

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

USG AND
PRESIDENT CHAIR
OF UNSC
DORA GÜVENGİZ

Agenda Item: The Issue of the Gulf War

Committee Date: 1990

The Secretariat's Welcoming Letter

Dear Delegate of BHMUN'21,

Since our first session in 2014, we have been establishing a platform where young innovators can have the opportunity to share their thoughts and ideas, whilst also educating themselves on world affairs, so as to learn to approach worldwide issues from different perspectives. This year, the Academic Team of BHMUN has decided to form both General Assembly and Special Committees held according to the most significant historical events from 1990 - 1999.

The variety of committees will allow delegates to discuss many world problems from the viewpoints required by their assigned country and role. We ensure you that every committee will offer issues of interest according to this historical decade together with extremely creative ideas. We promise to provide all delegates with interesting and debatable crises in each committee and offer rewarding opportunities that will allow you to 'Innovate the Future' in every aspect of the conference.

Due to the global pandemic, this year's BHMUN will be held online. However, with the help of our devoted Organisation Team, we affirm that your expectations of our BHMUN conference this year will be surpassed by providing an exceptional experience that will meet your every need from the opening to the closing ceremony.

BHMUN is the first and only entirely historical Model UN conference in Turkey organised under Harvard procedure. Helping delegates verge upon historical issues from modern perspectives is exclusive to our conference. Hence, we believe that BHMUN is a truly unique experience for delegates all around the world, and it is for this reason that we give great value to the discussions delegates will hold on the contemporary issues that are considered timeless.

With all being said, we invite you to join us in BHMUN'21 for an unforgettable and unique experience.

Welcome!

BHMUN'21 Secretariat

Introduction to the Committee by the Secretariat

Committee Description:

The Security Council is the highest committee of the UN. It consists of fifteen members, five permanent members (P5), and ten elected. The Security Council deals with the most serious topics of the UN that require immediate actions and decisions to be taken.

It's 1990, the Security Council will gather due to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. The Saddam Hussein regime has taken an aggressive step in international relations, and this step taken requires an immediate response. The invasion of Kuwait was easy for the Iraqi forces due to the small army of Kuwait that is relatively weaker. The position of the Middle Eastern Countries and the P5 is critical. While some of these countries support the Saddam Hussein regime, some oppose it. But what the world awaits is an explanation of the position of the Security Council regarding the issue. Therefore the Security Council, with all its members, needs to decide upon what to do in the so-called "Gulf War".

Now, it is up to the delegates to decide upon what they are going to do: Follow the path of history or draw a path of their own. The delegates' performance will shape the flow of the committee and the BHMUN'21 Team will shape their crises in accordance with the flow.

BHMUN'21 Secretariat

Letter from the President Chair and USG:

My name is Dora Güvengiz and I'm a soon-to-be senior in Bilkent Highschool. I would like to welcome you all to the annual session of BHMUN'21 as the president chair of the Security Council Committee. I can assure you that every single detail has been taken care of with the utmost professionalism from start to finish to present you with an experience that is enriching and enjoyable. I have attended both national and international conference and being an individual that puts a lot of time and effort to MUN with such compassion hasn't been easy with my busy schedule but at the end, it was all more than worth it. Every single conference I've attended has contributed to the formation of my personality whether it is how to have an argument in a professional environment with proper manners or preparing an academic paper that is bountiful with information. Throughout my MUN journey, I met wonderful that I wouldn't have met otherwise that those people became a vital part of my life. MUN conferences, for a passionate attendant, form an individual's life with different aspects, all at the same time. If I talk about myself for a bit, I'm an aspiring marine biologist with a never-ending passion for marine life and diving whenever I get the chance with my club. I have had a weak spot for the arts ever since I can remember where interpreting the philosophy of the artist or the meaning behind the piece of art has become a habit that I believe everyone should pick up. I would love nothing more than to bond with my delegates on a friendship level and for them to relax. I can assure you I will do my very best to ensure all of you that I will contribute to creating a peaceful and safe environment for everyone to express their opinions. I hope this conference will broaden your perspective with having much fun as you can with new potential friends.

*USG and President Chair
Dora Güvengiz*

Introduction:

On August 3, 1990, one day after Iraqi President Saddam Hussein attacked and involved the country of Kuwait, U.S. President George H. W. Shrubbery mobilized worldwide help for a bound together military mediation expected to free the little country. The six-week war that resulted was broadcast beginning to end, permitting the American public to see the innovatively progressed weaponry utilized in the activity. Both air and ground offenses came about in negligible U.S. losses and a quick and chose triumph, which set up President Bush as an amazing power in world issues. Americans, troubled for such a long time by the phantom of the uncertain Vietnam War, praised the loss of Iraq and the might of their military.

Iraq had risen up out of the Iran-Iraq War of 1980–1988 \$80 billion owing debtors. Since Iraq verifiably had looked at Kuwait as a piece of Iraq, Hussein requested that Kuwait raise the cost of oil, pardon billions of dollars in the red, pay billions more in the guide, and pay \$2.4 billion for Iraqi oil that it purportedly siphoned unlawfully from the Rumaila oil field, which rides the line between the two nations. At the point when Kuwait didn't surrender to these and different requests, Hussein attacked Kuwait without notice on the morning of August 2, 1990. Within a couple of hours, Hussein's military involved the whole country. Meeting little opposition, they killed many Kuwaitis and imprisoned and tormented hundreds more.

When President Bush learned of the attack, he and his staff started arranging the tactical mediation named "Activity Desert Storm" and coordinating a powerful power of 500,000 American soldiers and U.N.- alliance powers from many nations. By late November 1990, a gigantic military presence was set up in close by Saudi Arabia and in the Persian Gulf itself. Ambassadors from the United Nations and the United States endeavored to arrange a quiet finish to the intrusion, however, Hussein would not move. January 15, 1991, was set as the cutoff time for withdrawal. At the point when Hussein overlooked the final offer, U.S. what's more, alliance powers released an air assault on Baghdad and other army bases inside Iraq. Very quickly, the United States' state-of-the-art military innovation had annihilated large numbers of Iraq's order and control focuses, weapons industrial facilities, and other army bases. After 72,000 forays dropped 141,921 tons of bombs more than five weeks of air assaults, President Bush arranged the initiation of a ground hostile.

Definition of Key Terms:

Arabia: A peninsula between the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf

Annexation: Transfer of political sovereignty over a chunk of land to a new state.

Coalition: The union of diverse things into one body or form or group

Expelling: Any of several bodily processes by which substances go out of the body

Operation Desert Shield: Towards the end of the year 1990, the US launched “Operation Desert Shield” in the defense of Saudi Arabia against an attack from Iraq. Over 500,00 soldiers were placed in Saudi Arabia in a case of attack.

Operation Desert Storm: When Iraq didn't withdraw from Kuwait on January 15th, 1991, Operation Desert Shield became Operation Desert Storm as a strategy to attack Iraq began to take form.

Background Information:

Iranian Revolution:

The unrest of February 1979 was a revolt of the general public against the state. In a portion of its essential qualities, the unrest didn't adjust to the standard standards of Western upsets, on the grounds that the state didn't address simply a normal tyranny however an outright and subjective framework that needed political authenticity and a social base practically across the entire of the general public.

The Iranian Revolution was for the expulsion of Mohamed Reza Shah Pahlavi, the country's ruler since 1941. The ruler – Shah Pahlavi was upheld by Western Countries like the United States and the United Kingdom. Even however Iran (Persia) appreciated times of monetary success under Shah's standard, locally, the system was somewhat of an autocracy. Additionally, numerous fundamentalists were against the ruler's eager modernization program that rearranged land and pushed for social changes during the 1960s. Many felt the King's drives sabotaged Iran's Shia customs and served just unfamiliar interests.

The financial breakdown of Iran in 1977 which caused high joblessness and rising expansion turned into a setting-off factor to oust the government and the western interests. The upheavals of 1906-1909 and 1977-1979 look complete opposites in numerous regards. However, they were very comparative as to a portion of their fundamental qualities, which may likewise assist with clarifying large numbers of the divergences between them. Both were rebellions of the general public against the state. Vendors, dealers, erudite people, and metropolitan masses assumed an imperative part in the Constitutional Revolution of 1906-1909, yet so did driving 'ulama' and amazing landowners, to such an extent that without their dynamic help the victory of 1909 would have been hard to imagine making it look as though "the congregation" and "the medieval refined class" were driving an "average vote based upset". In that upheaval, as well, different political developments and plans were addressed, yet they were completely joined in the point of ousting the self-assertive state (and eventually Muhammad 'Ali Shah), which represented conservatism, so that the vast majority of the strict powers additionally energized behind the pioneer cause, but indiscriminately.

The circumstance in Kuwait was confounded by outside Shiite entertainers getting comfortable in Kuwait and participating in progressive activity against the state. In Iraq the Shiite political development, Hizb al Dawa would lead the political battle against the Saddam system by opposing state preclusion of strict parades in 1977 prompting struggle with the state. A great many Shiite activists were captured and executed-including Muhammad Baqir al Sadr and his sister Bint al Huda. The chain of occasions referenced raised the issue of Shiite character solidly onto the table, which was remarkable. This was an immediate aftereffect of the politicization of Shiite ministers and the Iranian upheaval which empowered Shiite people groups in the Persian Gulf to challenge and defy what were seen as abusive and shameful systems. Already the Shiite mindset and standpoint had been one of staying silent and continuing with ordinary day by day life amidst minimization and abuse yet this had changed because of progressive political thoughts and considerations which had entered the Persian Gulf and the Iranian transformation which associated the bad form, segregation and mistreatment to strict talk subsequently raising the feeling of having a place with the Shiite people group and fortifying Shiite identity. Thusly never again was there a feeling of a stashed and detached Shiite people group in Kuwait, Bahrain, and Saudi Arabia yet a Shiite recognizable proof with territorial Shiite people group had happened, reinforcing the connection between the Shiite people group in the Persian Gulf because of comparative encounters of foul play and oppression. Critically the Persian Gulf States didn't have a clue how to manage the rising tide of Shiite character, which was of worry to them as it was undermining their interior dependability.

Iraqi Invasion:

On August 2, 1990, at around 2 a.m. nearby time, the Iraqi powers attack Kuwait, Iraq's small, oil-rich neighbor. Kuwait's guard powers were quickly overpowered, and those that were not obliterated withdrawn to Saudi Arabia. The emir of Kuwait, his family, and other government pioneers escaped to Saudi Arabia, and inside the space of hours Kuwait City had been caught and the Iraqis had set up a common government. By adding Kuwait, Iraq oversaw 20% of the world's oil saves and, interestingly, a generous coastline on the Persian Gulf. That very day, the United Nations Security Council collectively condemned the intrusion and requested Iraq's prompt withdrawal from Kuwait. On August 6, the Security Council forced an overall prohibition on exchange with Iraq.

On August 9, Operation Desert Shield, the American protection of Saudi Arabia, started as U.S. powers dashed to the Persian Gulf. Iraqi despot Saddam Hussein, in the meantime, developed his involving armed force in Kuwait to around 300,000 soldiers. On November 29, the U.N. Security Council passed a goal approving the utilization of power against Iraq on the off chance that it neglected to pull out by January 15, 1991. Hussein would not pull out his powers from Kuwait, which he had set up as an area of Iraq, and somewhere in the range of 700,000 partnered troops, fundamentally American, accumulated in the Middle East to authorize the cutoff time.

At 4:30 p.m. EST on January 16, 1991, Operation Desert Storm, the huge U.S.- drove hostile against Iraq, started as the principal contender airplane was dispatched from Saudi Arabia and off the U.S. what's more, British plane carrying warships in the Persian Gulf. The entire evening, an airplane from the U.S.- drove military alliance beat focuses in and around Baghdad as the world watched the situation unfold on TV film sent live by means of a satellite from Iraq. Activity Desert Storm was directed by a worldwide alliance under the incomparable order of U.S. General Norman Schwarzkopf and highlighted powers from 32 countries, including Britain, Egypt, France, Saudi Arabia, and Kuwait.

During the following month and a half, the united power was occupied with a concentrated air battle against Iraq's military and common framework and experienced minimal viable obstruction from the Iraqi aviation-based armed forces or air protections. Iraqi ground powers were defenseless during this phase of the conflict, and Hussein's just critical retaliatory measure was the starting of SCUD rocket assaults against Israel and Saudi Arabia. Saddam trusted that the rocket assaults would incite Israel to enter the contention, in this manner dissolving Arab backing of the conflict. In line with the United States, in any case, Israel stayed out of the conflict.

On February 24, a monstrous alliance ground hostile started, and Iraq's obsolete and ineffectively provided military were quickly overpowered. Before the day's over, the Iraqi armed force had successfully collapsed, 10,000 of its soldiers were held as detainees, and a U.S. airbase had been set up somewhere inside Iraq. After under four days, Kuwait was freed, and most of Iraq's military had either given up, withdrew to Iraq, or been obliterated.

On February 28, U.S. President George Bush pronounced a truce, and on April 3 the U.N. Security Council passed Resolution 687, indicating conditions for a conventional finish to the contention. As indicated by the goal, Bush's truce would become official, a few assents would be lifted, however, the restriction on Iraqi oil deals would proceed until Iraq obliterated its weapons of mass annihilation under U.N. oversight. On April 6, Iraq acknowledged the goal, and on April 11 the Security Council proclaimed it. During the following decade, Saddam Hussein often disregarded the provisions of the nonaggression treaty, inciting additionally associated airstrikes and proceeding with U.N. sanctions.

Socio-Political Aspect of the War:

The Persian Gulf for quite a long time has been a significant road for culture and exchange because of its international importance with it being at the junction for admittance to Africa and Asia. Over the span of the last century, the Persian Gulfs' significance to the world developed through the revelation of oil and gas in the district. The disclosure of oil and gas has been significant for the West and the Persian Gulf States. For the West, the plenty of oil and gas in the Persian Gulf has given truly necessary fuel to help developing and growing economies and will keep on being ever significant into the future as the hunger for energy expansions in the West. For the Persian Gulf States, the offer of oil and gas has gone about as a significant wellspring of income and has assumed a focal part in creating social and political authenticity, through the arrangement of sumptuous social and government assistance administrations. This has been significant in developing a benefactor customer connection between the state and society. There is a lot of writing zeroing in on the effect of a benefactor customer relationship on state-society relations and regardless of whether such a relationship has gone about as an obstruction or not to political change and change in the Persian Gulf. It's anything but the reason for this paper to venture into this broad writing however to investigate the issue of religion, nationality, and character legislative issues, which has been hidden where no one will think to look in the Persian Gulf.

The First Gulf War (1980-1988):

The First Gulf War-Iran-Iraq war 1980-1988 The explanations for the Iran-Iraq battle of 1980–1988 are not authoritative going from Saddam's craving for force and authority to Khomeini's energy to spread the Islamic unrest past the shores of Iran. Despite this vulnerability why the conflict started, what is sure is the utilization of personality by the two sides to give authenticity. To give legitimization and to shape a strong assessment for the conflict the issue of character governmental issues was raised by Saddam-which would get into a tricky situation in the locale and influencing the idea of society and legislative issues in the area. Although Iraq is overwhelmingly Arab and Iran is prevalently Persian, the Iran-Iraq line actually cuts across some ethnic, strict, and political loyalties. In the north, an enormous populace of Kurds (who are neither Arab nor Persian) rode the two sides of the line. Along with the southern piece of the line, an Arab minority possessed the Iranian territory of Khuzestan among a Persian greater part.

Moreover, the biggest segment of the Iraqi populace is Shiite Muslims, similar to most of the Iranian populace. Shiite strict pioneers at chances with the mainstream (non-strict) legislature of their own nation at times looked for asylum in the other, stressing Iranian-Iraqi relations. Accordingly, the utilization of character legislative issues would turn into a strategy used by the two sides in the conflict. For instance, Saddam raised the old issue of power over the asset-rich Arab region of Khuzestan. The Iraqi system's disappointment over Iran's ownership of oil-rich Khuzestan territory was not restricted to simply expository and provocative explanations and addresses; verifiably Iraq had upheld secessionist developments in Khuzestan, and surprisingly raised the issue of its regional cases in the gatherings of the Arab League, with no achievement. In the development of the conflict Iraqi radio broadcasts started solely communicating into "Arabistan" (Khuzestan), empowering Arabs living in Iran and even Baluchis to rise and rebel against Iran's focal government and to request their own regional rights. Basra TV stations even began showing Iran's Khuzestan territory as a feature of Iraq's new region called 'Nasiriyyah', renaming all Iranian urban communities with Arabic names. Saddam proceeded with his enemy of Persian situation against Iran with a discourse at al-Mustansiriyyah University in Baghdad, on 02 April 1980, attracting equals to the seventh Century rout of Persia in the Battle of al Qadisiyyah.

By raising, the issue of Khuzestan and the utilization of hostile to Persian manner of speaking Arab character was raised by Saddam. The raising of Arab personality was huge because the possibility of 'Arabism' had debilitated in the repercussions of the 1967 Arab rout which finished the Arab political venture in the Middle East. Saddam accepted the initiative responsibility which had been left by Gamal Abdul Nasser and started to interest the Arab character of the Arab individuals to make public help in the conflict against Iran. The conflict started to be portrayed as one between the Arabs and non-Arabs (Persians) - this strategy filled in

as Iraq acquired the help of the staggering number of Arab states in the conflict, except for Syria and Libya. This refusal by Syria and Libya to help Iraq was persuaded by philosophy and their own territorial aspirations and significantly showed the disappointment of Arab character to join the entire Arab world contrary to Iran. Iran didn't stay inactive however played similar strategies against the Iraqi regime. Iran endeavored to destabilize Iraq and urged Kurdish patriots to separate the country in the South, in solution to Iraq's comparable exercises in Iran's Khuzestan region. Likewise, Iran utilized religion to battle the tide of 'Arabism' which was being aged by Iraq. Consequently, Iran extended the conflict as an Islamic conflict against a common system that was severe and uncalled for.

The war went on for a very long time and its local effect was incredible in raising character governmental issues into the cutting edge of the political medium in the Persian Gulf. Various personalities went to the bleeding edge in the area Arab character, Kurdish personality, Baluchi personality, Sunni character, Persian character and even Shiite personality which had surfaced during the last part of the 1970s was indeed fortified throughout the Iran-Iraq war. Iran engaged Shiite people groups all through the Gulf to defy administering systems that were supporting Iraq in the conflict. This fortified the Shiite character in the district. What's more, Iran urged Iraqi Shiite not to battle against their own brethren in Iran and to defy the unjustifiable and harsh Saddam system. Iraq not just played on the Arab card in the Persian Gulf to make support it additionally energized elective ethnic gatherings which later would mess up the Iraqi system. Saddam supported the Kurdish populace in Iran to revolt inside to help the Iraqi reason. This would be an error for the Iraqi system as it would give stimulus to its own Kurdish populace to dream of autonomy and partition from the focal Iraqi government later on.

The conflict had raised the secret intricacies of character in the Persian Gulf – with strict and ethnic personalities acquiring noticeable quality inside and across country states in the area. Pressures were obvious inside the Persian Gulf states between various strict and ethnic personalities and between states inside the locale. The 'Pandora's crate' had been opened with the arising result being wild and causing various issues for states in the Persian Gulf. The oversimplified arrangement of tossing cash at an issue was not, at this point serviceable in the Persian Gulf as the class of personality governmental issues had been raised.

Gulf Geopolitics:

According to the viewpoint of the 1990s, the Gulf would have all the earmarks of being one of the conceivably most temperamental districts of the world, given the blend of monetary assets, mobilized pressure, and inner political insecurity. However, past this clear unsteadiness, it merits analyzing what the challenges comprise. Taking everything into account, one can distinguish somewhere around six spaces of strain: an area, ethnic and strict minorities, oil, arms races, clashes in international strategy direction, and obstruction in one another's inner

undertakings. However, the sheer collection of these issues need not prompt doomsayer ends. The regional issues, if appropriately tended to, can be settled by compromise, be they the Shatt al-Arab or the Tumbs and Abu Musa: by the guidelines of other boundary questions, these are generally minor issues. The topic of minorities is again something that can, when not enflamed by outer components, be settled. Iraq has no conventional case on Khuzistan, while Iran acknowledges the power of the Gulf states in which Iranian minorities live.

These people group just become a significant, worldwide, issue, when states for different reasons decided to make them so. Taking everything into account, there are contrasts of assessment, and premium, however, as during the 1970s, these compare not to any Iranian-Arab division, but rather to the division that underlay the Iraqi assault on Kuwait in 1990, specifically that between oil-creating states with bigger and little populaces, and between states which are questioning a confined world market. It is business and segment factors, not religion or history, that clarify this issue, which can likewise be settled by multilateral exchange: for this, OPEC stays the conspicuous gathering. The issue of the weapons contest is, similarly, one that ought to, under appropriate political conditions, be available to the goal: for all that arms races are viewed as having a self-governance of their own, past political reasoning or control, that in the Gulf is brought into the world of the clear political doubts of the three significant conditions of one another and of the feeling that each might be enticed, for reasons of political estimation, to participate in additional tactical experiences later on. The equivalent applies, even more so, to the two last issues referenced above, non-obstruction and international strategy coordination: the previous is an unadulterated capacity of political will, of estimation by systems of where their state and public premium lies; the last is something which could without much of a stretch be settled, through a mix of endured variety, as on the Arab-Israeli inquiry, and expansive counsel.

It isn't simply the issues that represent the best issues, but instead the weakness of the three significant systems versus their own people groups and their feelings of dread concerning what others will try to misuse. In such conditions relations among Iran and the Arabs, and the belief systems of competition and doubt which Gulf states create, mirror the political person of these states themselves. What we find during the 1990s is the thing that has been the example since the impact of Arab patriotism with Iranian state intrigues originally arose in 1958: the disturbances in both Arab states and in Iran have delivered a circumstance in which the governmental issues of all nations are currently interconnected however this interconnection has been joined by the intercession of states whose belief systems stress the distinctions, and build up the mental holes, among Iranians and Arabs. The ascent of the advanced state, and of types of extremist patriotism and progressive philosophy related with it, has, in this way, as well as partitioning Iraq from the Arab governments of the Gulf, served to drive a more profound wedge than any time in recent memory between the Arab world and Iran closes.

Shatt al-Arab:

The control of the stream and its anything but a line has been a wellspring of conflict between the archetypes of the Iranian and Iraqi states since the Peace Treaty of 1639, marked by the Ottoman and Persian realms. Ambiguities in the understanding and challenges, for example, the foundation of a line ailing exhaustively prompted debates that have not been settled up to nowadays. While this plan demonstrated adequate in numerous spaces, it was not the situation in the Shatt al-Arab region, prompting the flare-up of threats effectively in the nineteenth century. Consequently, the political action that formed the course of the Iran-Iraq limit came about in the mark of different settlements characterizing or changing it. Subsequently, arrangements between the British, Russians, Ottomans, and Persians arranged the mark of a subsequent accord: the 1847 Treaty of Erzeroum and its 1848 Illustrative Note. This settlement likewise didn't prevail with regards to settling the issue as it needed explaining the course of the line in the Shatt al-Arab district, and in setting up the ownership of the eastern bank of the river. For this explanation, this settlement additionally ends up being inadequate and prompted the mark of the 1913 Constantinople Protocol, which set up an intervening commission to check the limit. In the mid-1930s, "allegations and counter-allegations of boundary infringement were made, and the two sides contended the limit issue in an uncertain hearing before the League of Nations in 1934-35".

Nevertheless, it was uniquely in the fallout of World War I, and with Incredible Britain's association in the turn of events and organization of the boundary, that the debate was first positioned in an Iran-Iraq context. That brought about the Saadabad Pact Regional Security Agreement between Turkey, Iran, Iraq, and Afghanistan, endorsed in Tehran in July 1937, in which a commission to decide the guest was set up. "Most importantly, the agreement was an indication of kindness among the signatories and looked to forestall expanded Soviet extension in the Middle East". It was distinctly with the Iraqi transformation of 1958 that Great England's personal and persistent contribution in line outlines ended.³⁸ "In spite of the expanded unfamiliar presence in Iran and Iraq, pressures stayed intense between the two nations over the Shatt al-Arab limit issue".

The overall influence essentially moved in support of Iran after a Kurdish uprising in Iraq in 1974, which was helped by the Iranian government who looked to change the water outskirts. Accordingly, the Shah of Iran and the Baathist legislature of Iraq arranged and marked the Algiers Agreement In March 1975, which set up the line along with the thalweg principle, making a barrier to Iraqi extension. The main effects of the understanding were the moving of the waterway limit and of route rights. The remaining divergences over that matter "end up being a significant hindrance in the United Nations-supported harmony talks between the two states". At long last, in 1979, Saddam Hussein requested an update to the Algiers Agreement, explicitly alluding to the boundary delimitation along the Shatt al-Arab waterway, which Iran denied. This

drove Hussein to at last impugn the 1975 Agreement and announce Iraq's power over the entire of the Shatt al-Arab, which set the ground for line conflicts among Iranian and Iraqi soldiers in 1980.

How the conflict came to be:

Despite the apprehensiveness with the progressions in the Middle East governmental issues brought about by the 1979 Islamic Revolution in Iran, the relations between Iran and Iraq didn't break down right away. Since the Algiers Pact, their issues had been generally quiet. In an endeavor to keep up with it thusly, the Iraqi President Bark made an impression on the as of late setup administration of Tehran passing on his all the best for the agreeable individuals of Iran. In addition, in August 1979, Iraqi specialists welcomed Mehdi Bazargan to visit Iraq with the point of working on the relations between the nations. Nonetheless, with the fall of the directed Bazargan administration in Iran and the ascent of Saddam Hussein in Iraq, the relations between the two nations began to fall apart quickly. The acceleration of threats that prompted the current struggle began as ahead of schedule as on September 4th, with equipped conflicts along the border. A couple of days after the fact Saddam annulled the 1975 arrangement, what's more, pronounced the Shatt al-Arab under Iraq's influence, advancing the threats. However, the battle tasks formally began uniquely on 22 September, when Iraq attacked the Iranian domain through three better places along the 733-mile line amid the two nations, in an endeavor to immobilize any Iranian protection.

While supporting the assaults Saddam Hussein illustrated his points as (1) the acknowledgment of Iraq's veritable and sovereign rights over Shatt al-Arab land and waters; (2) the Iranian

forgo meddling in any Iraq's inside issues; (3) Iran's adherence to the standards of great neighborliness; (4) the Iranian revoke of the involved islands in the Gulf – to be specific Abu Moussa, Big Tumb, and Little Tumb – in the advantage of the United Arab Emirates. As the fights went on, however, the expressed purposes for the assault marginally changed: the prevention of Iranian expansionism – perhaps trading the Islamic Revolution to different nations in the Center East – showed up as a fundamental undertaking for Hussein's system. Willing to achieve its objectives hurriedly, Iraq utilized 7 of its 12 divisions on the assault. From the start, very little obstruction was put by the Iranians. Its first genuine resistance happened at the point when Iraqi soldiers attempted to take Khoramshahr, the city set opposition with various Padasranwhat's more, customary armed force troops. In the fights between time, Saddam Hussein complied with the primary United Countries' proposition of ceasefire. Khomeini, in any case, would not consent to it, as Saddam requested its soldiers into Khoramshahr.

On 24 October 1980 Iraqi soldiers prevailed with regards to taking Khoramshahr. Around then, Saddam had effectively accomplished its principle key goals and appeared to sit tight for the breakdown of the Iranian system and for a settlement that ensured its cases over the Shatt al-Arab. Also, as the two sides had an incredible number of losses and as the colder time of year season had shown up, the outfitted tasks were stopped for a brief time. Assaults and counterattacks proceeded consistently. The utilization of youngsters (a few being under 12 years of age) in the Iranian human waves assaults denoted the course of conflicts. The contribution of paramilitary powers –, for example, the Iranian Padasran and Basij – is likewise a quality of the current conflict.

Throughout the spring of 1982, Iran figured out how to switch the results of the conflict by conquering the blockage of Abadan and recovering Khoramshahr. To protect its armed force powers from additional setbacks, Iraq pulled out to the boundary in 1982. This denoted the end of what can be distinguished as the primary period of the conflict. However, even before the Iraqi withdrawal, Saddam proposed the exchange of a serene settlement, which was denied by Khomeini, who around then needed to assume responsibility for southern Iraq from the Ba'thist. The two sides have recorded objections of assaults against the non-military personnel populace since 1983.

On 3 November 1983, notwithstanding, interestingly the public authority of Iran addressed a letter to the UN Secretary-General mentioning an examination over the utilization of synthetic weapons in the contention by Iraq. The examinations affirmed such accusations. Longer than a year prior, in February 1985 more than 1,000,000 setbacks had effectively been reported. Beyond the extraordinary human misfortunes, the financial destruction, brought about by the constant conflicts, is likewise a reason for concern and is by all accounts hard to outperform. The damage for the foundation and the benefit misfortunes with oil incomes appear to rise above the actual contention and are probably going to have a tremendous effect on the two nations for the following many years.

Countries Involved:

United States of America:

The United States of America calls upon the Iranian government to right away stop threats, taking into account that Iran is liable for frustrating the endeavors of the global-local area to arrive settled. The US direly suggests the finish of the military activities by the two nations and the achievement of a reasonable and serene goal immediately. For this accomplishment, the nation thinks about the standards of worldwide law, in what respects the tranquil settlement of questions, restricting to the seizing of domains forcibly. Regardless, it underscores the commitments taken by the belligerents under the Charter of United Nations, as a way to constrain Iran and Iraq to arrive at an arrangement. The United States of America focuses on its stresses over the danger that the contention presents to an area that is of indispensable significance to the monetary wellbeing of the world. Along these lines, the expansion of the conflict to unbiased neighbors is an extraordinary worry that would threaten American interests. Besides, the United States claims for the opportunity of the route to and from the Persian Gulf, as a basic issue for the worldwide local area. The USA unequivocally goes against the work of substance weapons and requires a quick finish of its utilization.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics tends to the Iran-Iraq war not just as a local issue, in other words, as a contention that happens in a space that is near its boundaries, however as a genuine danger to worldwide harmony and security. The Soviet Union accepts that the questions between the two nations should be settled through strategic methods, in this manner shielding a prompt truce and proclaiming that the lone keen on the conflict are those who wish to see Iran and Iraq debilitated and the locale precarious. The USSR goes against the utilization of the contention as a pardon for unfamiliar intercession in the nations' interior issues, particularly in what respects the organization of provincial normal assets. In addition, the USSR affirms that the presence of military nearby, like the posting of third nations' war makes in the Gulf, is another component that adds to the disturbance of the danger of a heightening conflict that could arrive at global extents.

United Kingdom:

The United Kingdom advocates a prompt truce, trailed by the withdrawal of all soldiers from the involved domains, under oversight and checking of UN faculty approved by the Security Council, coordinated and administrated by the Secretary-General. The utilization of compound weapons in the contention is firmly denounced by the UK, summoning the Geneva Protocol of 1925. The nation additionally denounces and calls consideration upon assaults against unbiased transportation from third states who are not engaged with the threats, shielding the worldwide law guideline of free route rights.

French Republic:

The French Republic is stressed over the danger of a potential acceleration and augmenting of the contention. Thusly, the nation accepts that a pressing finish of threats ought to be attempted and a reasonable understanding should be empowered, regarding the sway of the two nations. In this sense, the previous wilderness among Iran and Iraq, followed by the Algiers accord ought to be regarded. Moreover, France considers that all through this interaction the goals taken by the Security Council should be regarded, especially in what respects the regard of basic freedoms.

People's Republic of China:

The People's Republic of China is worried about the security in the district of the Bay. It puts stock in the limit that the Security Council needs to arrive at a sensible accord for Iran and Iraq and calls for more prominent endeavors in such a manner. The nation upholds the recommendations around the accomplishment of such understanding as per global law standards. China thinks that no crucial irreconcilable situation exists between underdeveloped nations furthermore, consequently, contrasts between them ought to be settled through conferences or exchanges. In addition, it shows its distraction with the utilization of compound weapons in the war.

Timeline:

The timeline given below consists of events that will not have happened yet when the Security Council comes together at BHMUN'21. Delegates are expected to know that when their sessions start, the only update that they will receive will be that Iraq just started the invasion of Kuwait. Nevertheless, we have decided to give you an extensive timeline of what has happened in history for you to have ideas as to what you can add to your resolution.

August 2, 1990

Iraq invades and annexes Kuwait. The UN Security Council passes Resolution 660, condemning the invasion and demanding the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi forces.

August 5, 1990

U.S. President George H.W. Bush gives a speech in which he declares “this will not stand, this aggression against Kuwait.”

August 1990

Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney and General Norman Schwarzkopf, the commander of U.S. forces in the Middle East, initiate planning for operations to defend Saudi Arabia from a possible assault by Iraq. Troops and equipment for U.S. air and ground forces begin to arrive in Saudi Arabia.

October 1990

U.S. military planners begin to plan an offensive to expel Iraqi forces from Kuwait.

November 29, 1990

The UN Security Council issues Resolution 678, calling for the use of “all necessary means” to force Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait if it has not done so by January 15, 1991.