# Iraq-Iran War

The attack of Iran by Iraq marked the beginning of the Iraq-Iran war. This attack introduced concurrent attacks through land and space into the Kingdom of Iran on 22nd September 1980. Consequently, there was a history of long boundary disagreements as well as Shia revolution’s qualms among the Shia majority group which had been repressed for a long time in Iraq.

The Iran-Iraq War lasted for almost eight years. This was among the most exorbitant battles that were fought in that century. More than one million people were killed during the war and another million people injured in both Iran and Iraq. The devotion of the Western public was stimulated by the eruption of this war. Additionally, there was a presumption that this war would endanger oil drift and that there would be a recurrent of the oil blow of 1973.

This war had countless subsists cost. It also impaired the Iranian and Iraqi military in terms of their financial strengths. Additionally, many civilians died while others were injured. To worsen the situation, this war did not modify the boundaries. A cessation of the war was bargained by the United Nations within the United Nations Security Council Resolution 598’s system which brought the conflict to an end. Both the Iran and Iraq boundary sides accredited this form. Nevertheless, Iran took several weeks before relinquishing the Iraqi land and accepting the pre-war boundaries that existed between these countries (Farber 58).

### ****Iranian Revolution****

The revolution of 1979 was a separatist move combined with a response of the Shi’a Islamist group that was opposed to the Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi’s regime. Despite being irreligious, Shah was a pro-western potentate. Following this revolution, different groups emerged including the National Front which was an irreligious separatist group and the Communist Tudeh Party. These groups comprised of the metropolitan Iranians and the Khomeini line’s Islamists. Khomeini operated basically from the countryside.

Temporarily, Saddam Hussein, the ground breaker in Iraq chose to take advantage of what was considered as the rising malady during the Iranian revolution as well as the disapproval that the revolution got from the Western administrations. At some point, the Iranian force was strong but the rebellion split it. Shah was exiled and Saddam was determined to become the robust, newfangled man in the Middle East. Nevertheless, he was also determined to acquire the land obtained from Iran by Iraq earlier in order to enlarge the admittance of Iraq to Persian Gulf (Abrams 344).

Although the military of Saddam Hussein had several improvements, the Iraq military was pushed back to Iraq by the Iranian military by 1982. Following this push, the Khomeini did not agree to the truce suggested by Iraq. This necessitated hefty compensation expenditures and the end of the reign of Saddam. Additionally, Saddam was tried for human delinquencies. The aim of Khomeini was also to disseminate Islamic rebellion to the west in Iraq especially the Shi’a Arabs within the country.

Most Iranian militia and noncombatants were killed when nuclear weaponry were used by Iraq during combat.  Momentarily, Iraq got support from Egypt, Arab democracies in the Persian Gulf, the Warsaw Pact states, the USSR, USA, Germany, the People’s Republic of China, Brazil, the United Kingdom, and the French government. These countries offered chemical weapons negotiators, intelligence and military assistance to the administration of Saddam Hussein.

There were more than 100,000 Iranian fatalities due to the nuclear weaponry that were used by Iraq during the 8 years of the war. This placed Iran in the second position in the list of the most distressed states by annihilation artilleries with Japan topping the list. Almost all international intervention established that the aim of Hussein while using chemical weapons was to blunt the invasion of social wave by Iran while persistently claiming that Iraq did not use chemical weapons during this war (Farber 64).

### ****Iran Hostage Crisis****

The overseas associations showed more participation in the determination of a new state. Contrary to what was initially driving the shah, the drive this time was the participation of the United States in Iran. The interim administration publicized that American welfare within the Persian Gulf would not be attended by Iran. It also publicized that Iran would suspend the martial treaties that it had entered with the US. However, majority of the regime domains and Khomeini feared that the US would be tempted to intervene at some point just like it did in 1953 bringing back shah into power.

In September 1980, while Iraq was facing a criminal disaster, the state made a surprise attack on Iran. Nevertheless, Iraq opted to avert provocation of Iraqi’s Shias by the Iranian republic so that they can repel against an irreligious government of Iraqi. The Khorramshahr and Abadan metropolis as well as other towns and several villages were almost demolished. Oil making as well as export amenities also sustained continued and heavy impairment. Nevertheless, this war created a sense of harmony throughout the country and this helped the new administration in combining power to develop small businesses that manufactured war merchandises.

Better grounds that gave Saddam an excuse for inaugurating the war were established by the Shatt al-Arab agreement. The Persians and Arabs who lived in Persia in different places outside Arabia were ancient contenders for many years. Iraq and Iran had several border conflicts during the Turkish and British reigns. In particular, these states conflicted over Shatt al-Arab’s control which was the major waterway that linked the Abadan and Khorramshahr harbors of Iran to the Persian Gulf. This waterway also liked the Basra harbor in Iraq with the Persian Gulf. The frontrunners of Iraq seized an excellent chance to attack Iran. September was supposedly the best time to make a good infantry mugging (Raǧā’ī 17).

### ****Nationalism Succeeded****

The Iran and Iraq conflict is founded on intensely and momentous engrained apprehensions of regional borders and interior security issues. Matters that relate to philosophy as well as determinations of countries that uphold its audacity, advance and rule over the regional and internal governments are among the recent antiques to this conflict. Anxiety is increasing over interior security due to the mix in these republics. Arab is the mainstream ethnic group in Iraq. However, there are marginal groups such as the Kurds which are significantly large. There are also other cultural groups although these are relatively small (Abrams 344).

Iran has a multifaceted cultural structure. This comprises of the Persian, the Baluchis, the Turkmens and Kurds. It also has Turkic clusters. Apart from these ethnic associations, there are also national ambitions and philosophical variances. Sunni is mostly the marginal group in Iran. Apprehensions of boundary safety issues are caused by a record of invasions and counter-incursions during the pre-historic times in Persia and Mesopotamia zones.

Philosophy apprehensions involve nationalism issues as well as their interpretation in terms of the regional prerogative given to them by each of the sides and their management as depicted in their history. As such, supremacies can raise lawful claims or even take a dogmatic trend. These entitlements have always promoted the increasing wave of nationalism. However, there are other nationalism methods that have surpassed nationalism threshold with Kurdish nationalism being the most predominant (Gieling 98).

During the era that preceded the resentment between Iran and Iraq republics in 1980, philosophy appeared as conflicting religiosity. To most people, this notion is outdated and patriotism is the most contemporary perception though Western-focused. The aim of these philosophical alignments was to establish a basis of amalgamation for the inhabitants of various welfare. According to the advocates of these philosophies, both had a joint snootiness as well as troubles that were faced by individuals who devoted themselves to both philosophies.

Going by traditionalist intellect, philosophical conflict depicted a modernism versus a custom system. In genuineness however, it was perceived as a practice of the Persian perspective versus the Arab perspective. There were similar intimidation of social and dogmatic constancy experienced in both nations. Rapid acquisition of wealth occasioned terrorizations due to the unprecedented revenue increment from the oil trade in the 1970s (Arjomand 23).

There were also personal determinations among the leaders due to the apprehension of alliance issues in dogmatic authority within their countries. They also envisioned the power that would ensure their supremacy over the surrounding countries or even enable them to reject foreigners’ policies. Another individual approach is the dangers’ computation problem that would be taken while choosing the rule options as well as the advances of the front-runners.

### ****The Tanker Wars****

The Tanker War refers to the period of anti-shipment movements during the war between Iran and Iraq (1980-1988). Iraq invaded Iran’s shipment vessels in 1981 to deteriorate its ability to fight. This made Iran extremely weak. The ships were initially ferrying military goods to the war fronts as well as exporting Iran merchandises. Following the invasion, Iran hit the confronting ships of Iraq that were trading cohorts. Iraq used the ships to trade with republics that supported it in the war (Habeeb, William, Frankel, and Mina Al-Oraibi 113).

In 1984, Iraq advanced by raising the struggle and this marked the second part of the progression of their Tanker War. The Super-Entendard war airplane from France with its Exocet artillery boosted the Iraqis. Iranians were forced to implement imaginative strategies because they lacked adequate operative anti-ship missiles from 1984 to 1986. Iran for instance used air-to-surface armaments that are used to attack automobiles in a secured land. They also used AS 12s and Mavericks. These were not as effective as the ones used by Iraq.

There was a probability of the oil markets to be familiar with the Hormuz Strait. Initially, the contribution of this Tanker War was 25% of regression in the profitable shipping as well as a stable rise in the crude oil price in the global markets. However, oil consignments were not expressively interrupted by the tanker war.  In fact, Iran dropped the oil costs as a way of counter-balancing insurance premiums for the consignments. The prevalent oil prices internationally declined progressively in the 1980s. The vessels that were sailing through Persian Gulf were not affected by the Tanker War. As such, the desire for Iran to induce a barricade for the Hormuz Strait was minimal (Klüsener 45).

### ****Saddam Use Of Chemical Weapons Against International Law****

In the 1980s, Saddam Hussein was dedicated to the use of nuclear weaponry enormously. His dedication was against the Iraq Kurds and the Iranian military that Iraq was fighting with. After several years, the US was probably complicit to accept any engagement with Saddam. This tale though unfriendly had new significance considering the essence of ensuring that such weaponries are not used worldwide.

The criminal tyrant in Iraq, Saddam Hussein started a fight with Iran in 1980. This is the time when the U.S was under the presidency of Jimmy Carter. Jimmy Carter liked Iran. At this time, the Embassy of the United States was grabbed and the workers were held captive. Nevertheless, Carter maintained that the US would not involve itself in the Iran-Iraq conflict. Consequently, the trade between Iraq and the United States ended.

The global version today is that worldwide prohibition of the use of chemical artillery started in the 1990s. Gieling (64) notes that this was because the US accepted and probably expedited the use of these weapons by Saddam against the Kurds and Iran.

Contrary to this, Barrack Obama continuously states that the worldwide prohibition of the use of these weaponries started with the 1920s’ Geneva Protocols. His attempt is to make the entire world understand that this prohibition is dynamic to ensure that lawbreakers have to be chastised regardless of the unilateral action taken by the United States without engaging in consultations with the UN. Hence, the action of the United States to counter Saddam Hussein during the conflict of the 1980s is challengeable.

The entire world might lack trust. It is understandable that the United States’ deduction on nuclear weapons’ prohibition might not be accepted by some leaders. This happens in some conditions when different countries use these weaponries. The use of these weaponries should not be prohibited when their use is perpetuated by states that are perceived otherwise by the United States (Gieling 65).

### ****Capital Wars****

During the entire period of the Iraq-Iran War, all amenities of the metropolitan were used as the war facilities especially clinics. This is because there were many war fatalities. The city seemed to be under the rule of the Iranian militia. This made life more complicated for the anti-war campaigners. Iran invasion by Iraq was successful at first because Iraq detained the Khorramshahr town towards the end of 1980. Hostility of the Iranians created a sense of strength which forced the Iraqi paramilitaries to withdraw from some parts of Iran in 1982. However, Ruhollah Khomeini who was the Iranian frontrunner confessed that combat would not end until the government of Saddam was brought down (Abrams 344).

### ****Peace Agreement****

The Iraq Republic and Iran Republic agreed to a Secretary-General’s suggestion in the August of 1988 after almost eight years of war. This was after rigorous conferences held by the foreign ministers of the two republics and the Secretary-General. The suggestion entailed the acceptance of a ceasefire. Both foreign ministers also had to engage in direct talks with the Secretary-General acting as the mediator. The mandate to authorize, oversee and confirm the antagonisms’ termination and extraction of the militaries to globally acceptable boarder minus was given to an organization called The United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group. This organization was put in place before the truce was start officially on 20th August 1988 (Abrams 344).

### ****Iran & Iraq Weakness****

Iraq did not take responsibility of the Iraq-Iran war. However, Saddam was depicted as a novice in the war contrary to Iran when it withdrew its military from Iraq and Kuwait. Eventually, Iraq became a weak state in terms of its military defense. The Iraq’s Baathist administration was brought down by the US. Chemical Ali and Saddam Hussein were tried for waging war against Iran as well as the nuclear criminalities that they committed against the noncombatant individuals of Halabjah.

Nevertheless, a dual-standard comportment of how the global bodies reacted to this war did not end at this point. Iraq compensated Kuwait approximately 36 billion dollars for staying there for seven months in 2012. This reparation’s imbursement was to last until the beginning of 2015. Currently, 5 percent of the income that comes from the unrefined oil sales in Iraq caters for the 1990’s Kuwait fatalities of martial attack. Additionally, Iraq chose to pay additional 16 billion dollars to this country. However, Iran has not been paid any amount by Iraq for invading it and staying on its land for the eight years of the war.

### ****Conclusion****

Iran was strong and almost solitary during the obligatory conflict that lasted for eight years. Iraq on the other hand was sustained by Arab groups, Eastern and Western states as well as some states in South America. Throughout the years that this war lasted, Iran had two major objectives. These were to disapprove the belligerence of Iraq against Iran and to ensure proper chastisement of Iraq by a global system.

Contrary to this, the military of Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. This compelled the world wide community to progress the execution of crippling authorizations. These led to the collapse of the Iraq’s Baathist government. Although there were high indemnities that Iran was required to pay, there are no mechanisms for recompense and fortitude of these indemnities (Pelletiere 89).
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Klüsener, Edgar. The Iranian Revolution of 1978/1979 and How Western Newspapers Reported It. München: GRIN Verlag, 2007. Internet resource.

Pelletiere, Stephen C. The Iran-Iraq War: Chaos in a Vacuum. New York: Praeger, 1992. Print.
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