

# **GECMUN 8**

## **Background Guide**

### Historical Security Council

Responding to the Alleged Presence of Weapons of Mass  
Destruction in Iraq

SDG: 16. Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions

Authored by Sang Yoon (Fred) Lee, and Jeslyn Park

Last updated on October 22, 2021

# Letter from the Chairs

Greetings honourable delegates,

We are Sang Yoon (Fred) Lee, and Jeslyn Park both from North London Collegiate School Jeju. It is our greatest pleasure to be serving you as the chairs of the Historical United Nations Security Council in GECMUN VIII.

In the Historical Security Council, you will be discussing the agenda regarding the alleged presence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq. Throughout the conference, we, the chairs, will try our best to help you engage in a fruitful discussion with fellow delegates and devise resolutions entertaining the matter at hand. In order to yield effective and practical solutions, we thoroughly advise all delegates to have acquired sufficient background knowledge on the topic.

When researching for the conference, make efficient use of various online and offline resources—such as the CIA World Factbook, government statistics, newspaper articles, research papers, and most importantly this chair report. If you have any further inquiries about the procedure or topic, please don't hesitate to contact us at any time. We wholeheartedly look forward to meeting you at the conference!

Kind Regards,

Sang Yoon (Fred) Lee ([syoonlee22@pupils.nlcsjeju.kr](mailto:syoonlee22@pupils.nlcsjeju.kr))

Jeslyn Park ([seopark23@pupils.nlcsjeju.kr](mailto:seopark23@pupils.nlcsjeju.kr))

# Committee Introduction

*The United Nations Security Council,*

Since its first meeting in the historical site of Westminster, London, the United Nations Security Council has been at the crux of past collective efforts conducted by the United Nations in maintaining sustainable global security and peace. The Council has been the leading organ of the United Nations in preventing or resolving any and all threats to peace or acts of aggression via implementing means such as embargoes, humanitarian interventions, and diplomatic condemnations. Notwithstanding such efforts, international disputes remain existent, causing countless numbers of lives at stake as well as infringing upon the sovereignty of other nations. Ergo, delegates of the Council are expected to contribute to the collective effort to peace, i.e., to provide insight into resolving ongoing disputes across the globe.

## Agenda Introduction

*Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction,*

The alleged presence of Weapons of Mass Destruction with the intent for use by the Iraqi government has been a significant threat to the international community given the serious degree of harm such weapons can inflict upon society surpassing borders. That is to say that the usage and the development of Weapons of Mass Destruction by the Iraqi government is not a new topic: Iraq actively researched and employed Weapons of Mass Destruction from 1961 and has a history of alleged execution of armed strikes accompanied by the usage of Weapons of Mass Destruction during the 1980s by the then-President of Iraq, Saddam Hussein. Rather, the status quo is an accumulation of past actions executed by the Iraqi government and the failure of previous attempts to halt the development of such arms. Despite constant efforts made by nations ranging from international condemnation to direct military intervention where nations such as the United States and the United Kingdom located and destroyed large quantities of Iraqi chemical weapons ceasing the nation's development programmes, it has been recently claimed that Iraq still possesses significant reserves of Weapons of Mass Destruction. However, to verify these arguments is a challenge due to the lack of cooperation by the Iraqi government with the international community. Ergo, this Council aims to resolve this crisis via further investigating the presence of Weapons of Mass Destruction and suggest possible solutions to reach an international consensus on this agenda.

# Key Terms

## **International Atomic Energy Agency**

International organisation founded in 1957 that seeks to promote the peaceful utilisation of nuclear energy and prohibit the use of nuclear power for any and all military purposes. It serves as a forum for both scientific, technical and security operations regarding the use of nuclear technology by encouraging the development of peaceful applications of nuclear energy and providing safeguarding mechanisms against possible threats that may arise from the abuse of nuclear power.

## **Weapons of Mass Destruction**

Any weapon that can kill and inflict considerable damage to numerous individuals or artificial constructs. Originally coined in reference to aerial bombardment and chemical weapons, the realms of WMDs have expanded to chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons capable of triggering large-scale damage.

## **Al-Qaeda**

Militant Sunni Islamist Terrorist organisation founded in 1988 by Osama bin Laden and other military personnel and Islamist fundamentalists during the Soviet-Afghan War

## **United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441**

United Nations Security Council Resolution adopted unanimously by the United Nations Security Council on 8 November 2002 offering Iraq the final opportunity to comply with its disarmament obligations previously set out by past United Nations Security Council Resolutions. It stated that Iraq violated the ceasefire agreement as well as possessing WMD and other prohibited types of armaments.

## **Geneva Convention**

A collection of international agreements that establish internationally-approved legal standards for humanitarian treatment during warfare. It is responsible for laying out the basis for the fundamental rights of prisoners of warfare, protections required for wartime casualties, treatment towards civilians and non-combatants.

# Historical Background

The upcoming United Nations Security Council meeting is not an event derived solely out of the blue. Anti-Iraqi sentiments have been accumulating long before this year and the threat of Iraqi armaments on the international community has always been an issue. Ever since Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, strong international opposition to the Saddam Hussein regime has been present, evident from the Gulf War which took place in 1991 by a military coalition led by the United States for the purpose of eradicating Iraq from Kuwait. Following the Gulf War, the western world had been implementing economic sanctions, no-fly zones and UNSCOM inspections to protect the Kurds and the Shias as well as preventing the Iraqi government from developing weapons of mass destruction. 16 other Security Council resolutions were passed to enforce the complete elimination of Iraqi WMDs. However, the Iraqi government refused to cooperate with the inspectors in 1998 causing the U.S. government to officially enact the Iraq Liberation Act supporting the removal of the Iraqi government.

Following the election of George W. Bush in 2000, the U.S. took a more aggressive stance against Iraq calling for the full removal of Saddam Hussein. This was bolstered by the 9/11 attacks drastically shifting the public sentiment for the invasion. Calling Iraq the Axis of Evil, President Bush formally addressed the case for an invasion of Iraq during the September 2002 address to the United Nations Security Council. After discussion, the United Nations Security Council Resolution 1441 authorised the resumption of weapon inspections and non-compliance principles for Iraq. Key U.S. allies in NATO such as the United Kingdom approved such acts, despite the weak certainty regarding the actual presence of Weapons of Mass Destruction within the nation of Iraq. Nevertheless, Resolution 1441 set up guidelines for Iraqi inspection by the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

## Current State of Affairs

14th of March 2003, just after the UN Weapons Inspector Dr. Hans Blix and International Atomic Energy Agency Director is when this UN Security Council session begins. Prior to their presentation on the 5th of February, US Secretary of State Colin Powell gave his presentation, attempting to justify an invasion into Iraq. Secretary of State Powell has recently argued that Iraq was sponsoring terrorism and presented several satellite images showing weapons of mass destruction present in Iraq. The most recent presentation given by Dr. Hans Blix and Directors of Atomic Energy Agency was in the form of a refutation to Secretary of State Powell's claims. There isn't much evidence presented publicly about the presence of Nuclear weapons in Iraq. Therefore countries may have to garner further evidence possibly collected from their intelligence agencies (collected before 14th of March 2003) in order to make a more informed decision.

An weapons inspection team is currently deployed in Iraq, trying to validate US' claims. Several reports have been presented to the UN Security Council already; the presentation by Dr. Hans Blix is one of them. Although the inspection team doesn't believe that enough evidence is available to justify the claim that there are nuclear bombs and chemical weapons in Iraq, the investigation team is continuing its mission to bring a fuller picture of the current circumstances in Iraq.

No countries have particularly publicly announced their stance on this agenda except France, Germany, and the United States. France and Germany have previously announced their anti-war stance, but there is still enough room for both countries to retract their statements if any rapid changes to the situation were to occur. The US has shown its firm willingness to invade Iraq. Rumors and intelligence has been circulating amongst the Security Council members that the US has already made a war plan to invade Iraq.

The Security Council members must decide upon a course of action to deal with Iraq.

# Stances of Parties

## United States of America

The United States of America has a vested interest in invading Iraq for various reasons. The primary reason is to find the weapons of mass destruction allegedly present in Iraq. Several Iraqi intelligence sources have informed the United States government of the possible threat posed by Saddam Hussein.

However, the USA is also pressured by other groups—oil companies and weapons manufactures as an example. Following the 9.11 terror attack, the US has declared a war on terror, and the blame has to be channeled somewhere: Iraq. The US is the most ardent supporter of the War.

## United Kingdom

A close ally of the USA, the United Kingdom has recently sought stronger ties with the US. Although the evidence for the development of prohibited weapons in Iraq may not be so strong, there is sufficient evidence to at least modestly justify an invasion. If the UK joins the US in its war, the UK expects that it can earn a great favour from the US. The UK is most likely to support the US justifying its war.

## France

While the US as an ally is important, France also trades oil with Iraq. Although some evidence was presented by the US to support a war against Iraq, the evidence is extremely weak and mostly unfounded. France must consider the stakes of supporting or not supporting the US in its war. Yet, with the current turn of events, France is more drawn towards not joining the US in its war.

## Russia

While the Cold War ended more than a decade ago, Russia still retains its status as one of the major powers in the world. Although it is still doing its best to stay out of a direct confrontation with the US, it is still in an unspoken competition with the US. It is unsure for the US if Iraq actually possesses the alleged chemical weapons. All options are available for Russia, but it considers a full on military invasion a last resort after all diplomatic options have been exhausted. Russia also believes that no single state alone should wage war against Iraq. Rather, it hopes that a resolution to this crisis is brought forward through the UN and the Security Council.

## China

China is a newly rising power, functioning as the world's factory. Whilst China, like Russia, wants to stay away from a direct conflict with the US, China is also very cautious about a military invasion into Iraq. The concern comes from the fact that if the US

invaded Iraq, it may use it as a springboard for other invasions in the middle east and ultimately an US control over the middle east.

### **Germany**

Germany has been expanding its regional influence in Europe while it is doing its best to redevelop the eastern part of its country after the reunification of West and East Germany in 1990. Germany is most likely not going to support such a military invasion, opting for more peaceful methods.

### **Syria**

Although Syria has had historically worsening relations with Iraq, Syria is very opposed to the proposed Western intervention in Iraq. Syria sees such a full-scale invasion as a threat to not only Iraq but the entirety of the middle east and its sovereignty.

### **Mexico**

As a close neighbour of the US, Mexico doesn't want to provoke Washington D.C.. While Mexico is somewhat reluctant in joining the US in its war, if there is something Mexico can benefit from such participation, it might be inclined to support the US. However, the overwhelming domestic opposition to the invasion of Iraq may be a challenge for the Mexican government to support the US initiative fully. An approval from the UN security council may be helpful for the Mexican government to justify participation in the war.

### **Spain**

As a regional European power, Spain has been attempting to gain more influence within Europe. With other stronger European powers like the UK, France, and Germany, Spain has been seeking closer ties with the US. Spain is likely to support the US in its war against Iraq.

# Possible Solutions

## **Collective Military Invasion**

Although the presence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq isn't a guarantee, the uncertainty is still a risk. The global community can not gamble with such a massive risk. The UN Security Council may decide to fully back the US initiative to invade Iraq and disarm the nation.

The US may be inclined to carry forward with an invasion with its allies even if the Security Council disapproves of an invasion. In this case, it may be better for the global community to closely monitor the invasion by joining in the war. Collective military action will better ensure that the voice of the global community is reflected in disarming Syria.

## **Diplomatic Negotiations**

A full-scale invasion must always be the last option. It is still possible to bring Iraq to the negotiating table, and a collective demand from the UN Security Council may put enough pressure on the Iraqi government to reveal their weapons arsenal and allow inspections. The Security Council may decide to impose economic sanctions to further pressure Iraq to open up its borders for a rigorous investigation. A military option can always come later if diplomatic negotiation fails.

## **Disapproving the Invasion**

Because the US seems so inclined in invading Iraq, if the Security Council was to disapprove of the invasion, the US may lose some of the justification to invade Iraq. This may pressure the US to withdraw its plans on invading Iraq and to bring back the US to the negotiating table in the Security Council.

## **Condemning and Sanctioning the United States**

The aggressive attitude exhibited by the US resembles more of a colonial empire than a leader of the free world. The US is clearly attempting to get a foothold in the middle east to expand its influence. Condemning the United States may be a stronger option against US aggression, which may pressure the US to back down.

Another option could be pushing for a resolution that would sanction the US and its allies once they decide to invade Iraq. Although such a resolution is unlikely to pass in the UN Security Council where the US holds veto power, the mere act of pursuing such sanctions may be a stronger show of disapproval. It will also make the US be perceived as a rogue state by the global community.

# Questions to Consider

## **Verifying the existence of Weapons of Mass Destruction**

One major source of dispute amongst security council members is the presence of nuclear weapons in Iraq. Proving or disproving the existence of weapons of mass destruction may be critical in supporting one resolution over the other.

### **Time Availability**

The availability of time may also be a critical factor to account for when considering adopting a resolution. Given that there is enough time, the Security Council may be able to support a softer solution, deciding to continue with the current investigation process. Time will tell if there is a threat in Iraq or not. However, if there is the slimmest possibility that a nuclear and/or chemical weapon is already deployed or that they are nearing completion in its development, acting quickly may be more helpful in defusing the threat.

### **Practicality of Different Options**

The Iraqi government hasn't been particularly cooperative. It is unclear how Iraq will react to further investigations or economic sanctions. Perhaps the Iraqi forces may retaliate to sanctions imposed by the Security Council, giving further justification for the US to invade Iraq. The practicalities and the responses to such solutions from the Iraqi government must be assessed before adopting any resolutions.

### **Backlash in Iraq (Aftermath of an Invasion)**

Invading Iraq may be a quick and effective option in defusing any possible threat. Yet, Security Council members must consider the later implications of such invasion. After the dictatorial government falls in Iraq, who will occupy Iraq, how will Iraq be occupied, and when will Iraq be occupied? Or, would Iraq be occupied at all? There are many questions regarding the fate of Iraq to consider before invading the country.

## **Bibliography**

Al Jazeera (2004). The UN's decline: Timeline. [online] [www.aljazeera.com](http://www.aljazeera.com). Available at: <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2004/3/16/the-uns-decline-timeline> [Accessed 18 Jul. 2021].

- Breslow, J.M. (2016). Colin Powell: U.N. Speech “Was a Great Intelligence Failure.” [online] FRONTLINE. Available at:  
<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/colin-powell-u-n-speech-was-a-great-intelligence-failure/>.
- Butt, A.I. (2019). Why did Bush go to war in Iraq? [online] www.aljazeera.com. Available at:  
<https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2019/3/20/why-did-bush-go-to-war-in-iraq>.
- Council on Foreign Relations (2021). The Iraq War. [online] Council on Foreign Relations. Available at:  
<https://www.cfr.org/timeline/iraq-war#:~:text=In%20March%202003%2C%20U.S.%20forces>.
- Every CRS Report (2003). Iraq War: Background and Issues Overview. [online] Everycrsreport.com. Available at:  
<https://www.everycrsreport.com/reports/RL31715.html>.
- Jackson, R. (2018). war on terrorism | Summary & Facts. In: Encyclopædia Britannica. [online] Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/war-on-terrorism>.
- Kafala, T. (2003). The veto and how to use it. news.bbc.co.uk. [online] 17 Sep. Available at:  
[http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle\\_east/2828985.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/2828985.stm).
- Majid Khadduri and Kennedy, H. (2018). Iraq | History, Map, Population, & Facts. In: Encyclopædia Britannica. [online] Available at:  
<https://www.britannica.com/place/Iraq>.
- The Editors of Encyclopedia Britannica (2018). Iraq War | Summary, Causes, Combatants, & Facts. In: Encyclopædia Britannica. [online] Available at:  
<https://www.britannica.com/event/Iraq-War>.
- United Nations (2003). SECURITY COUNCIL CONCLUDES TWO-DAY DEBATE ON MILITARY ACTION IN IRAQ; NEED FOR IMMEDIATE HUMANITARIAN AID, PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS STRESSED | Meetings Coverage and Press Releases. [online] www.un.org. Available at:  
<https://www.un.org/press/en/2003/sc7707.doc.htm>.
- United Nations (2019). SECURITY COUNCIL HOLDS FIRST DEBATE ON IRAQ SINCE START OF MILITARY ACTION; SPEAKERS CALL FOR HALT TO AGGRESSION, IMMEDIATE WITHDRAWAL | Meetings Coverage and Press Releases. [online] Un.org. Available at: <https://www.un.org/press/en/2003/sc7705.doc.htm>.
- US Department of State (2019). The Global War on Terrorism: The First 100 Days. [online] State.gov. Available at: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/s/ct/rls/wh/6947.htm>.