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ANNEXATION OF KUWAIT

Ever since its inception the United Nations was assigned to maintain international peace and security, which is the cherished goal to save the mankind. Since the sole purpose of the organization has been the maintenance of global peace and security. The UN charter provided different provision for settling international disputes; such as diplomatic, judicial and coercive etc. When the Gulf crisis broke out the international community had high hopes, that U.N. will solve the crisis peacefully. But the series of events proved that UN could not live up to meet people expectations.

The annexation of Kuwait although was condemned by the world community, yet they were helpless to solve it peacefully. To tackle the crisis the United States, the European Community, Japan, Canada, and the Soviet Union, already had taken some measures. The broad measures were taken to freeze assets, land put ban on oil supplies of both Kuwait and Iraq. Accordingly, the Security Council adopted resolution 660 condemning Iraq's invasion of Kuwait and demanding an immediate and unconditional withdrawal\(^{(1)}\).

The United States called on emergency meeting of the Security Council under Chapter-VI, Article 35(1) which provided that "any members of the UN may bring only dispute or any situation of the nature referred to in article 34 to the attention of the Security Council or of the General Assembly\(^{(2)}\).
The President Saddam initially had claimed that Iraqi troops entered Kuwait at the request of a revolutionary movement opposed to the Al-Sabah. On 4 August, Kuwait was declared a republic and the head of this short-lived regime was Alaa Hussein Ali a colonel in the Kuwaity Army. Whatever, the justification it was felt that Iraq’s installation of new government was a clear step to divert the international opinion from the real motives behind the invasion of Kuwait. Iraq claimed it was a military coup which had taken place and invited a military reinforcement from Iraqi forces.

The American’s concern was to prevent any Iraqi incursion into Saudia Arabia. On 5th August 1990 the American President already declared the failure of the Arab efforts to find an amicable solution of the Kuwait crisis. Arab world frankly had floated and discussed number of options held at the Jeddah Conference. One option suggested was that the Iraqi-Kuwaiti dispute should be put for arbitration. An understanding was reached by which Iraq was make entitled to have an outlet to the Gulf waters.

Yet, another arrangement provided that after Iraq’s withdrawal from Kuwait and the restoration of Kuwaiti ruling family, Kuwait would pay financial compensation to Iraq for its slant drilling of Iraq’s Rumalia oil-fields across the borders. A third option envisaged by Arab leaders suggested for the establishment of a Kuwait Government that would be prepared to enter into some formal economic, political and military
association with Iraq after withdrawal of Iraq and restoration of the ruling family. These moves for negotiation with Iraq in Saudia Arabia were stopped once the US President Bush decided to intervene in the crisis by immediately dispatching American troops in the Saudia Arabia and the Gulf. The world witnessed on 5th of August 1990, that the American President had side tracked all possibility of negotiations, and had opened option for strategy of confrontation with Iraq\(^{(3)}\).

The US President George Bush had stressed the integrity, freedom of Saudia Arabia from the very beginning of the crisis. On the 6th August, the US Defence Secretary, Richard Cheney, was in Jeddah to discuss contingency plans. On the same day the Security Council passed resolution 661, and imposed trade sanctions, excepting medicine, and in humanitarian circumstances food stuffs against Iraq\(^{(4)}\).

A ban was imposed on Iraqi and Kuwaiti oil a measure which had already been adopted by the US. On UN resolution Cuba and Yemen abstained, however, the resolution passed by the vote of 13-0.

The President Hosni Mubarak was greatly embarrassed by Saddam, who made him to believe that he had been instrumental in resolving Iraqi–Kuwaiti differences, while Saddam intended to invade Kuwait all alone. Both the leaders were competing for leadership of progressive Islamic national block. The President Mubarak had felt that Iraq’s chemical, nuclear and biological warfare programs might threaten Middle East peace, and affect Egyptian Security.
The Soviet Union and American had already issued a joint statement condemning the invasion of Kuwait. The US, the Soviet, and Britain had ruled out any proposed for cease fire or peace paused by the Security Council. Their stand had been that Saddam Hussein must withdraw from Kuwait before the council take up such a proposal.

Neither Saudia nor, America were sure about the assurance given by the Iraq. Accordingly, the US President George Bush announced in a televised address to the nation on the August, that the 82nd air borne division was being dispatched to Saudi Arabia. Remarkably it was the largest American troops deployment overseas since the Vietnam war. Washington also listed four main principles demanding an immediate unconditional withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from Kuwait, the restoration of legitimate Kuwaiti government’s, reaffirmation of the US commitment to stability in the Gulf, and America’s determination to protect the lives of its citizen. The Saudi authority at the beginning were reluctant to permit presence of large size of US military deployments in the region. The American President George Bush had ordered General Powell of the U.S. army “to let them see satellite photographs of Iraqi forces a massing for an invasion along their border.

Saudia Arabia faced the harsh reality and finally permitted Americans troops deployment in the area. At the beginning Saudia Arabia was sensitive to the presence of foreign troops, because it considered itself as guardian of the most holy places for the Muslim, and in case of permission, it might have negative impact.
on its position as spiritual leaders of Muslim throughout the world. In the course of developments Saudi were forced to denounce this policy. Saudi Arabia has been one of the US most loyal and dependable allies in the Middle East ever since 1943, at the Cairo Conference, when King A Abdul-Aziz met with President Franklin D. Roosevelt and had reached mutual understanding with America for its Security Compulsion.

ROLE OF UN IN THE GULF CRISIS:

The United Nations as an organization has never participated directly in conflict between two member states. The sole responsibility of United Nations has been to resolve disputes peacefully and to maintain international peace and order. Violence and war have been an alienable phenomena in the human history. In the race for power. The violence has been the means which various parties have resorted time to time to achieve its desired ends. The state has considered it a means of achieving foreign policy goals.

Therefore, the war has hindered the international organization functioning to discharge its duties smoothly in the maintenance of healthy relations among nations. Though, it has been a code of conduct, but nevertheless nations relations have always marked by violence and power struggle. The Security Council as an organization is assigned the responsibility of collective security as contained in the Chapter VI of the UN charter. The Security Council, because of the permanent members antagonistic behaviour involving in the disputes, either directly
as in Gulf war using Veto power has not been successfully able to tackled the crisis.

The Gulf crisis was put to test the very capacity of the UN in resolving a dispute in a peaceful manner. The UN did not manifest strongly as its functioning was dominated by powerful states of the West. As the great powers joined together to preserve their interests the UN was used as merely rubber stamp to meet the requirements of the US goals to serve its strategic interests. The UN failed to act in defence of collective security, the purpose for which it was created. Because of internal problems the Soviet and Chinese Veto were not effectively used. The the intimacy of small countries among the ten non-permanent members of the Security Council also proved fullness. The Security Council led by US condition adopted 661 resolutions and imposed economic sanction against Iraq. The United States and its allies combined took the necessary measures. To the control of oil reserve or even any threat to the flow of oil to their countries was declared not acceptable to the US and its allies. Even in the first Gulf crisis three years ago, oil shipments were escorted by naval forces of USA and other industrialised friends and allies.

In the Gulf region the US had a three fold oil interests, flow of sufficient the quantity of oil; the price of oil; and the availability of Petro dollars. Had Iraq not brought under control Gulf crisis similar to oil crisis might have had catastrophic effects on industrialized nations of the West. The
Gulf crisis seemingly threatened the structures of world economy rather than world peace and majority of mankind.

Therefore, it was not surprise to see USA championing the cause of Kuwaiti as a sovereign nation. On 9th August, the Security Council adopted unanimously resolution 662 declaring Iraq’s annexation of Kuwait as null and void. The Arab nations were deeply disturbed. As a result to resolve the crisis diplomatic initiative took place. The Arab League held an emergency meeting in the Egyptian capital Cairo and passed a resolution condemning the invasion. The Arab League endorsed economic sanctions and tough stand up against Iraq and promised military aid to Saudi Arabia. Major Arab, states of Egypt, Syria, Morocco and Saudi Arabia, supported. Only Libya voted with Iraq against the resolution. Algeria, Yemen and PLO abstained while Jordan, Sudan and Mauritania entered.

There manifested deep division among Arab States in their perception to the Gulf crisis. Their differences on this angle enhanced USA to step its efforts to maintain its troops present in Saudi Arabia.

The President Hafez al-Assad of Syria had emphatically stressed for an Arab solution to the crisis arguing that it should be limited to the regional parties to the conflict and the concerned nations. He stress that the solution of the Gulf crisis should not be sought by foreign powers. The foreign powers should be kept out of the conflict. This idea found a wide acceptance among the Arab League.
On August 6, the Secretary of Defence Cheney visited Riyadh with a proposal for US military support for preserving the nation's sovereignty and integrity of the region. Although some of King Fahd's advisers felt that the American proposal would be undesirable at the same time he was worried by the marshing of Iraqi troops on his border. On 8 August, President Bush announced that US troops would be stationed in Saudia Arabia on a wholly defensive mission to protect the Kingdom from Iraqi troops massing on the Saudian-Kuwait border. In the light of fast developments the US stepped up its efforts to broaden membership. Seek the mandate of the international community to intervene in the crisis militarily.

For the first time in the Middle East modern political history the Arab states realized that the economic disparity among Arab League members was the main cause that stood in the way of reaching consensus, especially on the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq. Of course, all the nations condemned the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq but, unfortunately they could not find a solution acceptable to all, as it was a fact that there was great disparity between the "have" and "have-nots" of the Middle East.

The vast economic disparities continued to influence the political environment in the region. It was felt that unless affluent countries work cooperatively to minimize the gap in terms of economic assistance for the development of the least developed countries the differences among themselves would further widens.
In this respect it should be pointed that President Saddam Hussein met the Secretary General of the U.N. Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, where he asked for 'package deal' for such arrangement pointing that each party knew exactly what it would have to give and what it would receive... added that it would not be possible to find readily solutions to such a complicated issue in asingle meeting. Saddam also said that Iraq was ready to sacrifice for the cause of peace if others would do the same. In this connection he cited example of Israeli's occupation and annexation of Palestinian land. The Israel had never been subjected to sanctions or any out side military intervention to ensure compliance with the Security Council resolutions. The Iraqi President stated, that the US is adopting double standards policy.

THE ARAB DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS:

In order to defuse the tension mounting in the region' Yemen took initiatives to resolve the crisis, which contained seven propositions as follows:

1. Withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait;
2. Consider the factors that led Iraqi to invade Kuwait, and their settlement in reasonable and just way. This can be done in frame work of Arab body or international body;
3. Withdrawal of foreign forces from Arab peninsula and from the Gulf;
4. Respect for right to sovereignty, independence and self determination of Kuwait people;
5. Termination of economic blockade of Iraq;
6. Establishment of a just and new economic condition in the region, which will remove the wide gap between rich and poor and secure for the region stability and peaceful co-existence among the people of the region;

7. Work on bringing lasting and just peace in the region and that is by solving the problems of the region, the utmost problems of Palestine.

Thus, the Yemen initiative was put forth keeping into consideration different dimension of the problems. On one hand, it required the withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait on the other hand it addressed the removal of sanction against Iraq. It carefully recommended that the solution to the crisis should be sought from within and not from out. In fact, the Middle East geograph had created complex political relationship among the states which had been the outcome of Israel and Egypt war and Arab-Israeli conflict. Similarly the Iraq-Iran war was referred widely in the Arab mass media as a war between Arab and Iran. In Iraq-Iran was Baghdad was posing as a defender of other states in the area. Yet both countries had shared the similar religious believe having a historical ties through the border tribes.

Although Yemen was championing the cause of the normalization and peaceful co-existence with its neighbour Saudia Arabia, still her own border dispute is still remained unsolved. Yemen's delegate who had travelled throughout the Middle East during the days immediately following the invasion and spoke with many Arabs from the different countries, whereby he realized that there was wide support for Iraq.
To bring a lasting solution and just peace in the region lie in resolving and settling Palestine problem.

II. ARAB LEAGUE INITIATIVE:

The Arab League Foreign Ministers in extra ordinary meeting held in Cairo forwarded five-points plan to resolve the Gulf crisis. Thus stressed that any solution of the Gulf crisis ought to have Arab League mandate, and should be backed by Gulf states to defend themselves against aggression. The meeting was called by Iraq, PLO, Algeria, Tunisia, Yemen and Jordan. In the meeting the members felt that Egypt was instigated by the US and was acting according to US wish. The plan proposals put forward had been as following:

1. Immediate and unconditioned withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait.

2. Immediate release of hostage, unconditioned on solution to the crisis safety of Arab labourers in Kuwait to be guaranteed.

3. Condemns Iraq's treatment of foreign embassies in Kuwait, and refuses to recognize Iraq's annexation of Kuwait.

4. Iraq should compensate Kuwait for damages at the time of invasion and any subsequent losses, the security of Kuwaiti assets inside Kuwait, like funds in the central bank, should be guaranteed.

5. Calls for the return of Kuwait royal family.

These demands were put forward by the Gulf Co-operative Council constituting Kuwait, Saudia Arabia, UAE, Qatar, Oman, Baharin. But amazingly these proposals did not find any appreciation in the region from other Arab states.
In addition the Libyan initiative also provided a golden chance for face saving way to Iraq to get rid out of the impasse. The move was supported and approved after consultation with Iraq, Jordan and Sudan. Surprisingly this did not clearly endorse UN and Arab league resolutions on the crisis, and demanded an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi troops and restoration of the royal family to Kuwait which was to be carried out under supervision of UN and Arab League. The plan included.

1. Iraqi troops to withdrew from Kuwait and be replaced by UN forces.
2. US and other international forces to pull out of Saudia Arabia and be replaced by Arab or Muslim troops.
3. UN embargo to be lifted.
4. Kuwaiti’s al-Rumeilah oil field and Bubian islands, both in border areas claimed by President Saddam to be given to Iraq.
5. Political self determination for Kuwait.
6. Agreement on “unified Arab oil policy” which would deter countries from violations.
7. Negotiations over debt and compensation.

These proposition were not acceptable to Kuwait, and majority of Arab and Western countries. It was also not clear certain how Iraq would response to the peace plan putforth by Libya. 
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The Libyan peace plan was prepared keeping in mind historical and economic factors of parties involved in the crisis. Still, it lacked comprehensive proposition for Iraq-Kuwait dispute.

IV. INITIATIVE OF YASSER ARAFAT CHAIRMAN OF PLO:

The Palestinian leader Yasser Arfat, Chairman of the PLO, who travelled to Iraq and western countries capitals widely floated a proposal that was intended to reflect Baghdad’s new negotiating position. "Back-channel deal" was offered by Iraqi intermediaries and subsequently denied by President Saddam. The proposition were as following:

1. A US guarantee that it would not attack Iraq, or stage an air strike against its chemicals plants and nuclear laboratories.

2. All hostages allowed to leave Iraq.

3. Iraq to withdraw from all of Kuwait except the islands of Bubian which would give Iraq access to the sea and a border strip containing the al-Rumeilah oil field.

4. The people of Kuwait to be allowed to decide their future, but the Emir would be barred from returning to the throne.

This was the most realistic plan. The Saudi monarchy almost stood by the Emir. But the UN backed by US and UK outrightly opposed arguing that it would leave President Saddam with at least same of the spoils of his aggression.\(^{13}\)

This proposition also failed and did not materialized as it was planned. Iraq did not response to it positively. Contrary the
US demanded that Iraq should compliance with Security Council resolution. This scenario continued as there was no change in the attitude of the concerned parties. The initiatives to find an Arab solution to the crisis were dashed to the ground.

Meanwhile, the Security Council adopted resolution 664 on 18th August, and demanded that Baghdad should allow foreign nationals to leave Iraq. The resolution was adopted unanimously. However, Iraq continued to detain the western nationals. The President Saddam Hussein blamed the US and Britain as the chief source of sanction and adopting hostile attitude towards Iraq. Both Kuwait and Iraq permitted to leave specially Asian labourers from other Arabs countries except western nationals. Iraq threat to use them as human shields in case of attacks by America. The United States on the other hand described the western nationals detained by Iraq as hostages. "There were more than 2,000 westerners in Iraq and Kuwait who were kept in sensitive installations as insurance against an attack by western forces assembled in the Gulf."

In retaliation Britain by detained 33 Iraqi students claiming that they were arrested on the grounds that they were members of Iraqi armed forces. Baghdad condemned London's decision to in turn detained 33 Iraqi students in Britain calling the move as cowardly British behaviour. The America blamed Iraq for detaining the western innocent civilian as "hostages" and demanded their immediate release.
President George Bush condemned Iraq action as ruthless and against all norms of international behaviour. On 22nd August 1991, the US rejected Iraq’s order of closure of all foreign embassies in Kuwait, the American security of state Mr. James A. Baker welcoming the Iraqi decision, to release western citizen while testifying before the house foreign affairs committee. “This welcomed and significant development, our determination that Iraq’s aggression against Kuwait must be reversed by full implementation of all security council resolutions”.

The Soviet viewpoint of the Gulf crisis had been that it was American and not Iraq who complicated the situation. On 24th August, President Mikhail Gorbachev sent a letter to the Iraqi President Saddam Hussein warning him that the situation was extremely dangerous. Following the first batch of Soviet technicians left Iraq. A first group of 250 Soviet citizens has already received visa and were due to fly home. Moscow in the beginning of the crisis was even very reluctant to condemn the Iraqi. Having proximity in the region the USSR had participated generously in transformation of President Saddam’s dreams of building Iraqis huge arsenal.

On 25th August, the Security Council adopted in a sweeping move (13 to 0 vote with Cuba and Yemen abstained), resolution 665 and appealed member states to use limited naval force to enforce economic sanction against Iraq. Several members of the UN expressed their serious concern over the situation some of them had reservations for variety of reasons. Yemen and Cuba were
suspicious about the intention of the permanent members in the Security Council. Their perception to the situation was clear right from the beginning the resolution was moved in the Security Council. Their objection was based on ambiguity of power use and its purpose and limitation.

The resolution has not mention any means to check the use of power or even supervise the action. No clear definition was given regarding the exact role of the Security Council. Columbia’s representative made objectionable remark pointing that the use of force to ensure the sanction, might be misused, and even lead to naval blockade France stressed that it did not imply a blanket authorization for the indiscriminate use of force. In addition China stood in favour of diplomatic solution, and pleaded that no force should be used in the name of UN. However, President Bush had decided to make the best use of a golden opportunity. On diplomatic level all efforts were taken to ensure that Iraq was punished militarily. The US wanted permanent presence in the Gulf region.

The United States considered the Iraqi closure of US embassy in Kuwait described it as illegal. In retaliation America resorted and reduced the number of Iraqi diplomatic corps from the current 55 to 19. The US declared that the reduction of the diplomatic personnel would be carried out in strict accordance with the UN and international law. By the end of the August, 1991, Iraq declared the total absorption of Kuwait at administrative level.
Iraq continued to put obstacle in the process of diplomatic efforts to defuse the crisis. Baghdad refused to comply with UN Security Council resolution. Iraq refused to permit food shipments to go direct to foreign nationals trapped in Iraq and Kuwait. This move led the Security Council to pass another resolution 666 on 13th September, 1991, which approved shipments of food to Iraq and Kuwait for humanitarian reasons to be distributed by approved international aid agencies. The resolution 667 was adopted by 13-2, votes, Cuba and Yemen opposed to it. In response to it Iraq ordered closure of the diplomatic mission in Kuwait. Baghdad ordered entry of Iraqi troops into French embassy residence area. Following, the Security Council condemned raids by Iraqi troops on French and other diplomatic mission in occupied Kuwait. Although, Iraq rejected the resolution on the ground that the Security Council should have send an inquiry committee or or should have verified the fact.  

INTERNATIONAL EFFORTS TO DEFUSE THE CRISIS:

To diffuse the crisis the attempts was also made by the international community. France with its historical and commercial ties, introduced a comprehensive peace plan, which was supported by permanent members of Security Council such as China and non-permanent members, like India, Australia, Belgium, Cuba, Ecuador, Yemen, Zaire, and Zimbabwe. Ironically it was endorsed by Soviet Union which later switched its stand in favour to the British alternative. The French proposal contained six points as follows:
1. The launching of a final appeal to the Iraqi leadership to comply with Security Council resolutions calling Baghdad’s withdrawal from Kuwait.

2. Calling on the Iraqi leadership to announce immediately its time table for pulling out of Kuwait and to begin immediately a rapid and massive withdrawal of its troops.

3. As soon as this commitment is received, the UN Secretary General, would arrange for UN verification of the Iraqi withdrawal with despatch of multinational observer force and the deployment of the Arab peace keeping force.


5. Necessary measures in consultation with Arab nations, to promote negotiations to consolidate the peace process.

6. And once the Security Council resolutions have been completed with, members of the council will actively support the resolution of the other regional problems, particularly the Israeli-Arab conflict and more specifically of the Palestinian problem with the convening appropriate international conference. Similar to the other initiatives it was declared to be died by the US which opposed the question of linking Palestinian issue, or even any trial of Israel occupation of west bank "US representative to the United Nations Mr. Thomas pickering said : I have the instruction not to support such an initiative."

INDIAN PROPOSAL FOR NON-ALIGNMENT PEACE INITIATIVE ON 2ND FEBRUARY 1991:

After intensive consultation among the members of the non-alignment movement, in which Iraq was an active member the foreign ministers of the respective in their meeting in Belgrade
expressed their deep distress and anguish at the outbreak of hostilities in the gulf, despite all efforts made till the last moment to defuse the crisis. The Chairman and the individual member of the concerned countries asserted for peaceful solutions to the crisis. They called upon the respective parties to avoid the destruction of properties and lives of civilian. They all felt that their objective should be to liberate Kuwait. They also felt that to dismantle Iraq's technological and physical infrastructure or cripple its social and economic life would not be their objectives. Hence, Non Aligned Peace Limited moved by India put forth:

1. An immediate cessation of hostilities simultaneously with the announcement by Iraq of an unequivocal commitment to withdrawal of its troops from Kuwait as well as an announcement of a time frame of complete withdrawal.

2. Commencement without delay of the process of the withdrawal as a part of the time frame of complete withdrawal.

3. Simultaneous arrangement to be made by the Security Council for verification of compliance with both cessation of hostilities and implementation of the withdrawal schedule.

4. The withdrawal of all foreign forces from the region simultaneously with commencement of Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, and the replacement of these forces by the deployment of a UN peace keeping force.

5. A guarantee of non-aggression against Iraq to be given by the Security Council.

6. The commencement of the withdrawal of sanctions against Iraq and complete withdrawal of these sanctions simultaneously with completion of the withdrawal of Iraqi forces from Kuwait.
The ministers further urged that:

(i) Agreement should be reached in the Security Council on the modalities for commencing negotiations, after the completion of the process of withdrawal, for resolving Iraq-Kuwait disputes in order to strengthen peace and Security in the region.

(ii) Agreement should be also reached in the Security Council to address, in a comprehensive manner, after the completion of the process of withdrawal, the Arab-Israeli conflict, particularly the Palestinian question, through the convening of international conference on the basis of the relevant UN Security Council resolutions on this subject and with participation of PLO.

(iii) Bilateral and multilateral consultations should be promoted among the countries of the region, to take further steps to consolidate peace and security, including mutual non-aggression pacts and arms reduction agreements. These pacts and arrangement should be gauranteed by the Security Council, if so requested by the parties concerned.

(iv) Urgent steps should be taken for the rapid conclusion of the on going global disarmament negotiations, such as negotiations on chemical weapons convention, for the baning of the development, production stock piling, deployment and the use of weapons of mass destructions.

The Ministers also decided:

1. To send a small team consisting of the foreign ministers, a selected group of NAM countries to Baghdad and Washington to seek the agreement of the two parties, the recommendations in point 1 and 2 of the section II of this initative.

2. To take formal action, as soon as an agreement of the two parties is obtained, to convene an emergency session of the Security Council to consider and take action on the other points indicated in sections II and III. Belgrade 12 February, 1991."
The non-aligned comprehensive plan like other plan also resulted in failure to stop the volatile situation in the Gulf region, either Iraq nor other Security Council permanent members, supported the peace initiatives. With object decline of Soviet power it was but natural that the non-alignment did not work as a useful political platform to resolve the crisis. The demise of the Soviet Union and end of cold war dramatically weathered the Third World. The shaky political position globally and as consequence the elites did not play any commendable game in world policies.

Therefore, the Gulf crisis automatically reflected the missing ground for non-aligned movement legitimacy. So, their proposal went to the dust bin like it’s predecessors to seek any peaceful solution to the Gulf crisis.

**THE SOVIET ROLE:**

The Soviet Union was considered a traditional ally of Iraq during the Gulf crisis the role of Moscow was more ambiguous. The Soviet Foreign Minister Edward Shevardnadze in the course of meeting with his US counter part, discussed co-operation between USA and the USSR in the settlement of regional conflict in Siberian city of Irkutsk on 1-2 August, 1990. By the times Iraq invaded Kuwait and every body has been taken by surprise.

The Soviet Union and the United States as a member of Security Council considered it as important issue and released a joint statement on 5th August, 1990. Both immediately and resolutely condemned the flagrant and unlawful invasion of Kuwait.
by the armed forces of Iraq. The Soviet Union and the United States considered it fundamentally important that the Security Council resolution be immediately and fully complied with. They felt that Iraq's action runs counter to the fundamental principles of the UN charter and international law. This was an obvious violation of the basic norms of civilized conduct by a nation like Iraq.

The Soviet Union suspended the supply of arms while United States froze bank assets of Iraq. The USSR and USA called upon Iraq for unconditional withdrawal of its troops from Kuwait. Both asserted that the sovereignty, national independence, lawful authority, and territorial integrity of Kuwait should be fully restored. Moscow and Washington reiterated that international community should not only condemn the invasion but also take practical steps in response to Kuwaiti invasion by Iraq. Both jointly urged international community to join them to suspend all supplies of arms to Iraq on an international scale.

The USSR and USA also called on regional organizations, primarily the league of all Arab countries, as well as, non-alignment movement, and the organization of Islamic Conference to take all possible steps to secure the implementation of the UN Security Council resolutions. It was pointed that Government that resort to a glaring aggression should know that the international community cannot and would not reconcile itself to aggression or assist it. Suprisingly the Soviet Union had not clearly defined its role in the crisis,
Although the America urged Soviet Union to play an active part in the US coalition. But, Moscow refuse to involve in a military adventure as the USSR was terribly engulfed in demostic problems. Still America succeeded in gaining Soviet support at least in neutralizing Moscow from the crisis.

The Soviet Union during course of contacts at various levels occurred that Iraq will withdraw its troops from Kuwait in near future. Speaking of the fate of about 900 Soviet citizen in Kuwait and 7,000-8,000 Soviet citizens in Iraq, Shevardnadze said, we hope that the safety of Soviet people will be ensured. Otherwise the consequences may be very serious he noted. A similar statement concerning the safety of American citizens in Kuwait and Iraq made by Baker\textsuperscript{24}.

While the Soviet response to the Gulf crisis reflected Gorbachev’s foreign policy. By adopting neutral stance economic advantages. Many economic and diplomatic concessions were made to Moscow during this period. During late October during diplomatic trip Gorbachev signed several trade agreements with Spain and France. The USSR voted the UN resolution to authorize use of force against Iraq. Saudia Arabia agreed to lend Soviet Unions 1 billion. Other loans included $1 billion from France, $1,5 billion from Span. $6,3 billion from Italy, over $10 billion from Germany, possibly $ 1 billion from Kuwait, and $ 5 billion from other Gulf states. On the diplomatic front, several nations, including Saudia Arabia, Iran, Japan, and Israel reestablished relations with Moscow\textsuperscript{25}.
On December 1990, the Foreign Minister Mr. Shevardnadze resigned, after the USSR voted the controversial resolution 678, authorizing the allied to use force to liberate Kuwait. The Joint Soviet-American declaration supported all twelve resolutions on the Gulf conflict passed by the United Nations Security Council. They were primarily the result of personal efforts made by Foreign Minister Shevardnadze, and his closest advisers. This position was not backed by all leading institutions and interest groups. A pro-Iraqi lobby in the foreign policy establishment had opposed this orientation since the first day of the Gulf crisis\(^{(20)}\). The pro-Arab lobby succeeded during November 1990, when a Soviet envoy selected for bilateral talk with Iraq the personnel envoy of the USSR President then, Mr. Primakov representative of Iraq, friendly policy was able to prevent Shevardnadze from carrying the mission. Thus, the Soviet vote for the resolution 678 was criticized. Shevardnadze’s cooperation with USA became a target of criticism by nationalist and anti-western leaning groups. The cooperation with USA was considered as a betrayal of a long standing friend. Above all the abandonment of strategically important terrain in this region to USA warning could already be heard in Moscow during the first few days after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait Washington, was thus successfully planned in alonger term for its military presence in the Gulf region with the aim of substantially upsetting the balance of power in its favour in the Middle East and Persian Gulf\(^{(27)}\).
At the critical juncture of the Gulf crisis there was considerable opposition to the Shevardnadze's policy of close co-operation with USA. From the very outset, he was confronted to explain the contradictions in the soviet policy ever since the out break of the Gulf crisis. In the beginning of the Gulf conflict Soviet diplomat refused to provide information on the extent of arms sales to Iraq. Later Shevardnadze indirectly confirmed this fact. The Soviet repeatedly rejected request made by the USA to withdraw military advisers from Iraq as Kremlin felt that would be a violation of the treaty of friendship with Iraq.

President Bush was unable at the Helsinki summit in September 1990, to persuade Mr. Gorbachev to make such concession. British Prime Minister Major was also not given any assurance during his visit to Moscow at the beginning of March 1991, that the Soviet Union would not help Iraq rebuild its military potential during the negotiations on the cease fire arrangements made by the UN Security Council. The Soviet Union tried to ensure that Iraq could keep a number of short-range missiles with a range of up to 340 kilometers$^{28}$. 

Due to the Soviet pressure the Security Council resolution 687, exempted Iraqi missile up to 150 kilometers. Meanwhile, it was pleaded that Iraq will destroy all its ballistic missiles. However, the Gulf war was the first test to the new international ordered marking the end of cold war. In the word of Michael Howard, the cold war was won by the triumph of the global market
economy over the Marxist-Leninist command economies. It was also a victory of pluralist democracy over totalitarianism. But this triumph was made possibly only by the stable framework provided by military deterrence. Peace and stability can now be preserved only if that economy continues to operate successfully.

No doubt Soviet collapse and decline of its power as balancer of power paved the way to USA hegemony. This facilitated the destruction of Iraqi military might. Meanwhile the Security Council passed resolution 689, on 24 September 1990, adopted of procedural measure entrusting the Security Council’s sanction committee to evaluate requests for help from countries effected by the trade embargo. The resolution was adopted unanimously.

Jordan and Turkey and some other Arab countries were hit badly economically by the embargo. These countries were heavily depended upon the export of oil through their countries. They were getting partially their portion in the form of crude oil to meet their domestic consumption needs. On 25 September 1990, the Security Council issued resolution no. 670, prohibited air traffic with Iraq and Kuwait except in humanitarian circumstances. The resolution adopted by 14-1, vote Cuba opposed. Iraq continued to stress that Kuwait was integral part of Iraq, so Baghdad claimed the resolution 670 was aimed to ensure boycotting trade and cooperation with Iraq. The resolution made it possible to the United Nations to take action against any member state who dare to violate the resolution. On 29 October, the Security Council adopted the resolution 674, and demanded Iraq to immediately release hostages and stop oppressing
Kuwaitis. Iraq was also to repay financial losses and human rights violations incurred by the invasion. The UN Secretary General undertook peace efforts. The UN resolution held Iraq responsible for the violation of human rights in Kuwait and demanded an immediate end to hostages detention. However, Iraq was asked to ensure food, protection of Kuwaitis.

Remarkably, Iraq continued to ignore the United Nations resolutions describing it as motivated by the interest of American and Western European countries. On 28 November, 1990, the Security Council adopted the eleventh resolutions and "asked UN Secretary General to safeguard smuggled copy of Kuwait's population and register so as to prevent Iraqi repopulation. The resolution was adopted unanimously\(^{(31)}\). This resolution was enacted to prevent Iraqi attempt to destory population statistics and destruction of civil records which was intended to facilitate easy amalgamation of Kuwaiti citizen after declaration of Kuwait as nineteenth province. By sheer chance in the month of November a Kuwaiti citizen managed to locate a slip computer discs containing the civil record. This facitiated to ensure that the Kuwaitis will be able to reclaim their homes and business, the persons who lived in Kuwait as of August 1, 1990, whether Kuwaiti or of other nationalities, is listed on these discs, should there be any difficulty in ascertaining just who is who, the authorities will ask neighbour to identify neighbour, and this identification process will travel chain like across streets, neighbourhoods, towns, cities, and country side until all persons are verified as being who they say they are\(^{(32)}\).
On 29th November 1990, the Security Council authorized to 'use all necessary means' against Iraq unless Iraq withdraw on or before 15th January, 1991. This resolution was voted 12-2, China abstained, Cuba and Yemen voted against the Security Council authorization.

1. Demand that Iraq comply fully with resolution 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions, while maintaining all its decisions, to allow Iraq one final opportunity, as a pause of good will, to do so.

2. Authorize member states cooperating with government of Kuwait, unless Iraq on or before 15 January 1991 fully implements, as set forth in paragraph 1 above, the foregoing resolutions to use all necessary means to uphold and implement resolutions, 660 (1990) and all subsequent relevant resolutions and to restore international peace and security in the area.
3. Requests all states to provide appropriate support for the actions undertaken in pursuance of paragraph 2 of the present resolutions.

4. Request all states concerned to keep the Security Council regularly informed on the progress of actions undertaken pursuant to paragraphs 2 and 3 of the present resolutions.

5. Decides to remain seized of the matter\(^{(39)}\).

It should be pointed here that up to this phase the UN resolution, so far had used the word use of force. But the phrase "all necessary means" indicated that the use of force was implied in the resolutions. The Security Council no doubt exhausted all means like sanction, embargo, etc. against Iraq. But Saddam Hussin did not comply the UN resolutions. Finally the Security Council endorsed the use of force against Iraq. But while using force the Security Council was to create Military Staff Committee under Chapter VII of UN Charter article 46 and 47. The UN was to specify the means for implementation of its resolutions. Therefore, the resolutions were designed as an excuse to delegate authority and legitimacy to any military action taken by the Security Council permanent member against Iraq on the pretext of liberation of Kuwait. The unclear nature of the wording of the resolution allowed the scope of its interpretation in many fold manners.

The UN chart in Chapter VII, articles 46, 47, 48 49 dealt comprehensively with composition of the military committee, its function, and relation to Security Council. However, the resolution provided golden opportunity to the great powers namely
USA to take upon itself the leadership of liberating Kuwait. "The cold war between East and West put an end to the initial solidarity in the Security Council. It helped the great powers to derive legitimacy for the use of force for the purpose of securing their specific goals in the region and establishing a precedent that have suicidal consequences in the exploitation of the third world countries by powerful states.

Iraq, of course, reacted to the resolutions. On 15 January as deadline, declaring that they "illegal, and null and void". The Security Council seemed to be under pressures and threats in the guise of monetary aid to the tune of billions of dollars by USA. The adoption of the resolution by 12-22 with China among the permanent members gave fillip to USA diplomatic efforts to win global opinion in its favour. The resolution sponsored by Britain, Canada, France, Romania, USA and Soviet Union, Yemen and Cuba voted against. The vote followed heavy lobbying by Mr Baker and American diplomats in New York and in various capitals with the twin-objectives; to seek approval of use of force to end Iraqi occupation of Kuwait; and shelve a move to send UN observers to monitor Israeli occupied Arab and Palestinian lands.

The super power US, acted in pursuit of its national interests claiming that, Washington was exercising power in the name of collective security. The crisis was brought to an end by use of enormous pressure of the USA supported by the Soviet Union, Chapter VII of the Charter suits the will of the two
Superpowers or at least one tolerated the will of the other. The UN is basically an organization composed of medium sized and small states. For the big powers it provides a means of cooperation in partnership when the need arises as in the current gulf crisis\(^{[37]}\).

Since the Security Council adopted the resolution 678, under Chapter VII of the UN Charter which laid down the complete procedure to be followed in article 42 to 49 for the use of armed forces to restore international peace and security. Therefore, the authorization of use of force was given without providing sufficient time to the economic embargo and blockade to function and to assess the impact upon Iraq. Economy. All this raise a question about the failure of UN in resorting to other means to resolve the dispute and annexation of Kuwait by Iraq.

The Charter of UN no where permits the use of armed forces by one member against another. Rather the UN charter prohibits the use of force. Only the Security Council is permitted to authorize use of armed force against a member of UN. The Security Council can seek assistance from members but the action must be Security Council action. Therefore, it would be in violation of the UN Charter to allow individual members to use armed forces against any member under the excuse of carrying out the duty which Security Council alone has been entitled to do under UN charter. The resolution moreover has not made any reference to the establishment of the military committee which is incumbent under article 47. Another aspect which was not in conformity with
Charter, there were no provision entitled member state to create a military force. Even in case of authorization by the Security Council the council should be consulted, informed, and should receive reports about the military operations and the operations should be carried under the flag of UN, which was not mentioned in the resolutions.

The multinational forces did not fight under UN flag or uniform, or even under Joint military command of the Security Council. Therefore, this war can not be legitimately called a war waged by the UN. USA took a tough stance and made efforts to make the military action. Britain shared this stance, the other three Security Council members, on the other hand made greater efforts to find a political solution.

The UN sanction was the blatant violation of human rights and humanitarian laws. It endangered the survival of mankind. However, the legitimacy of resolutions 678, was questioned on a numbers of grounds, for example:

1. It was in contradiction with spirit of the UN charter which promises to eliminate scourage of war;

2. The resolution has not mentioned how long the application of "all necessary means" will continue, the type and size or amount of forces was to be used.

3. It negate the provision in Chatper VII of the Charter, which specifically empower the Security Council not any member to indulge in the use of force and to conduct the operations under the military staff committee and under UN flag.
4. It was also in contravention of article 27(3), which requires that an important resolutions of the Security Council must have the concurrence of the five permanent members, since China abstained it implied that it did not concur and as such meant that resolution 678, was not perfect and its follow up action was not legitimate.

This point was realized during Korean crisis when in the three successive resolutions of the Security Council which sanctioned enforcement measure against North Korea were adopted. The Soviet Union boycotted the council on the basis of article 27(3), which asks for, 'concurrence' of permanent members. The Soviet Union challenged the legality of these resolutions in the 482nd meeting of the Security Council. It maintained that became of its boycott the resolution had no legal force.

Thus, the resolution 678, generate a huge amount of controversial world wide regarding its legality. The Security Council issued the resolution under Chapter VII of the Charter. Surprisingly the same Chapter includes beside the provision collective measures by the UN (article 41 to 42) provision on self defence article 51. Therefore, for the first time in UN history through its 11 resolutions a step-upon-step strategy of timely responses tailored to the requirements of the unfolding situation. Mr Kurt Waldheim, even while serving as Secretary General of the UN admitted that "same small states no longer turn to the United Nations as protector of their sovereignty rights ascribing it to a lack of confidence in the Security Council's wisdom, objectivity, and capacity for even handed and effective action".
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Some scholars have argued that the Security Council can allowed the coalition to take collective action against Iraq on behalf of the UN in defence of Kuwait. So, the UN was merely a formality by giving its approval to an operation which was based on the right of self defence. Therefore, it was a legal operation, the critics on the other hand pointed that. The Security Council called for the use of military force against Iraq, called enforcement of economic sanction not in collective self-defence it will have same legal consequences since the use of force exceeded the liberation of Kuwait to the maintenance of peace and security in the area. The inclusion of "all measures", therefore, indicate that coalition force was given opportunity to indulge in complete destruction of Iraq and to end the threat to international peace and security as it was propogated by the coalition forces.

However, the resolutions 678, triggered off varied responses from different corner of the globe. The US and Britain acknowledged the adoption of the resolution as a major diplomatic victory. The US troops were despatched to Saudia Arabia prior to the UN sanction. US in fact was trying hard to get such resolution passed by UN categorically stating that "all means" including use of military forces etc. The very next day the UN adopted on 30 November, resolution 678. It is difficult to assess the US role in the Gulf region legitimized by UN resolutions. The US cleverly sent James Baker for "face to face" talk with Saddam Hussein, and the next day the sanction was approval
by UN. This shows President Bush using the traditional formula of both the "carrat and stick in his matter game. China abstained, Yemen and Cuba voted against, Cuba rejected and voted against all resolutions and described them as imperialist policies. The Soviet Union voted in favour but stayed away from military action by coalition. Another permanent member France though supported the resolution, President Mitternad had urged for a peaceful solution to the crisis through negotiation. Thus, the US single minded had within its sights the destruction of Iraqi military machine and possibly the downfall of the Saddam Hussein regime. The war against Iraq was engineered to determine that there should be no regional power to challenge a West Asian political order which best serves US interests. However, the heat generated by 678 resolution would occupy central point of debate in decade to came from international law experts and likely would remain a most contraversial topic in war history of the world.

The resolution 678, left in limbo all arrangements for organizing or mobilizing more efforts for solving the crisis through negotiations. Then the result was a loss of credibility of the Security Council as an instrument working in for general interests of the whole world. The devastating nature of the Second World War remained in the memory of the world community. This led to a great efforts by the community of nations to create a world free from terror and war in the future. It is widely believed among scholars, politicians all over the world, that political fragmentation or international anarchy was the sole factor responsible for conflicting behaviour of the nation-state.
Therefore, the United Nations was given the responsibility of managing and organizing the political behaviour of the states by acting as supra national agency. It was made the chief guardian of the world peace and security.

The means of pacific settlement enumerated in Chapter VI clearly specify that in modern times "war is an out dated teachiques for settlement of international disputes". The prevention of war should be achieved by both possible and desirable means. The only way to achieve it is by providing a functional equivalent to war.

Therefore, the task of international organization is to provide a variety of peaceful substitutes to the war and encourage disputants to use them. The enforcement measures include two kinds of action, the first consists of peaceful means which do not involve the use of armed forces as provided in article 41, the second kind of measure is applied under article 42, when the measures provided for an article 41 prove in adequate. The Chapter VII bestows on the Security Council the right to sanction the use of force when it deems it necessary to maintain international peace and security.

The delegates at the San Francisco Conference armed the UN with military powers to put same teeth into the enforcement measures by the UN against aggression but it was made clear that force should be resorted to only when all peaceful settlement measures had failed. The unanimous decision to vest military powers on the UN was considered quite importnat. The framers of
these provisions held the view that the exercise of military power depend on the conclusion of military agreement provided for in article 43 of the Charter which provides that all members of the UN undertake to make avoidable to the Security Council on its call and in accordance with special agreement on armed forces, assistance and facilities. But no special agreements has ever been signed till today. The UN can establish three major form of forces, UN observer force, peace keeping force and enforcement force. It is the third form of force which should be employed to enforce the UN policy resolution. This force should have the responsibility to resort to military action to enforce a UN decision taken to maintain peace and security. Korea was an example, the force was recommended under Article 39.

However, during the course of Gulf crisis, the UN adopted a number of resolutions based on article 39 and 41. The multinational troops which were sent to the Gulf could not be called UN forces since they were not authorized by Article 42. One of this development was that the troops were sent independently by individual members to make sure that the economic sanction were effectively maintained. The other is that those forces were there to impose UN sanctions and also partly came under the clause of collective self-defence. The use of force was justified by the British and American governments throughout the course of military operation as based on the right of collective self-defence.
This would also have a sufficient legal basis they maintained that for their troops presence there was no legal requirement for resolution 678, therefore, to liberate Kuwait would have been justified under Article 51 of the UN Charter which states, "nothing in the present charter shall impair inherent right of the individual or collective self-defence, if an armed attack occurs against a member of United Nations, until the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security."

Thus, the first condition laid down by Article 51 was certainly met because Iraq invasion of Kuwait was "an armed attack" against Kuwait "a member of the UN". Moreover, the Iraqi armies continued to occupy Kuwait territory. In addition to that Kuwait had appealed for a military aid from the US and other western countries. In fact the controversy on the legality of the US action began from the fact that although article 51 gave the right of self defence. It could be exercised only after the Security Council has taken measures, the right of states for collective self-defence ended.

Some critics are of the opinion that since Security Council adopted such measures in resolution 661, which imposed economic sanctions. Thus, no military operations to liberate Kuwait could legitimately be based on the right of collective self-defence. Any armed action now would need the specific authorization of the Security Council. However, the Security Council resolutions have generated a wide range of criticism regarding its legality.
In fact the analysis of legality dimension is out of this study scope. Therefore, it is discussed roughly. But the similarity to the Korean case when the Security Council passed resolution 82 on 25th of June 1950, called North Korea to withdraw and permit the sending of force to enforce the decision and asked all member states to provide all help to UN to carry out these sanction, but there were no mention or armed forces usage, two days later the Security Council adopted resolution 83, stated the urgent military measures are required to restore peace and security and call member state to contribute all help to South Korea needed to defend the armed attack by North Korea. Later the council issued resolution 84 on 17th July 1950, recommended that "all members provide military force and other assistance... make such forces available to a unified command under the US, it also requested the US to designate the commander of such forces and course of operation against North Korea along with various flags of all participant nations. It is assumed that these resolutions were adopted unanimously since the Soviet Union was boycotting the Security Council at that time".

In both cases, Korea and Iraq operations carried out by the states which, contribute forces, U.S. Hegemony in taking all decisions regarding military operation during Gulf crisis was obvious. The war was fought without UN flag, the Commander received his orders from the U.S. President, who is commander-in-chief of the Armed forces and not from UN. The difference between Iraq and Korea, in the later UN forces were authorised by the UN. Therefore, they had legal validity but the multinational forces
mobilized in Gulf, which, destroyed Iraq capability and potentiality and not merely liberating Kuwait. Therefore, the 'Desert storm' campaign, was launched entirely under the command and flags of the contributing states". The Security Council resolution 678 thus voted to legitimize the allies actions, but it did not take responsibility for them, or take command of them, as a UN operation\(^{(45)}\).

However, the ambiguities remained in the wording of the UN Charter, its resolutions will always be given varing interpretation. The US led coalition justify their crucial deeds, on the basis of resolution 678, which, allowed unrestricted use of force against Iraq. After the expiry of the January 15 deadline, it did not limit the duration of the actions, nor restrict the destructive means to be used, not even stipulate that the move against Iraq should be guided by the UN. The resolution. Thus, the negates the purpose for which the world organization came into existence\(^{(46)}\).
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