

Study Guide Historic Security Council

Chairs: David Radji & Madita Straehle, Can Balcioglu & Arthur Francois

Topics:

1)Cuban Missile Crisis

2)US Invasion of Iraq



8th & 9th of April

Index:

TOPIC A: The Cuban Missile Crisis	2-10
Introduction	2
Historical Background	2-5
Timeline of Important Historical Events	6-7
The Cuban Missile Crisis	7-8
UN involvement	8-9
Further Suggestions for Research	9
References	10
TOPIC B: US Invasion of Iraq	11-21
Introduction	11
Understanding Iraq	11-14
Saddam Hussein Regime	14-15
Iraq's Situation in 2003	15-19
Issues implied for HSC countries	19-21
Issues a Resolution Should address	21

THE CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS 1962

I. Introduction

In October 1962, American U2 Spy planes reported that Soviet ships were seen heading for Cuba and that rocket-launching sites were being built on the island. These missile bases on Cuba were built for the installation of medium range ballistic missiles which were capable of reaching and destroying American cities across the country. Thus, a nuclear war seemed imminent and the world stood still during these thirteen days in which the ‘Cuban Missile Crisis’ took place.

This study guide serves as a general source of knowledge in regard to the events that happened during the Cuban Missile Crisis (Oct 16, 1962 – Oct 28, 1962). It provides an overview over the historical background of the crisis, the current situation (1962), and suggestions for further research in order to be prepared for the debate.

II. Historical Background

The Yalta Conference

Cooperating as Allies during WW2, together with other nations -primarily Great Britain and France – the United States of America and the USSR were important influences when deciding upon Europe’s structure after the end of the war. During the **Yalta Conference**, held in February 1945, the ‘Big Three’ represented by Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt and Joseph Stalin, agreed on the unconditional surrender of the Nazi-regime and with it the demilitarization and denazification of Germany. It had furthermore been decided upon that Germany should undergo a division in four distinct zones: three sectors in the west that would be governed by the U.S.A, the U.K. and France and one sphere in the east of Germany controlled by the Soviets and Berlin as a divided capital. Moreover,

the basis for the founding of the United Nations, initiated by President F. Roosevelt, have been discussed including the USSR's demand for a secret Security Council providing Veto Powers for the U.S.A., the USSR and Great Britain. Stalin furthermore agreed to holding free democratic elections in the nations which were then under the occupation of the USSR, however, this promise had not been kept and hence the mistrust between the U.S.A and the USSR grew further. The Yalta Conference achieved important agreements in terms of ensuring a collective security order and offered a diplomatic outline to give self-determination to the liberated peoples of post-Nazi Europe. However, by marking the end of the WW2 era, it is also considered the beginning of the Cold War, with growing tensions between the East and the West and with it a power struggle between two ideologies, namely capitalism and communism; a war determined by the developments of nuclear arms and a 'Nuclear Arms Race' between the two superpowers USSR and U.S.A.

The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan

In March 1947, President Harry Truman delivered a speech which has later become known as the **Truman Doctrine**, representative of the U.S. policy towards communism. Following a policy of containment, Truman believed that communism was not to be eliminated from the states in which it already existed, but rather to be hindered of spreading to further nations. Truman's speech was mainly directed to two nations, Greece, and Turkey, which were both facing political and economic tumults which is why the U.S. feared an overtake by communism. Truman thus announced that the U.S would do anything within its power to assist these nations including financial aid consisting of approximately \$400 million which should guarantee the reestablishment of Greece and Turkish economy as well as the installation of a firm, democratic government. Following up on the **Truman Doctrine**, the United States began also assisting other western European nations in 1948. Initiated by the

Secretary of State, George Marshall, the **Marshall Plan** disposed more than \$12 billion to Europe over the course of four years in order to prevent European Nations from communism, while the Soviets considered it a 'Marshallization' and thus a strategy of the United States in order to gain more influence in Europe. Up until the 1980s both, the **Truman Doctrine** and the **Marshall Plan** and with them the policy of containment became valid justifications for the United States in terms of entering into multiple military conflicts such as, but not limited to the Korean Conflict and the Vietnam War.

The Berlin Blockade and the foundation of the NATO

Three years after the defeat of Nazi Germany, in June 1948 the Soviet Union began to blockade all ground traffic into Western sectors of occupied Berlin. The **Berlin Blockade** was considered a Russian response to the U.S. policy of containment in Western Europe and a direct reaction to the introduction of a new currency in Western Berlin which Stalin considered a move of American economic imperialism. He therefore determined to force the Allies out of Western Berlin by starting the Berlin Blockade. Berlin's strategically important location caused the Allies to initiate the **Berlin Airlift**, a fifteen months' operation which guaranteed the resupply of Western Berlin. As a response to the Berlin Blockade, the **North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)**, was founded by eleven European Nations and the United States, serving as a defence organization to both counter the military power of the USSR and to prevent the revival of nationalist militarism. On the other side the Soviets initiated the founding of the **Warsaw Pact**, a defence treaty among all Eastern European Nations. The Soviets finally lifted the Blockade in May 1949.

The Cuban Revolution

Cuban President Fulgencio Batista, democratically elected in 1940, ruled the country until 1944. Due to an increasing abuse of power, it became clear that Batista wasn't going to be re-elected. Oppressing Cuba under a military dictatorship, however, keeping a close relationship to the United States who had a major influence on Cuban economy and politics, revolting groups soon began to rise up. During the **26th of July Movement** (1953) approximately a hundred guerrilla fighters under the lead of Fidel Castro, tried to take over the Moncada Barracks in Santiago, however the Cuban government defeated them. Released from jail revolution leader Castro fled to Mexico, where he planned a revolutionary come back. On January 6, 1958, Castro led 86 men back to the island of Cuba, where over the time more protest movements have been in the uprising. His aim was to start another revolutionary insurgency. The Cuban government was however informed about Castro's plan and attacked them upon their arrival onto the shore. Pushing them into the Sierra Maestra mountains, the rebel forces used this environment as an establishing base for their opposition. In 1958 Batista sent a large army into the mountains in order to defeat the revolutionary movement. The guerrilla forces managed to fight back the governmental forces, causing many in the army to switch sides. Making use of the new gained strength, the rebels launched a counter attack marching through the country to Santa Clara while being supported by the majority of Cuban citizens. The international community urged Batista to leave the Island of Cuba, granting the rebels to take over Havana in January 1959. The persecution of former Batista supporters and the de-Americanisation led to many people fleeing the island and finally the United States posing economic sanctions upon the island of Cuba. In 1962, the United States supported a group of Cuban Exiles in an attempt to overthrow Castro's regime in an operation referred to as the **Bay of Pigs Invasion**. This mission, however failed and as a consequence, Castro announced Cuba as a socialist country, entering an alliance with the Soviet Union.

III. Timeline of important historical events

1945: May, 8	End of WW2
1945: February, 4-11	The Yalta Conference
1945: August, 6	The U.S.A. drops the atomic bomb on Hiroshima
1947: March, 12	Truman Doctrine
1947: June, 3	Marshall Plan
1948	Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia
1948: June, 24	Begin of the Berlin Blockade
1949: April, 4	Founding of the NATO
1949: May, 12	End of the Berlin Blockade
1949: September	Communist takeover in China
1949: September	Soviets first explode Atomic Bomb in Kazakhstan
1950 -1953	Korean War
1954	Overthrow unfriendly regimes in Iran and Guatemala aided by the USA
1955, May	Founding of the Warsaw Pact

1959: January	Cuban revolution
1960: May	Soviet Union reveals that U.S. spy plane was shot down over Soviet territory
1961: April	Bay of Pigs Invasion
1961: August, 17	Construction of the Berlin Wall begins
1962: October, 16	Begin of the Cuban Missile Crisis

IV. The Cuban Missile Crisis 1962

October, 15

During a U-2 operated by the U.S, the pilot, Richard Heyser, discovers and takes pictures of Russian large-range missiles (SS-4), which have been placed on Cuba five months before the discovery by the Soviet Union. These missiles are capable of traveling 2,200 miles.

October, 16

The EXCOMM (Executive Committee of the National Security Council), launches a first meeting in order to discuss the discovery of the soviet missiles on Cuba. Recognising the missiles as a thread of disturbing the political balance within the structures of the Cold War, the EXCOMM took into consideration different approaches in order to react to the discovery such as but not limited to diplomacy, invasion, blockade and airstrike.

October, 18

During a meeting between President J.F. Kennedy and Andrei Gromyko, soviet minister of foreign affairs, Gromyko assures that the Soviet Union only equipped Cuba with missiles which secure the defensive capabilities of Cuba, not mentioning the large-range missiles that Kennedy, however is aware of already.

October, 20

The EXCOMM suggests establishing a quarantine, around the Island of Cuba in order to prevent Russian Ships from reaching the island. The crisis is still not openly debated in public.

October, 22

In a speech broadcasted on live television, President J.F. Kennedy informs the public about the missiles placed on Cuba. He furthermore urges the Soviet Union to withdraw the weapons and announces a quarantine consisting out of American Navy ships being established around the island.

October, 23

The crisis deepens when Premier Nikita Khrushchev orders soviet ships approaching the quarantine to turn around, only 750 miles before reaching the American blockade.

V. Involvement of the United Nations

The nuclear arm race between the two superpowers USA and USSR has finally reached a phase in which thousands of lives are threatened and the escalation of the conflict closer than ever. Thus, the Security Council is called upon to come together for an urgent meeting in order to de-escalate the conflict and secure peace between the conflicted nations.

VI. Further suggestions for research

- Iron Curtain Speech
- Berlin Crisis
- Spanish- American War
- San Francisco Conference
- Monroe Doctrine
- MRBMS and IRBMS
- Actual Results of the Crisis 1962



VII References

<https://unchronicle.un.org/article/first-70-years-united-nations-achievements-and-challenges>

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cuban_Missile_Crisis

<http://muntr.org/Study-Guides/JCC-Study-Guide.pdf>

<http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/colc.html>

<http://revcom.us/a/056/cubahist-en.html>

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-cuban-revolution-the-u-s-imposed-economic-blockade-and-us-cuba-relations/5433797>

http://www.coldwar.org/bcmt/mrbm_irbm_1.asp

http://www.navy.mil/submit/display.asp?story_id=3830

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EP9LYoDO5M>

<http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-38892352>

<http://www.nato.int/>

<http://www.loc.gov/exhibits/archives/x2jfk.html>

http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nsa/cuba_mis_cri/620928_621025%20Chronology%201.pdf

http://isreview.org/issues/11/cuba_crisis.shtml

http://nsarchive.gwu.edu/nsa/cuba_mis_cri/docs.htm

TOPIC B: THE US INVASION OF IRAQ

This Study Guideline deliberately deals with the 2003 Iraq's situation without going beyond the situation. Delegates need to closely take care of not reflecting through the events that happened after the US intervention against the UN will as well as the overthrow of Saddam Hussein.

Introduction

Since Saddam Hussein formal rise to power in 1979, the Security Council of the United Nations always kept following events in Iraq. The 1980-1988 Iran-Iraq war engendered first resolutions of the Council toward Iraq. However, it was its invasion of Kuwait that triggered for the first time a military intervention under the mandate of the United Nations on Iraq's soil.

Since 1991, Saddam Hussein' Iraq has kept defying international law and human rights rules¹, especially toward minorities such as the religious Shiites or the ethnic-linguistic Kurds. NGOs such as Human Rights Watch² assessed those violations. Besides human rights' trampling, several security issues are concerned with Iraq. Despite Iraq's commitment to disarm, chief United Nations weapons inspector Hans Blix stated there are no evidence of disarmament but conversely, "evidence of increase activity"³. Iraq indeed used in the past chemical weapons violating the Geneva Protocol of 1925 and are suspected to still clandestinely dispose them. Furthermore, the United States and its allies have reported and assessed serious evidence of state-sponsored terrorism by the current government of Iraq: Saddam Husain is accused of being linked to terrorist organization Al-Qaeda and to have endorsed 9/11 attack. In the wake of this terrorist threat, Iraq's case is clearly the hot-button issue Security Council has to tackle.

Since Iraq is a State reflecting a diverse range of ethnic and religious groups and suspected of sensitive security issues, Security Council will have to approach the situation carefully and comprehensively by proposing solutions considering both short-term and long-term issues springing up from 2003 Iraq' current situation.

Understanding Iraq: Geography and History before United Nations' involvement

The Land of Modern Iraq

The current State of Iraq was artificially created under the British mandate, and was carved from three former provinces of the Ottoman Empire. Borders were created without consideration of the cultural, religious and ethnic diversity of people, and have been a factor of tension and rivalry between different groups. Contributory cause to the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s⁴, the southern section of the border with Iran is still contested; as well as the UN-demarcated border with Kuwait that Iraq agreed in 1993.

¹ [Makiya, Kanan](#) (1998). *Republic of Fear: The Politics of Modern Iraq, Updated Edition*. University of California Press

² <https://www.hrw.org/reports/1993/iraq/>

³ <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/02/26/international/middleeast/top-un-inspector-still-sees-no-iraqi-commitment-to.html>

⁴ Christopher Greenwood, "New World Order or Old? The Invasion of Kuwait and the Rule of Law," *The Modern Law Review* 55, No. 2 (March 1992)

Being the largest country of the Fertile Crescent, Iraq forms a lowland corridor of 438,317⁵ square kilometres between Syria and the Persian Gulf. Excepted the northern areas that are mainly mountainous, the rest of the country is made of valleys where people rely on the Tigris and Euphrates twin rivers to irrigate fields or to supply water to cities.

Iraq is a resourceful country. Although mismanagements of both rivers led to a decrease of Iraq agricultural potential, Iraq's proven oil reserves are the world's second largest, estimated to over 112 million barrels in 2000⁶. Iraq's population acquired knowledge to manage a complex and diverse economy and has important stocks of capital for development. Therefore, Iraq's problems are beyond everything social and political.

7

The People in Iraq

The Iraqi State and its 25 million inhabitants in 2003⁸ are reflecting a diverse reality. Two main divisions can be highlighted: the ethnical-linguistic one between Arabic and Kurds, and the religious one between Sunnis and *Shi'a*.

Kurdish speakers represent up to 20% of the global Iraqi population, mainly located in the northern mountains. Although there are 4 million Kurds Iraq, 13 million can be found in Turkey, 5 million in Iran and 1 million in Syria. Their own language made them difficult to assimilate. Arabic speakers compose the major part of the society, dominating the western steppes and the Twin Rivers Valleys. They are however religiously divided (the religious division indeed does not concern Kurds as they are globally all *Sunnis*).

Religious dispute began after the death of Islam's Prophet Mahomet over who should be selected as successor. The *Sunnis*, the majority, accepted all caliphs whatever the method of selection as long as he was an efficient caliph. The *Shi'a* minority were originally an opposition movement to caliphs' rules. They took the side of Ali, the cousin and son-in-law of the Prophet, claiming he was the only one being legitimate to guide Islam as will be his heirs. *Shi'a* are primarily located in the South-East of the country, along the Iran border. Each individual *Shi'a* is expected to follow the leadership of a *mujtahid*, giving to the *Shiite* community a better sense of cohesion than its counterpart. They represent up to 60% of the population, while Sunni Arabs 20% and Sunni Kurds 17%.

Small minorities such as Sunni Turkmen, various Christian sects, Jews, Iraqi Lurs, Yazidis or Sabian represent up to 3% of the total population.



⁵ <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/iz.html>

⁶ U.S. Energy Information Administration, Iraq. November 1998, p.2.

⁷ <http://www.worldatlas.com/webimage/countrys/asia/lqcolor/iqcolor.htm>

⁸ <http://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-25849945>

Iraq before the British Mandate: three eras, three legacies

Three historical eras shaped Iraq collective memory: the Ancient Mesopotamia, the Arab-Islamic Civilization and the Ottoman Empire.⁹

Ancient Mesopotamia is the oldest and the less-known of these three eras. It used to be seen by Iraqis only as a distant phenomenon. However many archaeological marvels were discovered during the twentieth-century, mainly about the Sumerian people. Thus, modern Iraqis artists began to draw on this heritage to praise Sumerian's contributions to mathematics, writing or sciences. Mesopotamian civilization is now firmly rooted in Iraqi consciousness.

The Arab-Islamic Civilization is probably the most decisive event shaping current Iraq identity. Arab conquests of the seventh century made Arabic the main language of the whole Mesopotamia. The battle of Qadisiyya in 637 opened the Iraqi territory to the invading Muslim army. The geographical area was then gradually Islamized. Iraq became the centre of the prosperous and modern Abbasid Caliphate. Nevertheless, it didn't last. Incursions of nomadic groups broke the Empire by the middle of the ninth century. This era is remember as a golden age by Iraqis.

Later, the Ottoman Empire modernized the Iraqi territory. Conquest started in 1514 and Ottoman influence was quite weak until the end of the nineteenth century. Under the governorship of Midhat Pasha (1869-1872), Iraq both education and agriculture system were modernized while a new centralized administrative system was brought. However, only Sunnis and urban people were benefiting from these reforms. It triggered for the first time tensions between Sunnis and *Shi'a* in Iraq and left rural tribal groups behind.

From the British Mandate to the Saddam Husain Regime

During World War I, the Iraqi territory was under the yoke of the Ottoman Empire, allied to Germany, Italy and Austria-Hungary. Facing them, the Triple Entente could relied on Arab Revolts to fight in the Middle East. For geopolitical, but beyond all economic reasons (petrol and Silk Road), the French and British divided among themselves Middle East through the secret Sykes-Picot Agreement¹⁰: Syria should belong to France while Iraq to Great Britain. They received mandate of the League of Nations to administrate those territories. Current borders are roughly inherited from this accord. Although they brought modern administrative organization, European powers were seen mostly as imperialists.

A revolt was launched by nationalists in 1920 against the UK, leading to the Cairo conference where it was decided Faisal I bin Husain would be the first king of Iraq. Iraq went gradually to independence in 1932 then. A period of political instability ensued and the Kurdish question started. In 1945, Iraq joined the United Nations.

1946-1958 can be considered as the slow agony of the old monarchy regime, suffering from growing internal contestations highlighted by the 1948 Al-Wathbah uprisings and the 1952 *Intifada*. 1958's coup d'état led by Army Brigadier Abd Al-Karim Qasim overthrew King Faisal II to implement a revolutionary regime.

Qasim was nonetheless challenged by both nationalists and communists. Nationalists triggered the Mosul revolt since Qasim was planning to join the United Arab Republic led by Egyptian Nasser and was having increasingly close ties with the communist party. The failure of this

⁹ Phebe Marr, "The Modern History of Iraq", Boulder, Westview, 2004

¹⁰ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-36300224>

revolt convinced the *Ba'ath Party*, advocating an authoritarian nationalist regime being a third voice between communism and liberalism, to attempt murdering Qasim. It failed but brought national attention on them. If communists didn't threaten Qasim's regime directly, they however weaken the cohesion of the society by triggering riots against well-educated Turkmen in Kirkuk. On the one hand, Qasim's regime modernized the country especially regarding the use exploitation of oil. On the other hand, it eroded national unity by bringing back the Kurdish question, triggering a Shi'a revival and letting Kuwait gain independence from the UK in 1961.

In 1963 Qasim was assassinated and Ba'ath Party came to power led by Colonel Abdul Salam Arif. The beginning of this regime is marked by the intensifying of the First Kurdish War. Even if Arif and Kurd leader Barzani made a joint coup in 1963 against Qasim, conflict resumed as discussions about the issue of the level of autonomy for Kurds had been a deadlock. Tensions with Iran supporting Kurds and internal spats within the Ba'ath Party between conservative and those militating for a more open political system led to the end of the war in 1970.

In 1966, Ba'ath Party split between the regionalist, more left-wing and influenced by Marxism, and the nationalists representing Pan-Arabism. The first branched became the official Ba'ath branch in Syria while the second came at power in Iraq in 1968. Led by Bakr and Saddam Husain, they transformed Iraq into a one-party system and held a radical foreign policy line, turning to the USSR and recognizing East Germany. Tensions with Kurds escalated again in 1974 despite the 1970 Peace Agreement. It strongly exacerbated tensions between Iran and Iraq, increasing tensions between Sunnis and Shiites since most of the Ba'ath Party leaders were Sunnis (as Saddam Husain) while Iran embraces Shi'a leadership.

The Saddam Husain regime: beginning of the United Nations Security Council involvement

President Abkr was forced to resign in July 1979 after internal political manoeuvres orchestrated by Saddam Husain.

Both historical border disputes and Iranian Revolution led by Grand Ayatollah Khomeini pushed Saddam Hussein to attack Iran, launching the Iran-Iraq war (1980-1988). For the first time, the United Nations Security Council tackled the Iraqi case. Here is the list of the most important one:

31 October 1983: Resolution 540 condemned violations of international law¹¹.

24 February 1986: Resolution 582 deplored the use of chemical weapon¹².

20 July 1987: Resolution 598 requested an immediate ceasefire while mandating UN Secretary General to investigate on the cause of the conflict.¹³

9 May 1988: Resolution 612 "*Expects both sides to refrain from the future use of chemical weapons*".¹⁴

¹¹ [http://undocs.org/S/RES/540\(1983\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/540(1983))

¹² [http://undocs.org/S/RES/582\(1986\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/582(1986))

¹³ [http://undocs.org/S/RES/598\(1987\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/598(1987))

¹⁴ [http://undocs.org/S/RES/612\(1988\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/612(1988))

9 August 1988: Resolution 619 created United Nations Iran–Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) to ensure ceasefire requested by resolution 598 is applied efficiently.¹⁵

Considered by Saddam Hussain as a victory, UNIIMOG finally declared war ended up as *a status quo ante bellum* (not any economic, political or military side gain or loss for different parties).

Outside UNSC, major powers such as the US or Soviet Union nonetheless mainly backed Iraq, letting Iran isolated.¹⁶

The Security Council kept focusing on Iraq during 1990-1991 Gulf War. Iraq and Kuwait diplomatic tensions over their shared oil fields and claims that Kuwait belongs to Iraq according to Ottoman provincial lines led Saddam Hussein to invade Kuwait on the 2nd of August 1990¹⁷. Security Council passed resolution 660¹⁸ condemning this operation of breach of peace and urging Iraq to withdraw its troops. As the Iraqi government continued to defy UNSC resolutions, Security Council passed on the 6th of August resolution 661¹⁹, entering into force economic embargo on Iraq and endorsing its application through the use of full legal forces. Security Council's involvement went further on the 29th of November as resolution 678 passed. It launched an ultimatum on Iraq: if Iraqi troops were not withdrawn entirely on the 15th of January 1991 (that is to say if resolution 660 was disregarded by Iraq), a broad international coalition under the mandate of the UN led by the US would intervene. Since diplomatic talks failed, aerial operation *Desert Storm* started. UN military intervention wound up on the ground through the 100 hours *Desert Sabre* operation²⁰.

Iraq was left humiliated since its army was quickly defeated and its chemical and biological weapons development programs unveiled. Besides, Iraq was economically destroyed since oil fields were burnt during the operation and undergoing a humanitarian crisis.

Several issues our committee shall tackle actually sprang up during these two wars. Those issues are mainly ethnic conflicts inside Iraq, the presence of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) and suspicions of Iraq sponsoring terrorism in the wake of the 9/11 attack on US' soil.

The 2003 Iraq situation (Delegates should consider that we are meant to be in 2003, right before the US intervention in Iraq)

Beyond susceptibly owning Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs), Iraq was considered as a little cooperating State for the United Nations and more broadly for the West. Indeed, the 1991 UN intervention on Iraqi soil greatly jeopardised the Iraqi economy and the embargo put into force in 1990 actually carried on until now despite denunciations from part of the Global Community. Actually China and Russia condemned for a while the ever continuation of the embargo even after the 1991 intervention. However, both voted for Resolution 1141 in

¹⁵ [http://undocs.org/S/RES/619\(1988\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/619(1988))

¹⁶ Stockholm International Peace Research Institute: Indicates that of \$29,079 million of arms exported to Iraq from 1980 to 1988 the Soviet Union accounted for \$16,808 million, France \$4,591 million, and China \$5,004 million (information have to be entered on SIPRI database)

¹⁷ Christopher Greenwood, "New World Order or Old? The Invasion of Kuwait and the Rule of Law," *The Modern Law Review* 55, No. 2 (March 1992)

¹⁸ [http://undocs.org/S/RES/660\(1990\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/660(1990))

¹⁹ [http://undocs.org/S/RES/661\(1990\)](http://undocs.org/S/RES/661(1990))

²⁰ http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/ops/desert_sabre.htm

2002 demanding compliance with UN inspection regimes and recognise legitimate international concern with Iraq's current situation. The issues the delegates must address combine a divided society, a country ruled by a cornered leader suspected of being linked with Al Qaeda amongst other terrorist groups along with drawing upon Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs). The next sections will provide information and facts as they were known in 2003.

A religiously and ethnically divided country

Under Saddam Hussein's ruling, the Sunnis — despite they were a minority — harshly dominate the country and government, going as far as repressing political and religious rights.²¹ Furthermore, the violence against non-Sunni Arab populations were numerous as well as those directed against Islamist organisation. Indeed, the Hussein's regime was secularly-led and had for ambition to unite the country through nationalism and not around religion. However, that aim was contingent upon people's will to follow it and to forget religious and ethnical disagreement. Saddam Therefore, Hussein waged severe repression wave against Kurds, Shi'a as well as Sunni Islamist groups in order to clearly punish any sense of division whether it be from religious or ethnical features in Iraq. Indeed Saddam Hussein and its government drew upon instruments along with physical violence to oppress and brutalise the Iraqi Kurdish population, at that time living in northern regions of Iraq along the borders with Syria and Turkey. The first stage of the process in the late 1980s involved denying Kurdish people political rights and introducing a programme of 'Arabisation' meaning that the common denominator was to be Arab and not Shi'as, Sunnis or part of any other ethnical group. Cultural, linguistic, and religious heritage of non-Arabs was voluntarily undermined in order to unite the Iraqi 'nation'. That is why every particularities that might divide this nation was fought by the regime. This struggle against Kurdish ethnical particularities went until drawing upon chemical weapons, killing thousands of Iraqi Kurds during the so-called 'Al Anfal' campaign between 1987 and 1989.

It goes almost the same for other religious or ethnical groups. For instance, Shiites and especially Assyrians and Turkmen in the South have underwent serious — even though lesser — internal displacement and physical oppression. 200 000 Arabs, mostly Shi'as also moved in the Southwest due to repression and habitat destruction through marsh-draining engineering projects by Hussein's government. Furthermore, Iraqi civil rights are plagued due to a lack of media independence, jeopardising the freedom of expression. Besides, only government-sponsored entities benefit from the freedom of association and of assembly. Some reports and *a fortiori* studies show that this situation of ever-growing repression against everything but Arab nationalism plummeted the actual nationalism in the country. For instance, in October, a note reported an attempt from a soldier during training to bomb the presidential Palace.²²

The Security Council should keep in mind that this divided and oppressed society is quite volatile and unpredictable along with their political choices. Communities that were punished for a long time because of their will to express and cherish their cultural particularities generally get more and more embedded to these values after a repression. The sense of solidarity between kin prevails in time of crisis whether it be related to religious or ethnical values. That is the first

²¹ International Religious Freedom Report 2003, Iraq," Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, 1 January 2004, accessed 14 March 2017, <http://www.state.gov/j/drl/rls/irf/2003/24452.htm>.

²² "Freedom in the World 2003: Iraq," Freedom House, 2003, accessed 15 March 2017, <https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2003/Iraq>.

foremost issue the delegates must address. How to give a national impetus while group feelings have been developed through a State-led repression?

Besides, please care about the notion of communitarianism and its shaping throughout a State-led process of repression. This notion of communitarianism has to be related with Islamism in this context.

Use of Weapons of Mass Destruction

During the Saddam Hussein's ruling, an extensive biological weapons program was pursued in Iraq from the early 1980s, violating *de facto* the 1972 Biological Weapon Convention. After the Gulf War (1990-91) the United Nations were mandated for the disarmament of the country along with investigating the arms detained by the country. After the United States Special Commission (UNSCOM) researches on Iraqi soil, details of the Iraqi Biological Weapons program were released. It has been disclosed that the Saddam's Iraq had operated a BW program at six major sites since the 1980s. Basic researches had been led on numerous biological agents. Besides, tests had been directed by the regime in order to someday release the Biological agents in case of need. Several missiles and weapons were filled with the biological agents and deployed in a few sites all over the country in order to be deployed.

Little of them were employed actually. Most of them were deployed during the Iran-Iraq War throughout the 1980s and against Iraqi Kurds during the 1988 An'fal campaign. Those weapons are considered as highly dangerous and caused severe threats for one's life (irritates the skin and lungs, large blisters, spread the risks of cancer). The World Health Organisation deem those biological weapons as ethically problematic and condemned by the United Nations.

After 1999, the monitoring regime (UNSCOM) meant to disarm Iraq by leading investigation on its soil moved to the new United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) in order to supervise the dismantling of Iraq's chemical and biological weapons programs and disarmament of existing weaponry. However, that was not deemed as enough for certain country like the United States and the United Kingdom which expressed deep concerns over continued research, manufacture, and undisclosed existing weaponry. That drove both of them to unilaterally bomb certain military facilities in Iraq. The operation 'Desert Fox' was launched in order to point out the Iraqi non-compliance towards the Global Community. It is at this actual moment that the US foreign policy moved to the official position of removing Saddam Hussein and supporting the establishment of a democracy in Iraq.

This operation targeted air-defense systems, command centers as well as WMD-delivery focused sites. The results of this operation remain unclear even for international observers, as several important WMD-related sites were destroyed. Lack of clarity about the effectiveness of the operation was also brought up but as a consequence, Iraq withdrew from Inspections agreements. If the effectiveness of the operation was unsure, nothing was not more certain than the international condemnation of such an aggression from the United States and the United Kingdom. It was deemed unproductive to Iraqi disarmament and poles apart the UN values. Following such attitudes from both parts, Iraqi reports to UNMOVIC stopped being send, and the UNSC unanimously passed Resolution 1441 on November 2002. It was stated that 'Iraq has not provided an accurate, full, final, and complete disclosure, as required by resolution 687 (1991), of all aspects of its programs to develop weapons of mass destruction [...] and of all holdings of such weapons, their components and production facilities and locations'.

Saddam Hussein's regime links with Al Qaeda (and more broadly, terrorist

organisation)

One of the most prominent US rationale to intervene in Iraq was to wage what they called the war on terror, against terrorism and especially Al Qaeda, the terrorist organisation responsible for the 9/11 attacks. However, no intelligence has related Iraq to the hijacking of the 9/11 flight. If documents and intelligences served as evidences to support the American claims, they demonstrated the connections between Baghdad and terrorist organisations.

Basically Saddam's regime has sponsored terrorist organisations in order to cope with issues he could not directly deal with. The aforementioned organisations focused Iraq supports regarding Iraqi strategic competitors, especially Israel, Iran and Turkey. The agreement included notably financial support, cover for money laundering, armament, training bases, logistical and intelligence support along with political support for these terrorist groups. Secular terrorist groups were also concerned as the Palestine Liberation Front, the Mujahadeen-e-Khalq in Iran and the Kurdistan Worker's Party in Turkey. Seeing the financed groups, it is obvious that the Saddam's regime aims to disturb its 'enemies' and to take advantage of this situation of troubles in those countries. The principal strategies allowed to these groups went from bombings, to plane hijackings.

The irony in this State-terrorist cooperation was that the so called groups were often seeking mutually exclusive goals from one another. For instance, Iraq refused granting political rights to its own Kurdish population while supporting Turkish Kurds against the Turkish State. Another example: Iraq supported Iran dissidents aiming to disrupt the Iranian State while they were financing a Palestinian terror group during the fight against Israel. The very same fight in which the Iranian State has taken part on the same side of the Palestinian terrorist group. These groups are rightfully regarded as non-state actors constituting another layer of security concerns to the situation in Iraq. On the one hand, this is due to the serious threat they might form in disrupting states and importance regional forces. On another hand, the risks involved in Iraq's trend to ignore UN disarmament and investigation protocols and keep going with their possession of chemical and biological weapons.

The sponsorship and financing of terrorism should thus be addressed by the delegates as it is directly part of the risks of dire disturbances in the Middle East. The Iraq Situation is so highly involved in the diplomatic resolution of these issues. Prominent significance shall be put into terrorist groups' claims along with their capacities of influence and spreading in the region.

The US intervention or Invasion

The actual election of the Republican Georges W. Bush in the Oval Office was enough to harden the US policy towards Saddam Hussein's Iraq. Their effective goal from this exact moment was to remove Sadam Hussein from the Head of the Iraqi State in order to protect the American citizens as well as establish and settle a democracy in the country. Furthermore, as it was exposed above, Iraq is considered as a terrorist State by the US since the unveiling of the state relations with terrorist groups. The genuine shift in the situation was provoked by the 9/11 attacks. Afterwards, Georges W. Bush called upon a Joint Congress Session. He addressed the US representatives about its belief that an intervention (according to UN legal terms) — or preferably invasion — had to be sought for the well-being of the Iraqi society. Bush spoke before the UN General Assembly on September 2002, presenting the position of the United States.

Bush stated *“the United States felt unsatisfied by the rigor of previous UN inspections of Iraqi weapons caches and other failed agreements on Iraq’s end in 1991, and it seeks to reinvigorate the UN’s sense of urgency regarding the global community’s action to protect Iraq from harming herself and other countries”*²³. The prominent point of the United States was then extremely clear: they aimed to gradually use rhetorical pressure on Iraq and the International Community. Even though the Security Council did not yet authorise nor vote for a plan of actions in Iraq, it nonetheless agreed in 2002 that Iraq non-compliance with the International Community could constitute a threat by the future and furthermore characterise a hypothetical will to hide its deeds. Here is what the Security Council formerly stated:

“Iraq repeatedly obstructed immediate, unconditional, and unrestricted access to sites designated by the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), failed to cooperate fully and unconditionally with UNSCOM and IAEA weapons inspectors, as required by resolution 687 (1991), and ultimately ceased all cooperation with UNSCOM and the IAEA in 1998.”²⁴

UNMOVIC agencies settled through the Resolution 1441 produced from November 2002 until March 2003 and brought up with few evidences of hidden activities on the Iraqi soil but eventually revealed inconclusive. However, the US rhetoric on Iraq has remained on issues questioning Iraqi chemical and biological weapons’ accountability. Implementation of Inspection regimes was sought over and over while only the hypothesis for Iraq minorities to let the state carrying on its chemical weaponry production presents a serious threat.

The inaction of the International Community at the time being could be observable by the UNSC countries’ indecision on the 30th of January. Indeed, it was reported that 11 of 15 members were not yet in favour of supporting an invasion of Iraq²⁵. Generally, the majority of the countries tended to a more peaceful disarmament of Iraq. Furthermore, the lack of “undeniable proof” of WMD production or terrorism sponsorship is constantly brought up, especially by the Permanent Russian Ambassador in the UNSC, Sergey Lavrov.

Issues implied for HSC countries

United States, United Kingdom, Spain, and Bulgaria

- The United States and the United Kingdom stand strongly against the Saddam’s regime and intendedly aim to disrupt the regime until an expected overthrow of Hussein. They are seeking to transform the country into a less repressive state. Furthermore, threats and pressuring are regularly used in order to fear Saddam’s regime and provoke a

²³ President’s Remarks at the United Nations General Assembly,” The White House, 12 September 2002, accessed 16 March 2017, <http://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2002/09/20020912-1.html>.

²⁴ SC/7564, “Security Council Holds Iraq in ‘Material Breach’ Of Disarmament Obligations, Offers Final Chance to Comply, Unanimously Adopting Resolution 1441,” United Nations Press, 8 November 2002, accessed 02 October 2016, <http://www.un.org/press/en/2002/SC7564.doc.htm>.

²⁵ “International Support Scarce for Iraq War,” *Fox News*, 30 January 2003, accessed 25 July 2016, <http://www.foxnews.com/story/2003/01/30/international-support-scarce-for-iraq-war.html>.

compliant reaction from Iraq towards the Global Community.²⁶ Bush introduced a doctrine of its name, calling for a preemptive war against the Hussein Regime to prevent future issues from arising.

- The United Kingdom deemed the Iraqi non-compliance with the United Nations WMDs inspections programs. However, they decided to support the US position since the Gulf War, despite their historical ties to pre-Hussein Iraq.
- Spain and Bulgaria also support US' intervention proposal in Iraq for disarmament rationales.²⁷

China, Russia, Pakistan, and Syria

- China and Russia denounced the no-fly zone over Iraq as an unfair restriction and stated that there was no international law or policy supporting the decision to infringe on Iraq's national sovereignty in this way.
- Even though China and Russia constantly asked for an end to the oil embargo over Iraq, they both voted for Resolution 1441 in 2002, reiterating demand for compliance from Iraq with UN investigation regimes and recognise 'legitimate international concerns with Iraq's current situation'.
- The fact of voting in favour of resolutions continuously focusing on Iraq pose a problem to Muslim-majority Security Council members (Pakistan, Syria). Furthermore, their position on Iraq aligns closely with China and Russia. No public comment from Pakistan¹ regarding the UN sanctions over Iraq even though it strongly encourages continued investigations.

France, Germany, and Latin America²⁸

- The German chancellor Schroder and the President of the French Republic Jacques Chirac reached agreement upon a drastic opposition on any invasion of Iraq. They called for greater inspection and oppose China and Russia's proposition to lift the sanctions.
- About Latin America: Although the Latin part of the American continent maintains good relationship with the US, the two countries currently part of the Security Council (Mexico and Chile) have remained supportive of further inspections and unclear about military intervention.

Cameroon, Guinea, and Angola

²⁶ A. Carney, "Allied Participation in Operation Iraqi Freedom," *U.S. Center of Military History*, 2011, accessed 12 July 2016, http://www.history.army.mil/html/books/059/59-3-1/CMH_59-3-1.pdf.

²⁷ "Mexico Shifts Toward U.S. Position on Iraq," *USA Today*, 26 February 2003, accessed 02 October 2016, http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/world/iraq/2003-02-26-us-mexico-iraq_x.htm.

²⁸ "Chileans Disrobe, Protest War in Iraq," *CNN World*, 1 March 2003, accessed 02 October 2016, <http://edition.cnn.com/2003/WORLD/americas/03/01/chile.protest.reut/>

- The African member states sitting in the Security Council stand neutral in the current debate, especially because of the lobbying carried out by the US and UK for their support of a military intervention. However, support for the French position have been announced in February from the African Union notably about continuing inspections and sanctions. The three African Security Council members signed the declaration.
- What need to be reminded about these three countries is that they can be flexible on their positions and remain today undecided.

Issues the resolution should address

We have the chance today to replay the scenario leading to the 2003 US invasion on Iraq. However, there is no certainty that you, delegates, will take the same decision. Yet you should hold into account a few features of the conflict and the whys of the US intervention. In 2003, the United States are gravely touched by the 2001 attacks on the World Trade Center towers and claimed themselves as leader of the 'war on terror'. Osama Bin Laden is sought more than ever to restore the US honour, and high suspicions indict Iraq of hiding him onto its soil.

- The Saddam Hussein's issue: overthrow, condemnation, by who, for what?
- Replacing the leader, regime? What kind of regime? How to settle it? What kind of transition?
- If intervention is needed, through which rationales? Are the UN the only body able to legitimate an international intervention in Iraq?

ⁱ "Pakistan Opposes Iraq War," *BBC News*, 10 March 2003, accessed 02 October 2016, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/2834997.stm.