richard Cheney ordered a blackout of battlefield news. "We cannot permit the Iraqi forces to know anything about what we're doing," Cheney warned. But the blackout failed to hold as hundreds of reporters in Dhahran broke for the desert. An ABC News team even took its own satellite dish to broadcast directly from the battlefield. This gross violation of Pentagon press rules did not seem to matter because the United Nations' forces rolled to a dramatic victory in a ground war that lasted barely 100 hours.

### **Criticism of the Rules**

After the fighting ended, many journalists continued to criticize the Pentagon's press rules. "They created a system of enormous control," wrote Clark Hoyt, Washington bureau chief for Knight-Ridder Newspapers. Others expressed fears that such a system would become the model for future American wars. Pentagon spokesman Pete Williams responded that "the press gave the American people the best war coverage they ever had."

The military responded, saying that control is necessary, especially in this age of rapid communications. Unlike World War II and Vietnam, the press can broadcast directly from the battlefield. Within seconds, the whole world—including the enemy—can see the report. Without controls, a reporter could unintentionally compromise U.S. forces. The military views its control over the press as a matter of life and death.

For the most part, Americans supported the military's control of the press during the Gulf War. In a Roper public-opinion poll after the Gulf War, 68 percent of those surveyed believed military control of the news was about right, 17 percent wanted more control, and only 13 percent wanted less.

But some advocates of free expression worry that military control of the press encroaches on our basic freedoms. They make the following arguments: The First Amendment's protection of the free press should not be thrown out whenever the military starts shooting. People in a free society should decide whether to go to war, whether to stay at war, and whether a war is just. To decide, people need information from a free press, not from a press controlled by the military. Otherwise, Americans might fight wars knowing only what the military wants them to know. And the military might not want people to know any bad news, anything critical of the military, or anything that might turn them against a war. Americans could then find themselves in the position of citizens in a military dictatorship—like Saddam Hussein's Iraq.

### **Policy #2: Proposed Rules by News Media**

Several months after the Gulf War, a committee representing most of the nation's major news media issued a report stating that independent and uncensored reporting should be "the principal means of coverage" for all future wars and military operations. The report also proposed some battlefield press rules, including the following:

1. The Pentagon should accredit independent journalists, who must observe "a clear set of military security guidelines that protect U.S. forces and their operations." Violators of these guidelines should be expelled from the combat zone.
2. Press pools should be used only during the first 2-36 hours of any major military operation.
3. Reporters should have free access to all major military units.
4. The military should not monitor or interfere with press interviews or any part of the reporting process.
5. Written dispatches and pictures from the field should not be subject to any "military security review."

The press argued that these rules would ensure press freedom and offer security to our military forces.

### **Policy #3: Embedded Journalists**

For the war in Iraq in 2003, the U.S. military devised new press rules. Responding to criticism that it did not allow journalists contact with fighting troops, the Pentagon's new rules allowed reporters to travel with U.S. military units as long as they followed strict rules. About 500 reporters (one-fifth of them from foreign countries) were placed, or embedded, in military units. They could remain with units until the end of the war or until they decided to leave. The Department of Defense stated the reasons behind this policy: "We need to tell the factual story—good or bad—before others seed the media with disinformation and distortions, as they most certainly will continue to do. Our people in the field need to tell our story—only commanders can ensure the media get to the story alongside the troops."

1. The media will be given access to operational combat missions, including mission preparation and debriefing, whenever possible. The media will be briefed as to what information may not be broadcast because of its sensitivity to military operations. For security reasons, commanders may impose news embargos and temporarily block communication transmissions.
2. The military cannot exclude reporters from combat areas to keep them safe. All reporters must sign an agreement waiving any legal action against the armed forces. Reporters are not allowed to carry firearms, use their own vehicles, or use lights at night (without permission).
3. Reporters can bring whatever communication equipment they want, but they must carry their own equipment. Reporters are encouraged to use lipstick and helmet-mounted cameras on combat missions.



4. The following information can be published or broadcast: approximate troop strength, approximate casualties, information and location of previous military targets and missions, names and hometowns of military units, service members' names and hometowns (with their permission).
5. The following cannot be published or broadcast because it could jeopardize operations and endanger lives: specific numbers of troops, aircraft, ships, and equipment; specific geographic location (unless released by the Department of Defense); information about future operations; rules of engagement (the circumstances under which a unit may fight).
6. Any violation of these rules will result in a reporter being sent away from the unit. These rules do not ban contact with reporters who are not embedded with the troops.

### **For Discussion and Writing**

1. Is it possible to carry on a war with a free press? Why or why not?
2. Do you think the press should have access to war zones? Explain.
3. What are the similarities and differences between the three sets of battlefield press rules discussed in the article?

## The GRADE Test

As citizens in a democracy, you'll be confronted with policy questions relating to information. Is it important for people in a democracy to know what the government is doing? Can the media print or broadcast all information they receive? What press policy should the military use in wartime? Government policies can profoundly affect our nation and your life. In a democracy, you have a say on government policies. It's important that you take a critical look at them. Use the following GRADE Test to evaluate a policy:

**Goal.** What is the goal of the policy? If you don't know what it's supposed to do, you can't measure its success or failure. Policies are designed to address problems. What problem or problems is this policy supposed to address?

**Rivals.** Who supports the policy? Who opposes it? Knowing the rivals can help you understand who the policy might affect and whether the policy favors special interests. Also, rivals are terrific sources for information. Be sure to check their facts, though.

**Advantages.** What are the policy's benefits? What is good about the policy? Will it achieve (or has it achieved) its goal? Will it achieve the goal efficiently? Is it inexpensive? Does it protect people from harm? Does it ensure people's liberties?

**Disadvantages.** What are the policy's costs? What is bad about the policy? Is it inefficient? Is it expensive? Does it cause harm? Does it intrude on people's liberties? Are there any potential consequences that may cause damage?

**Evaluate the alternatives.** One alternative is to do nothing. Most serious problems have various policy proposals. Evaluate them. Look at their goals, advantages, and disadvantages.

Once you GRADE the competing policies, weigh their advantages and disadvantages and decide which you favor.

## ACTIVITY

### Press Rules for Future Wars: A Presidential Commission

In this activity, students role play a commission recommending rules for the press in future military actions.

1. Divide students into groups of three or four.
2. In each group, students are to imagine that they are members of a commission appointed by the president to recommend press rules as America responds to terrorism. Their commission has been presented with three different sets of press rules—the three in the article.
3. Each group should:
  - A. Assign roles to each member of the group: a commission chairperson (who leads the discussion), a recorder (who writes the group's answers to each GRADE test on a sheet of paper), a reporter (who reports the commission's findings to the class), and, if the group has four members, a responder (who answers any questions the class may have about the group's findings).
  - B. Evaluate the three policies using the GRADE Test above and decide which to recommend to the president.
  - C. Prepare to present their decision and reasons for it to the class.
4. When the groups finish, call on reporters from different groups to answer GRADE tests for Policy #1: Press Pool Rules. Then call on reporters to answer GRADE tests for Policy #2: Proposed Rules by News Media. Ask which policy the groups favored. Hold a discussion over why they favored one policy over another.

# Response to War

## Suggestions for Teachers

During times of crisis, teachers are often confronted with a variety of student reactions ranging from fear to curiosity to lack of interest. The following suggestions have been gathered and distilled from experienced teachers and may be helpful as events develop in our recent national crisis.

Provide opportunities for students to talk about what has happened and how it affects them. Encourage students to also talk with their friends out of class, and, especially for younger students, with their families. A guided discussion activity is provided in War in Iraq—How Do You Feel? What Do You Think?

- Be aware that families may have shielded their children from certain information. You may have students that are finding out about traumatic events for the first time at school. This can put teachers in a difficult situation as they struggle to both respect family wishes and help students cope with the realities of the events. It can be helpful to communicate with parents to let them know how the school is responding and, if necessary, how particular students are affected.
- Keep yourself informed. Guard your students against rumors and misinformation. Students need to be able to look to their teachers as purveyors of reliable information. It is better to tell students that you don't know an answer to a question than to offer speculation that they could misinterpret as fact. Suggest ways that the class can work together to gather accurate information and find the answers to questions. Two lessons provide media-literacy activities: Fact Finders—The Media During Times of Crisis.
- Provide balance and perspective through discussions, and through sharing age-appropriate information. Sharing your initial feelings and reactions about the war in Iraq can be helpful to the students, but it is also important to provide a range of perspectives about the events and issues. Share your expertise in helping them better understand the issues, historical perspectives, and facts. Handling Controversy provides suggested strategies for teachers to use with students.
- Help students understand that their safety and future is foremost in the minds of the people making decisions, the civilians who work in law enforcement and public safety, and the military.
- Challenge expressions of stereotyping and scapegoating. Guard your students against jumping to conclusions about Middle Eastern people and religions.
- Help students understand that there are many different viewpoints about the war in Iraq and what should be done about it. They will continue to hear many opinions from the media, politicians, citizens, and the international community.

Encourage secondary students to use critical-thinking skills to form their own opinions. Demonstrate to younger students that opinions are different than facts.

- Consider having guest speakers that can provide answers to your students' questions:

\* Representatives of the Islamic community.

\* Experts on Middle Eastern studies.

\* Experts on foreign policy from local universities.

To ensure a balance of differing perspectives, invite a panel of speakers.

- While it is beneficial to identify and respond to "teachable moments" based on external events, it is also beneficial to encourage students to maintain their scholastic and extracurricular routines. Remember that students are not adults and need a structured and normal environment to feel secure.

# How Do You Feel? What Do You Think?

In this activity, students have the opportunity to express their feelings about the war in Iraq and discuss their thoughts and perceptions of its events.

You will need the handout How Do Your Feel? What Do You Think? for your students.

## **Step 1. One-Word Brainstorm—How Do You Feel?**

Ask the students to take a minute or two to think about the one word that best describes their feelings about the war in Iraq. Record all students' responses on the board. Review the list and point out how strongly many people feel.

If possible group the various responses under various headings such as pride, hope, fear, anger, confusion, or sadness. Point out that many people are feeling the same thing.

Remind the students that people around the world share the same types of feelings about what has happened and that they are not alone in their thoughts.

## **2. Small-Group Work—What Do You Think?**

Tell the students that you are interested in what they think and that now they will have an opportunity to use more than one word to express their views. Divide the class into pairs or triads of students and distribute the Handout "What Do You Think?" to each group. Tell the groups that they should discuss each question and select a person from their group to record the responses.

Remind the class that these are emotional issues, as the brainstorm showed. Not everyone in their groups needs to agree on the answers to the questions, but should listen to and discuss their views with each other respectfully. Each pair or group should select a person to record the responses to the questions and another person who will act as the "reporter" for the group. Allow the students time to discuss and complete the handout.

## **Step 3. Sharing Perceptions**

Conduct a class discussion using the questions from the handout below. Allow each group to share its responses to the questions. Bring closure to the discussion by explaining that as new developments happen, they may change their views about things, and that you will continue to be interested in their thoughts.

---

## How Do You Feel? What Do You Think?

**In your opinion...**

What are the most important questions Americans should be asking?

What are the most important things people should be doing right now?  
American citizens:

Iraqi citizens:

U.S. government officials:

World leaders:

Religious leaders:

What do you think are the biggest challenges before us?

What do you hope will happen? Why?



## Handling Controversy

These resources are designed to stimulate active student participation. Some of the examples and hypotheticals are controversial. They were developed (1) to provide a realistic context for students to discuss the war in Iraq, and (2) to generate critical thinking, debate, and analysis among students.

It is important to lay down ground rules in advance of discussing controversial ideas. Below are some suggested rules. Students should:

- \* argue ideas, not personalities or prejudices.
- \* represent the opposing positions fairly and accurately.
- \* demonstrate an attempt to understand all opposing perspectives.
- \* be able to admit doubts and weaknesses in their own position.
- \* concentrate on evidence in their arguments.

If serious disagreement arises in your classroom, remind students that they agreed to abide by the ground rules and set about defining, or clarifying the disagreement. Teachers should:

- \* Identify the issue(s) under dispute.
- \* Identify areas of agreement and disagreement.
- \* Identify underlying assumptions.
- \* Make sure students concretely define their terms and avoid slogans and epithets.

Students should look for a chance to air their own views, hear their opponents' views, and examine both. Be sure students understand that closure of a controversy does not mean one side wins.

## Project Suggestions

For many people, including youth, providing opportunities to take positive action to help can be an effective learning and coping strategy. CRF has provided a list of service-learning projects students could do to learn and teach about the war in Iraq.

1. Hold a teach-in. Using the social studies department and CRF's online web links as a resource, hold school or community presentations and discussions about topics and issues related to the war in Iraq. Topics could include the history, culture, and geography of the Middle East and Iraq in particular; a discussion of

Middle Eastern attitudes toward the United States; the economic, political and social effects of globalization on the “have-nots” of the area; how our nation has dealt with previous wars, attacks to its security; issues of security versus freedom, and more.

2. Hold a community town meeting. Have students brainstorm and research topics as a preparation for moderating discussions about terrorism-related issues.
3. Write and conduct a survey. Determine how students or community members feel about the war in Iraq and post the results at school and in the local media.
4. Humanitarian Aid. Research and contact humanitarian aid groups who will be sending food, clothing, and medical supplies to the Iraqi people. Choose a humanitarian aid group to sponsor and develop a strategy to support them.
5. Draw a map. Create and display a giant map of the Middle East including national boundaries, terrain, cities, and resources. Research and write short descriptions of relevant information and crucial events and attach them to their geographical positions.
6. Form a media watch. Monitor daily news broadcasts or newspaper front pages for evidence of bias; reflect on the fairness of the reporting, and prepare a media watch presentation for your school or community.
7. Design an art space. Create a space for students to paint, draw, and construct their thoughts and feelings about the war in Iraq and related subjects. Use the art space as a presentation forum and follow-up to classroom discussions, research projects, town meetings, or teach-ins.
8. Write a play. Following research and discussion about the Middle East, have students create a play about life in Iran, Iraq, Israel, Palestine, Afghanistan, Pakistan, or other Middle Eastern countries. Present the play to the school and community.
9. Poems, journals and letters. Provide opportunities for written expression about the war in Iraq including journals. Identify issues and have students write letters of concern to local and national elected officials, local newspapers, or United Nations officials. Create a voluntary forum such as a reading or display for students to share their writings.
10. Gather oral histories. Talk to parents, grandparents, and others from older generations who have experienced previous national and international crises. Ask them to compare their past experiences to their impressions of the current crisis. Transcribe and display or dramatize oral histories.

11. Locate and arrange to meet with students, teachers, or community members from an Islamic school, advocacy group, or community center to learn about Middle Eastern culture.
12. Form a study group. Meet with other interested students on a regular basis to research and discuss issues surrounding the war in Iraq, terrorism, international relations, Middle Eastern politics and culture, civil liberties in time of war, and more. Create presentations or conduct mentoring sessions with younger students.

# War In Iraq: Web Links

## Statistics and Information About Iraq

Library of Congress: Country Studies: Iraq <http://lcweb2.loc.gov/frd/cs/iqtoc.html>

U.S. State Department: Background Notes: Iraq  
<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/6804.htm>

CIA: World Factbook: Iraq <http://www.odci.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/iz.html>

Academic Info: Iraq Studies <http://www.academicinfo.net/iraq.html>

MidEastInfo: The Republic of Iraq <http://www.mideastinfo.com/iraq.htm>

ArabNet: Iraq <http://www.arab.net/iraq/>

Economist: Country Briefings: Iraq <http://www.economist.com/countries/Iraq/>

BBC News: Country Profile: Iraq  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle\\_east/country\\_profiles/791014.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/world/middle_east/country_profiles/791014.stm)

CountryWatch: Iraq [http://www.countrywatch.com/cw\\_country.asp?vCOUNTRY=81](http://www.countrywatch.com/cw_country.asp?vCOUNTRY=81)

Arab Social Science Network: Country Index: Iraq <http://www.assr.org/>

ArabNet: Iraq <http://www.arab.net/iraq/index.html>

About Iraq [http://www.theodora.com/wfb/iraq/about\\_iraq.html](http://www.theodora.com/wfb/iraq/about_iraq.html)

## Web Directories With Links on Iraq

Yahoo: Iraq <http://dir.yahoo.com/Regional/Countries/Iraq/>

Open Directory: Iraq [http://www.dmoz.org/Regional/Middle\\_East/Iraq/](http://www.dmoz.org/Regional/Middle_East/Iraq/)

Google Web Directory: Iraq  
[http://directory.google.com/Top/Regional/Middle\\_East/Iraq/](http://directory.google.com/Top/Regional/Middle_East/Iraq/)

## Maps of Iraq

Perry-Castañeda Library Map Collection <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/index.html>

Iraq <http://www.lib.utexas.edu/maps/iraq.html>

Iraq: Key Maps From the BBC.

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/sp1/hi/middle\\_east/02/iraq\\_key\\_maps/html/default.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/sp1/hi/middle_east/02/iraq_key_maps/html/default.stm)

Mapping Iraq From the *Boston Globe*. <http://www.boston.com/news/packages/iraq/map/>

Iraq: Map Sources A report to Congress from the Congressional Research Service. PDF File. <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/17340.pdf>

## Encyclopedia Articles on Iraq

Columbia Encyclopedia <http://www.bartleby.com/65/>

Iraq <http://www.bartleby.com/65/ir/Iraq.html>

Iran-Iraq War <http://www.bartleby.com/65/ir/IranIraq.html>

Persian Gulf War of 1991 <http://www.bartleby.com/65/pe/PersGWar.html>

Baghdad <http://www.bartleby.com/65/ba/Baghdad.html>

Ba'ath Party <http://www.bartleby.com/65/ba/Baathpar.html>

Kurds <http://www.bartleby.com/65/ku/Kurds.html>

Encarta <http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/features/home.aspx>

Iraq <http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/refpages/RefArticle.aspx?refid=761567303>

Iran-Iraq War

<http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/refpages/RefArticle.aspx?refid=761580640>

Persian Gulf War of 1991

<http://encarta.msn.com/encnet/refpages/RefArticle.aspx?refid=761551555>

## Persian Gulf War of 1991

The Gulf War From PBS Frontline. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/gulf/>

Fog of War An analysis of the war by the *Washington Post*.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/inatl/longterm/fogofwar/fogofwar.htm>

The History Guy: The Persian Gulf War (1990-1991)

<http://www.historyguy.com/GulfWar.html>

The Iraqi Invasion of Kuwait: An Eyewitness Account  
<http://users.lighthouse.net/danvaught/eyewitness01.html>

Operation Desert Storm: Ten Years After Documents from the war. From the National Security Archive. <http://www.gwu.edu/%7EEnsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB39/>

U.S. Navy in Desert Shield/Desert Storm Report from the U.S. Navy.  
<http://www.history.navy.mil/wars/dstorm/index.html>

GulfLink From the Office of the Special Assistant for Gulf War Illnesses.  
<http://www.au.af.mil/au/aui/bibs/pgwar/pgwrtc.htm>

Persian Gulf War 1990-1991 A huge bibliography of sources on the war.  
<http://www.au.af.mil/au/aui/bibs/pgwar/pgwrtc.htm>

Yahoo: The Persian Gulf War of 1991 Links. [http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Humanities/History/By\\_Time\\_Period/20th\\_Century/Military\\_History/Persian\\_Gulf\\_War/](http://dir.yahoo.com/Arts/Humanities/History/By_Time_Period/20th_Century/Military_History/Persian_Gulf_War/)

Google Directory: The Persian Gulf War of 1991 More links.  
[http://directory.google.com/Top/Society/History/By\\_Time\\_Period/Twentieth\\_Century/Wars\\_and\\_Conflicts/Persian\\_Gulf\\_War/](http://directory.google.com/Top/Society/History/By_Time_Period/Twentieth_Century/Wars_and_Conflicts/Persian_Gulf_War/)

Open Directory: The Persian Gulf War of 1991 Still more links.  
[http://dmoz.org/Society/History/By\\_Time\\_Period/Twentieth\\_Century/Wars\\_and\\_Conflicts/Persian\\_Gulf\\_War/](http://dmoz.org/Society/History/By_Time_Period/Twentieth_Century/Wars_and_Conflicts/Persian_Gulf_War/)

## **Iran-Iraq War (1980-1988 )**

Iran-Iraq War A history and analysis by the Federation of American Scientists.  
<http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/war/iran-iraq.htm>

Chemical Warfare in the Iran-Iraq War By the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. <http://projects.sipri.se/cbw/research/factsheet-1984.html>

Lessons Learned: Iran-Iraq War A Marine Corps Historical Publication.  
<http://www.fas.org/man/dod-101/ops/war/docs/3203/index.html>

Yahoo: Iran-Iraq War  
[http://dir.yahoo.com/Regional/Regions/Middle\\_East/Arts\\_and\\_Humanities/Humanities/History/By\\_Time\\_Period/20th\\_Century/Military\\_History/Iran\\_Iraq\\_War/](http://dir.yahoo.com/Regional/Regions/Middle_East/Arts_and_Humanities/Humanities/History/By_Time_Period/20th_Century/Military_History/Iran_Iraq_War/)

Google Directory: Iran-Iraq War  
[http://directory.google.com/Top/Society/History/By\\_Time\\_Period/Twentieth\\_Century/Wars\\_and\\_Conflicts/Iran-Iraq\\_War/](http://directory.google.com/Top/Society/History/By_Time_Period/Twentieth_Century/Wars_and_Conflicts/Iran-Iraq_War/)

Open Directory: Iran-Iraq War Links.

[http://dmoz.org/Society/History/By\\_Time\\_Period/Twentieth\\_Century/Wars\\_and\\_Conflicts/Iran-Iraq\\_War/](http://dmoz.org/Society/History/By_Time_Period/Twentieth_Century/Wars_and_Conflicts/Iran-Iraq_War/)

## **Saddam Hussein**

Saddam Hussein Profile From the BBC.

[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/1100529.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/1100529.stm)

Tales of the Tyrant From *Atlantic Monthly*.

<http://www.theatlantic.com/issues/2002/05/bowden.htm>

The Survival of Saddam From PBS Frontline.

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/saddam/>

Iraq: Nationalism in One Family From Out There News.

<http://www.megastories.com/iraq/family/family.htm>

Saddam Hussein From ABC News. <http://abcnews.go.com/reference/bios/shussein.html>

Saddam Hussein Interview by Dan Rather From CBS News.

<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/02/26/60II/main542151.shtml>

## **Humanitarian Organizations**

Relief Web <http://www.reliefweb.int/w/rwb.nsf>

Iraq <http://www.reliefweb.int/w/rwb.nsf/vLCE/Iraq?OpenDocument&StartKey=Iraq&Expandview>

Humanitarian Responses to a War in Iraq

[http://www.usip.org/newsmedia/releases/2003/0305\\_NBiraq.html](http://www.usip.org/newsmedia/releases/2003/0305_NBiraq.html)

United Nations <http://www.un.org/english/>

Humanitarian Affairs <http://www.un.org/ha/moreha.htm>

U.N. Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)

[http://www.reliefweb.int/ocha\\_ol/index.html](http://www.reliefweb.int/ocha_ol/index.html)



## **Anti-War Movement**

Cities for Peace A national coalition attempting to get cities to write resolutions against the war. <http://www.ips-dc.org/citiesforpeace/index.htm>

Cities with Resolutions A listing of cities that have passed peace resolutions. <http://www.ips-dc.org/citiesforpeace/resolutions.htm>

Move On A grassroots movement. <http://moveon.org/>

International ANSWER <http://internationalanswer.org/>

VoteNoWar.org <http://www.votenowar.org/>

Veterans for Peace <http://www.veteransforpeace.org/Default.htm>

Iraq Special Section <http://www.veteransforpeace.org/Default.htm>

## **Doves Who Became Hawks on Iraq**

Chatterbox Goes to War By Timothy Noah. From *Slate*. <http://slate.msn.com/id/2078396/>

I'm Persuaded By Mary McGrory. From the *Washington Post*. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn?pagename=article&node=&contentId=A32573-2003Feb5&notFound=true>

The I-Can't-Believe-I'm-a-Hawk Club By Bill Keller. From the *New York Times*. <http://query.nytimes.com/gst/abstract.html?res=F50914F6395F0C7B8CDDAB0894DB404482>

## **Weblogs**

Military Families Information helpful to those with loved ones in the military. [http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/news/special\\_packages/iraq/families/](http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/news/special_packages/iraq/families/)

Altercation By Eric Alterman, liberal writer for the *Nation*. [http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/news/special\\_packages/iraq/families/](http://www.kansascity.com/mld/kansascity/news/special_packages/iraq/families/)

Andrew Sullivan Conservative writer. <http://www.andrewsullivan.com/>

David Frum's Diary Conservative writer who coined "axis of evil" for a President George W. Bush speech. <http://www.nationalreview.com/frum/frum-diary.asp>

InstaPundit By conservative Glenn Reynolds, professor of law, University of Tennessee.  
<http://www.instapundit.com/>

Kausfiles By Mickey Kaus, conservative writer for *Slate*.  
<http://slate.msn.com/id/2080319/>

Bear Left! and Blog Left Two liberal weblogs. <http://www.bear-left.com/> and  
<http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/courses/ed253a/blogger.php>

Rittenhouse Review A liberal weblog of politics, finance, ethics, and culture.  
<http://rittenhouse.blogspot.com>

## **Analysis of Media Coverage**

Journalism in a Time of War Links on media issues related to the war. From Journalism.org. <http://www.journalism.org/resources/briefing/archive/war.asp>

Iraq and the Press Links to *Editor & Publisher's* coverage of the media and America's conflict. with Iraq. [http://www.editorandpublisher.com/editorandpublisher/headlines/article\\_display.jsp?vnu\\_content\\_id=1834937](http://www.editorandpublisher.com/editorandpublisher/headlines/article_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1834937)

Media News Tracker: Iraq Reports on media issues. From MediaChannel.org.  
<http://www.mediachannel.org/news/tracker/iraq.shtml>

FAIR Liberal media watchdog group. <http://www.fair.org/>

Iraq <http://www.fair.org/international/iraq.html>

Accuracy in Media Conservative media watchdog group. <http://www.aim.org/>

Columbia Journalism Review <http://www.cjr.org/>

The Note Long summary of what the media are saying. By Mark Halperin and Marc Ambinder, ABC News Political Unit.  
<http://abcnews.go.com/sections/politics/DailyNews/TheNote.html>

Romenesko Weblog of media news. From Poynter.  
<http://www.poynter.org/column.asp?id=45>

Behind the Homefront A weblog of news in homeland security and military operations affecting newsgathering, access to information and the public's right to know. From the Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press.  
<http://www.rcfp.org/behindthehomefront/>

The Journalists' Toolbox <http://www.journaliststoolbox.com/>

Iraq <http://www.journaliststoolbox.com/newswriting/iraq.html>

Iraq Coverage Resources From Poynter Online.  
[http://www.poynter.org/content/content\\_view.asp?id=20231](http://www.poynter.org/content/content_view.asp?id=20231)

War Coverage Resources From the Radio-Television News Directors Association & Foundation. <http://www.rtnda.org/resources/war/index.shtml>

## **Bush Doctrine**

National Security Strategy of the United States Document from the White House explaining President Bush's new strategy for national security.  
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>

U.S. Foreign Policy Agenda Many articles from the U.S. Department of State.  
<http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itps/1202/ijpe/toc.htm>

The War Behind Closed Doors The people, the clashes--and ultimately the "grand strategy"-- behind George W. Bush's determination to go to war with Iraq. From PBS Frontline. <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/shows/iraq/>

The President's Real Goal in Iraq Opinion piece by Jay Bookman in the *Atlanta-Journal Constitution* on the reasons behind the Iraq war. <http://www.accessatlanta.com/>

Reaction to "Bush's Real Goal in Iraq" A criticism of the above article.  
<http://www.newamericancentury.org/defense-100602.htm>

Bush's Grand Strategy By Andrew J. Bachevich. From *The American Conservative*.  
[http://www.amconmag.com/11\\_4/bushs\\_grand\\_strategy.html](http://www.amconmag.com/11_4/bushs_grand_strategy.html)

The Bush Doctrine A transcribed discussion between James Woolsey (former CIA director), James Lindsay (Brookings Institution), Victor Davis Hanson (visiting professor at the U.S. Naval Academy), and Daniel Brumberg (professor at Georgetown University). From FrontPage magazine.  
<http://www.frontpagemagazine.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=3652>

Toward Universal Empire: The Dangerous Quest for Absolute Security By David C. Hendrickson, *World Policy Journal*. <http://worldpolicy.org/journal/articles/wpj02-3/hendrickson.html>

A Grand Strategy of Transformation By John Lewis Gaddis. From *Foreign Policy*.  
[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/issue\\_novdec\\_2002/gaddis.html](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/issue_novdec_2002/gaddis.html)

Essential Elements Missing in the National Security Strategy of 2002 By Charles Knight.  
From the Commonwealth Institute Project on Defense Alternatives.  
<http://www.comw.org/qdr/0210knight.html>

The New National Security Strategy and Preemption By Michael E. O'Hanlon, Susan E. Rice, and James B. Steinberg. From the Brookings Institution.  
<http://www.brook.edu/comm/policybriefs/pb113.htm>

A Strategy Foretold By Tom Barry, codirector of Foreign Policy In Focus.  
<http://www.fpif.org/papers/foretold.html>

## **Reporters in the Field**

Jules Crittenden *Boston Herald* reporter embedded with U.S. troops.  
[http://www.poynter.org/content/content\\_view.asp?id=25334#series](http://www.poynter.org/content/content_view.asp?id=25334#series)

Letter From Iraq By reporter Borzou Daragahi.  
[http://www.poynter.org/content/content\\_view.asp?id=25379](http://www.poynter.org/content/content_view.asp?id=25379)

Links to Journalists Reporting From the War Zone From Poynter.  
<http://www.poynter.org/column.asp?id=61>

Lost Remote The lefthand column has links to reporters' weblogs from the field.  
<http://www.lostremote.com/#iraq>

Weblogs and Diaries From Embedded Journalists Links to many weblogs. From Cyberjournalist. [http://www.cyberjournalist.net/great\\_iraq\\_conflict\\_coverage/](http://www.cyberjournalist.net/great_iraq_conflict_coverage/)

## **More Collections of Links on the Iraq War**

Open Directory Project: Iraq War  
[http://dmoz.org/Society/Issues/Warfare\\_and\\_Conflict/Specific\\_Conflicts/Iraq/](http://dmoz.org/Society/Issues/Warfare_and_Conflict/Specific_Conflicts/Iraq/)

Yahoo: War in Iraq [http://dir.yahoo.com/Government/Military/War\\_in\\_Iraq/](http://dir.yahoo.com/Government/Military/War_in_Iraq/)

Google Web Directory: Specific Conflicts: Iraq  
[http://directory.google.com/Top/Society/Issues/Warfare\\_and\\_Conflict/Specific\\_Conflicts/Iraq/](http://directory.google.com/Top/Society/Issues/Warfare_and_Conflict/Specific_Conflicts/Iraq/)

Librarian's Index to the Internet: War and Peace <http://lii.org/warandpeace>

America Responds to Terrorism: Web Links Information on Iraq and terrorism.  
[http://www.crf-usa.org/terror/terrorism\\_links.htm](http://www.crf-usa.org/terror/terrorism_links.htm)



**U.S. Department of Education**  
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*  
*National Library of Education (NLE)*  
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*



## **NOTICE**

### **Reproduction Basis**

- This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.
- This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").