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1. THE FORMATION OF THE IRAQI ARMY:

The formation of Iraqi army power could be traced from the genesis of Ottoman empire. During the early period of Ottoman rule, a number of military schools were established in the Arab provinces of Ottoman empire. Most of the Sharrifian officers had their military training in these schools. In those times army life was considered a golden opportunity for social status and political advancement which was not available to Ottoman Arabs in other fields in the empire. In the Ottoman empire the Turks were allowed to raise a local force of some 16,000 men even in peace time, and in war time they were allowed to double this. The recruitment in army was by conscription. Theoretically it was applied to all males dwelling in towns and villages in the tribal areas. The number of eligible males were estimated and each tribe was supposed to pay an annual tax (badal) of 50 piastres. The enlisted men in army were exempted from tax. A fixed tax had to be paid by members of the non-Muslim communities in lieu of military service. In practice, normally only Muslims served in the army. These conscription laws had provided sufficiently source of revenue for the empire.

Generally, after three years at the school, those who passed their examination were given admission in military college at Istambul. The Iraqi Army in its early years was dominated by the
The term Sharrifian refers to those individuals, who were associated with the Sharif of Mecca in the Hijaz against Ottoman imperial rule. The King Faisal, was the first of the Hashemite family who was chosen to rule Iraq from (1921 to 1933) who raised the strength of the army from 7,500 in 1925 to 11,500 in 1933. The King felt the need for a protective force, which the government could use as a deterrent to deal with any popular resistance, or uprising, in order to ensure acknowledgement of the monarchy’s legitimacy and authority.

In this direction the first step was to set up the Ministry of Defence and appoint of Ja‘afar Pasha Al-Askari, late Commander in Chief of the Hijaz Army, as the Defence Minister. Jafar Pasha’s military experience was commendable. He was born in Baghdad in 1885, to a family who had moved there from the Kurdish village of Askar. After graduating from Baghdad Military School in 1904, he joined the army later he was sent to Berlin, where he spent three years training with the German army.

The Social Base of the Iraqi Army:

Since its establishment the Iraqi army was dominated by majority of Sunni Muslims from Baghdad and northern Iraq. After founding of monarchy many of them assumed important posts in the army and government. In many cases conflicts attributed to the shared upbringing, of common schooling, especially in military colleges therefore, Nuri al-Said, Taha al-Hashmi and Ali Jawdat, all of whom were to become Prime Ministers, were in the same class background having shared experiences of education and war.
They had similar social ties of friendship, marriage and brotherhood who become politically prominent such as Sami and Naji Shawkat; Shakir and Jamil Wadi; Ali Rida, Tahsin and Ja‘afer Al-Askari; and Jamil and Ibrahim Al-Rawi etc. The three al-Askri brother were related by marriage to Nuri al-Said and Ibrahim Kamal Tahsin al-Qadri were related by marriage to Jamil Al-Midfri... They all were prominent, militarily and diplomatically, and held important institutional positions for a long in their time.\(^7\)

Ja‘far Pasha’s had a keen desire to establish modern army in Iraq. He appointed his brother-in-law Nuri’s Pasha al-Saaid, as Minister of Defence who was highly qualified person educated in Turkish military schools, and who spoke five languages. His familiarity with modern ideas was indicated by British Embassy; “Soon after his arrival in Baghdad, Nuri was appointed officiating Commander of the General staff, inspite of the fact at that time the only army the country could claim was limited to a skeleton Headquarters staff of ten Iraqi officers.\(^8\)”

Remarkably, the expansion of army was directly linked to British security arrangement in the Middle East. The environmental change, greatly influenced those Arab officers by their counterpart in the Turkish empire. Britain over riding policy in the Middle East was the maintenance of maximum British influence in the area at the lowest possible cost to the British treasury. With this idea in mind, the British colonial officer arranged a conference for their middle east officials which was
convened at Cairo in 1921, and was headed by the Colonel Secretary, Winston Churchill. The main issues which were discussed included as what steps were to be taken for reduction of expenditures, the treatment of the Khurdish province, the claims of the various possible candidates for the throne of Iraq, and the nature of the forces to be created for the defence of new state.

The complex issue involved put Britain into dilemma as they had to formulate policy that would significantly reduce their defence expenditure in the region without jeopardising their internal and external security. There were two types of armed forces in Iraq, and they were controlled by Britain, whose cost annually was around 37 million. The first force consisted of thirty three battalions of British imperial troops and also a detachment of the R.A.F., whose continued presence in Iraq was considered essential. The second force was Iraqi levies, whose rank and file were mostly Assyrians. The levies were known to be loyal to Britain.

**EXPANSION OF THE ARMY:**

After its establishment the army absorbed a total of 121 ex-Turkish and ex-Sharrifian officers. In addition, new officer cadets was recruited, mainly from. The towns, around only 25 percent of the cadets were recruited from the tribal areas and Kurdistan, and they were in terms of training relatively backward. Hence, they had to undergo a longer courses than their contemporaries from the towns. The most remarkable feature in the
character analysis of this officer corps, was that only one out of 61 officers was Shia and 2 were Christian, while the remaining 58 were Sunnis. This reflected the underprivileged position of the Shia community as a whole during the Ottoman rule. Remarkably, the new Iraqi cadets were being trained at renowned military academies abroad, still their superior qualifications were not sufficient to secure them a proportional share of senior military appointments. High officers positions remained almost exclusively in the hands of the Turkish trained officers. Out of the fifty cadets trained abroad in 1935 to 1936 for example, only two had been given senior appointments by October 1936.

Thus, those officers, who were to effect coup d'etat later that year belonged almost exclusively to the same stratum from which seven of Iraq’s eleven Prime Ministers since 1920 had come. That is to say, they all shared the common experience of having served in either the Ottoman regime or the Hijaz army, making the coup d'etat in effect a horizontal movement within the same arena. There was lack of enthusiasm to join army and the main cause attributed was absence of ‘national spirit’ and less payment for military job. Hence, a private soldier was earning almost double that of his counterpart in the army. To remove the dichotomy the king Faisal attempt to appeal to the sentiments of the population by giving units of the armed forces names of important figure in Arab history, and equalized the rates of pay in the levies with those of the army and to restrict recruitment to the levies to non Arabs.
In 1922, Ja’far al-Askari, the Minister of Defence appealed to the government to increase the armed forces and to introduce same form of conscription, but conscription demand met stiff opposition in the tribal areas, who were Britain’s traditional allies.

The settlement of the Mosul dispute with Turkey and the ratification of the Anglo-Iraqi-Turkish Agreement in July 1925 gave Iraqi politicians great confidence. Since then more attention was observed to domestic matters. Priority was given to the question of defence. The conscription debate surfaced in Iraq in March 1927. A draft of the National Defence Act was passed by the Council of Ministers, and in May the government placed the conscription bill before the Parliament but all efforts failed.

The situation continued unchecked until final signing of the Anglo-Iraqi Treaty of 1930, and the admission of Iraq into the League of Nations in October 1932. Following King Faisal visited Diwaniya and Karbala where his chief object was to endeavour to obtain support of the ‘Ulama and the Tribal Shaikhs for conscription. The Ulama refused to take side on the political question, but, in return for undertaking touching their personal and material interest, the king succeeded in obtaining from a number of tribal leaders a promise that they would not oppose the introduction of a system of compulsory service.

To those advocating the introduction of conscription, the loss of Faisal’s support was more than compensated by the well publicised successes of the Iraqi army in its first major
confrontation; the suppression of the Assyrian revolt of August 1933, enhanced the image of the armed forces in public estimation bringing fame and promotion to the commanders of the expedition. This undoubtedly encouraged the government after Faisal’s death. In Parliamentary session the national service law was passed by early 1934. By the end of 1935, the army’s total strength, which had stood less than 12,000 in 1933, had risen to 15,300; and on the eve of the first successful military coup d’etat in Iraq its strength rose to 20,000. At this time, army was organised into regiments of cavalry; six field battalions of artillery, five mountain battalions of artillery, and seven infantry brigades with Iraqi Air Force.

1. Structure:

The size of the Iraqi armed forces in 1978, was estimated at '242,000' conscription provides the bulk of the soldiers every year about 120,000(42). After serving either as a conscript or as a short term volunteer, the men was obliged to serve eight to ten years in the army. They were put in reserve were called through short notice to return to active duty. The reserve force was estimated at 250,000 men in 1978. Army man power grew significantly under army rule (1936-41 and 1968-68). It tripled in absolute terms in the twelve years of Ba’ath rule. During these years Iraqi army was two and half times of Algeria’s, army.

In the Middle East Iraq’s army was twice that of Egypt throughout 1970’s(43). The growth in armed forces achieved during successive period. The first armed expantion was followed by
Iraq's independence in 1932, up to the denouncement of pan Arabism. The second expansion in 1941, during the short war with Britain. The second, more moderate period of growth which spread between the short-lived government during Qassim's government (1958-1963) which put greater expenditures on military equipments and salary of the soldier. The third expansion began with the new government in 1968, during which military expansion was most rapid.

Iraq ranked, six in number in the world, in terms of military expenditures, valued 0.9, U.S. Dollars in billions comparable to USA 186.5, Soviet Union 137.6 and India 5.5. In terms percentage worldwise, Iraq represented 12.1, USA 29.3, Soviet Union 21.9 and India 0.9. Numerically Iraqi Armed Forces in 1984 totaled 643,000, with reserve of 75,000 against other world powers e.g. USA with 2,136 and Soviet Union 5115, and China 4,000, India 1,120 with reserve of USA 1,440, USSR 5,300 and China 5,000 (in thousands).

The enlisted number of armed forces as well as estimated reserves of Iraqi army approximated around a million "with four corps, six armoured divisions (each with two armoured and one mechanized brigade), and three mechanized divisions (each with one armoured and two or more mechanized brigade). There were also four infantry divisions and one republican guard armoured brigade, three special forces brigades, nine reserve brigades and ten 'popular army brigades'. The army was equipped with arms mainly 7.63 mm. AK-47 (Kalashnikovs), 7.62 mm. SKS (Simanovs),
7.63mm. R.P.D. (Degtyaryevs) 7.62mm SGM (Goryunavs), 12.7mm DSHK 38/46 (Detyareevs) 82mm. M-37 and RPG-7. The army had tanks mainly T-72, T-62, T-55, T-54. The navy consisted of 4,350 men located in Basra, UMQASR and FAO, its weaponary includeded ten combat vessels, eight mine warfare vessels, twelve gun boats, 28 patrol crafts, eight landing craft and two auxiliary ships and a few frigates, etc.

The air forces consisted of 38,000 servicemen. There were 20 military air fields in Iraq, the most important being, Basra, Habbaniyah, Kikuk, Mosul, which were equipped with 500cm bat aircrafts, 30 bombers, 52 transport aircrafts, 110 training liaison aircrafts and 320 helicopters of different kinds. The Iraqi air force was equipped with Soviet made Mig-21 and Mig-925, Mig-23, SU-20, Mira-geFls and Hawker Hunters, etc.

After 1958 revolution the Soviet Union replaced Britain as Iraq’s main supplier of arms. During 1972 to 1979. However, the percentage of Iraq’s military equipments supplied by Soviet Union declined from 95 to 63 per cent. As a consequence France became the major arms supplier. Since, the Iraqi government adopted a policy of diversifying the source of its arms, so huge deals were signed with many western countries, especially France, Italy and Brazil. In 1978, France supplied 18 Mirage Fl interceptors and 30 helicopters. In fact France had become leading west European supplier of arms to Iraq. France total arms export to Iraq reached $2,148 million in 1981, $1,925 million in 1982, and $2,000 million in 1983.
The Iraqi armed forces by Mid-1980, were larger in size and better in shaped than they had ever before. They are better equipped with modernized arms and their capacity rapidly improved.

Arms Build-up since 1970s:

From the year 1970 the Iraqi armed forces have been witnessed many qualitative and quantitative change in size, structure, arms supply.

It was Saudia Arbia money which helped to under write Iraq’s armed build-up during eight years of the Gulf war. The United States, Britain, France and Gulf states, Saudia Arabia saw Iraq as the main bastian to check the spread of extreme Shia fundamentalism, emanating from Tehran. By and large it in the Saudis interests to ensure that Iraq was able to sustain its war against Iran. Hence, to meet that end they together with Kuwait, provided Baghdad with financial support. However, they also opened up route through their countries for arms transport to Iraq. Thus Iraq could build a huge kingdom of armament, specially during the period of 1970’s and 1980’s. The Iraq-Iran war had provided Baghdad a clear-cut advantage to procure both the quality and quantity of modern weapons available abroad, which exceeded Iraq’s needs of legitimate defence necessity. With stockpiling modern arms Iraq developed regional hegemonisite tendencies to dominate in the region.
In the recent decades the proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Technology among Third World states have become most critical security concern for the entire civilized mankind. It was felt that unless the diffusion of nuclear technology is arrested, a world of possibly twenty or more nuclear weapon states may emerge by the year 2000. Apprehension was raised the prospects for world peace and security was becoming most bleak. In the Middle East, it was feared, it could be perhaps the most volatile region in the world. Strikingly, the increased political and military destabilization, and confrontation in the region. The potential for catastrophe was resulting from a nuclearized Middle East. Iraq was considered as one of the Arab countries in Middle East, who tried to balance Israel in the early 1970s. A Deputy of President Saddam Hussein had personally negotiated the purchase of the French reactors during his visit to Paris. The French had supplied sophisticated technology to Iraq’s nascent nuclear energy programme. Iraq’s steadily attempted to acquire advanced technology since 1970’s. It was speculated that Iraq was planning to build a bomb. This concern was raised in many capitals of the West. Although, Iraq, unlike Israel, did not have a nuclear weapon and was a signatory in a good standing to Nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

The hidden objective behind Iraq’s expansion of its Nuclear reactor was the gradual acquisition of a nuclear weapon capability by 1980. Iraq completed its first French built
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The hidden objective behind Iraq’s expansion of its Nuclear reactor was the gradual acquisition of a nuclear weapon capability by 1980. Iraq completed its first French built
nuclear reactor, O Sirak, named after O Siris, the Egyptian god of the death. The nuclear facility on the out skirts of Baghdad was protected with French made roland grand-to-air missiles. On June 7, 1981, eight Israeli F-16 Jet fighters and six F-15 fighters interceptors zoomed out of the setting sun and obliterated Iraq's most prized possessions. The planes covered the nuclear reactor's sandy brown concrete dome with bombs bearing delayed action fuses, designed to explode when they hit the base of the dome, so that the reactor care, buried deep in the ground, would be destroyed in less than a minute.

The announcement from the Isreall Prime minister's office on the afternoon of the attack was more subdued. On June 7, 1981, the Israeli air force launched a raid on the atomic reactor O Sirak, near Baghdad. The communique stated "our pilots carried out their mission fully, the reactor was destroyed and all our aircrafts returned safely to their base". This excise of course, have had deep profound diplomatic and political consequences. The United States spent the next months working with Iraq on various United Nations resolutions condemning Israel. Another reactor was destroyed in September 1980, eight days after Iraq, Iran War started in an air attack, by Iranian

According to U.N. estimates, Iraq was 16 to 24 months behind building atomic bomb. When the Gulf war started the Western intelligence sources believed that the Iraq might have atleast started. To build one but the inspectors were not able to find it. The inspectors of United Nations were worried about
outside suppliers, especially industrial nations, but nothing in the recent history suggested that the industrial nations would exercise such restraint.

In the Security Council of the UN decision was taken to destroy Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. This is a positive step in the direction to curb the spread of nuclear weapons in the region. It is speculated that Iraq has already acquired the knowledge and had a good installations with capability to review its nuclear programme. The responsibility to destroy the stockpile is assigned to the staff of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), under direction to reinforce by the United Nation. The special Commission (UNSCOM) has been charged with the identification, removal, and destruction of Iraq's weapons of mass production.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS:

The use of chemical weapons in the war between Iran and Iraq seemingly had encouraged a number of Middle East countries to produce chemical weapons, like Libya, Syria, Iran. One reason for production of this weapon had been that the political cost to Iraq of using chemical weapon in its war with Iran was very low. Surprisingly, there was little international protest against the use of chemical weapons by Iraq. Given the historic tensions in the Middle East, the proliferation of chemical weapons in this region is of particular concern in the context of international arms control regime, many of Arab statemen have argued that chemical weapons are the poor state's Atomic bomb.... the Arab
countries have no option but to rely upon their chemical weapons to deter Israel. Biological warfare involves use of living organisms especially disease producing agents, against the enemy his animal and his crops. They have several implications, e.g.

A : They are infectious and remain virulent long enough to be effective.
B : They remain stable during storage and transit.
C : They are economical enough to admit of production on a large scale.
D : They can be easily and effectively disseminated, but it is not easy to detect them or immunize ourselves against it.
E : They are capable of being introduced into the air or the sources of water supply through a concentrated liquid suspension or in the form of a dry powder.\(^{(21)}\)

In August and September 1988, some 100,000 Kurds fled Iraq because of a major Iraqi offensive against their guerrilla army in the North. The Kurds have been in rebellion against Baghdad. After the cease fire between Iran and Iraq the Iraqis had used poison gas on fleeing Kurds which was testified through photographs showed bodies with bluish faces. Earlier in the year, Iraq had used both mustard gas and nerve gas against Kurdish village of Halbaja. The U.S. government was slow to respond these events Iraq deliberately used the poison gas to put down internal ethnic dissent. The whole world wondered the massive human suffering most particularly in the Third World. The missile which Iraq successfully launched against Isreal and Saudia Arabia early
in the Gulf war, did not have chemical war heads, but Iraq may have plans to deliver chemical weapons by missiles\textsuperscript{22}.

Broadly speaking, there is no international agreement yet which bars a country from manufacturing chemicals weapons. The Geneva protocol of 1925 prohibits the use of chemical and bacteriological weapons in war, but not the development, production, possession or transfer of such weapons. The Bacteriological (biological) and Toxic Weapons Convention of 1972, prohibits the production, development, stocking and transfer of biological agents and toxins\textsuperscript{20} of type that have no justification for prophylactic and other protective purpose, as also weapons equipment, the means of delivery for agents or toxins. Yet, neither of those agreements provide for adequate means to verify compliance of this agreement.

In 1984, George Bush, then Vice-President, had presented a draft treaty for a comprehensive ban on chemical weapon. The U.S. proposal intended to prohibit the development, production, stockpiling, acquisition, retention, transfer, or use of chemical weapons. It further required the destruction of all existing chemical weapons stockpiles and production plants. It also sought a complete and verifiable global ban on such weapons. The verification of such weapons could be accomplished by a combination of national and international measures, including systematic international on site inspection and mandatory challenge inspection. An International Conference on Chemical Weapons was held in Paris in January, 1989. The representatives
of as many as 149 states participated. About 110 of those were parties to the Geneva protocol.

The conference was stormy, but there was little progress. Iraq insisted upon the right to manufacture chemical weapons until a global ban on such weapons was imposed. In 1989, President Bush stated that he wanted a treaty that would ban all chemical weapons within ten years of signing. He even offered to have 80 percent of the U.S. stockpile of chemical arms destroyed before agreement was reached on a world wide scale.

MISSILES AND OTHER ARMS:

For sheer political, strategic compulsions Iraq decided to obtain arms from the West. The government was fully aware that reliance on any one supplier would make it vulnerable and might lead to political blackmail. Hence, Baghdad had direct dealing with arms manufacturers, knowing very well that the arms producing countries had commercial expediency, and pursuit of profit, rather than ethics which had been governing factor in arms sales. With intention to assist in establishing contacts with manufacturers and suppliers in the West Iraq had enlisted businessmen resident abroad, as well as, of arms dealers in Egypt, Jordan and Saudi Arabia, etc.

The Iraqis not only improved their procurement network in the West but they also established such nexus with Communist countries in the east, such as China and North Korea, whose products were the main copies of Soviet weapons and equipment already in service with Iraqi forces.
By late 1970s China had established a place for itself amongst the arms suppliers in international market. Since then Beijing had played a prominent role in supplying arms in the Gulf region. The Chinese government owned a company known Norinco, which had a large number of subsidiaries. Norinco company supplied a wide range of Chinese manufactured products, covering small arms, artillery to fighter Air craft, and Haiying-2 silk war missiles of the type purchased and used by Iran and Iraq during the Gulf war.

The Chinese arms supply to Iraq during 1980s were considerable. During the period of 1981 to 1984, Beijing supplied 700T-59 and 660 T-69 Tanks, 650 type YW-531 armoured personnel carries and 720 types 59/1 130 mm artillery pieces. Between 1981 and 1987 China supplied F-6, F-7, and F-8 fighter Air crafts. Four B-6 bombers, were Chinese copies of the Soviet ‘Badger’, and seventy two Hai Ying-2 silkworm.

Once Iraq found it convenient to gain access to superior western equipments mainly because of extremely generous loans and credit terms from European banks, who in most cases were tacitly encouraged by their respective governments. Baghdad increasingly shifted away from Moscow and Beijing towards the West. Whilst tried hard to obtain Iraq still relied predominantly on Soviet-type weaponry, Baghdad, obtained most of its advanced equipment from the French\(^{22}\). France had begun supplying Iraq with arms since 1967 and continued until early 1990. By this time France had replaced China as Iraq’s second largest arms supplier.
after Soviet Union. The inventory of items supplied during thirteen years was lengthy in addition to mystere and Mirage fighters. It included a Louette, Gazelle, Puma and super fireland helicopters; Hot and Milan anti-tank missiles and Exocet AM-39 and MM-40 anti-ship missiles from Euro missiles; as well as AMX-lop mechanized combat vechiles and AMX-30 main battle tanks supplied by GIAT other French companies who have supplied weapons and equipment to Iraq include, Thompson Brandt, Matra, Luchaire, COFRAS, etc.

The French arms industry suppliers have always enjoyed full support from its government. The French government's apparent attitude - had been that arms suppliers were in the larger interest of national security. Since, they enable French government to afford to manufacture its own arsenal\(^{24}\).

Undoubtedly France had considered Iraq an important client and hence has provided preferential treatment. During the first half of 1980s French government had extended to Iraq the loans to purchase aircrafts and personnel for use in the conflict against Iran. On 26th May, 1983, a secret agreement was signed by President Francies Mitterrand, covering supply on lease of five super E Tendard aircrafts to Iraq.

At the beginning of June 1983, the Defence Minister, Charles Hernu signed an agreement with the manufacturers of the aircraft Dassault and Snecma. Subsequently, Iraqi pilotes and technicians underwent fourteen weeks of intensive training at an air base at Guers. On October, 1983, Iraq had received five super E tendard
Aircrafts from France along with a detachment of thirty French military personnel, including seven pilots and several technicians from Dassault. An acrospaliate was established base in Iraq to provide training and logistical support to the personnel of Iraqi army.

Dassulat, one of the Jewels in French arms industry's crown had supplied to Iraq air-crafts. Since 1976, it had sold thirty-two Mirage FIEQ and four FIBQ to Iraq. A second order for twenty eight FIEQ-4 and Three FIBQ was placed in the same year and all these air-crafts were delivered between 1980 and 1982. A third order for twenty Mirage FIEQ-5, equipped to carry exocet missiles were placed in 1981, and they were delivered between 1983 and 1985. At the same time, further eighteen FIEQ-band six F-18Q were ordered, delivery being planned to take place at intervals between 1987 and 1989.

However, in 1989, it was announced that the French had reached and agreement with Baghdad over reschuedling of Iraq's arms debt. This led to Britain entering the scene as competitor. The reschuedling of Iraq's debt repayment was from the French Ministry of Finance. Following an agreement was drawn upon due to be signed on 2nd August, 1990 the day Iraq invaded Kuwait. The French Technicians helped the Iraqis to upgrade some of their Scud missiles. By mid 1988, the missiles renamed Al-Hussein and Al-Abbas, were fitted with a sophisticated internal guidance system alleged to have been supplied by Sagem, despite the fact that France was a signatory with six other
industrialised nations such as U.S. Britain, West Germany, Italy, Canada and Japan who were signatories to the Missile Technology Control Regime, which intended to forbid the export of such equipments. This had obliged signatories to stop companies under their jurisdiction from suppling components for missiles possessing ranges of over three hundred miles and capable of carrying 500 Kg warheads. The maximum ranges of Al-Abbas and Al-Hussein were increased from two hundred to three hundred and five hundred miles respectively.

West Germany had also figured prominently amongst those western countries whose military equipments and sophisticated technology had found their way to Iraq over a period of eight years commencing in 1982. Roughly sixty eight West Germany companies reportedly had supplied equipments and had assisted in setting up arms production facilities in Iraq. All these indicated that Iraq was trying hard to become self sufficient in arms. The supply of pair crafts, weapons and equipments from Italy were also reported throughout the Gulf war. Between 1980 and 1988, Italy supplied Iraq with a large number of helicopters, which included two A-109, six-561 A-4, thirty Model-500C, fifty four model 500-D, five anti submarine a variants of the AB-812, twelve AB-412 Grillons and six AB-412, etc.

During the same period, Iraq also purchased naval weapon systems from Italy. These included ten Aspide/Albertrass SAML Launchers together with 294 Aspide surface to air missiles, and ten Atomat-21 launchers with sixty atomat - 2 anti ship missiles.
Italian companies. Also assisted Iraq in assembling its own ammunition production facilities. Norway's Dyno industries supplied Iraq with 1200 tons of explosive in 1988, Switzerland which remained normally a natural country too supplied arms to Iraq. It was reported that she supplied fifty Roland armoured personnel carriers during the period 1980-81. Moreover, Switzerland also sold a large number of training air crafts to the Iraqi air force.

However, the Austrian company consults had help Iraq designing 16 missile and chemical weapon research and development complexes at which missile boosters were tested in a supersonic with tunnel designed by another Austrian company[^25].

Moreover, the Dutch industry had also played its part in supplying conventional weapons between 1982 and 1985. The ammunition manufacturer Euromental reportedly had delivered 220,000 propelant charges and 30,000 155m.m. artillery shells. This supply was halted by the United Nations embargo.

British companies in 1982, signed a contract for the supply to Iraq of approximately 312.5 million worth of defence-related but non-lethal equipments, a large quantity of one thousand land rovers, constructed to military specification, were supplied together with a further sixty vehicles fitted with radio communications equipment and fifty range rovers at the cost of 28 million. During the early part of the Gulf War Britain continued to train military personnel from both Iraq and Iran. During the early 1960s, the United States sold Iraq $12.486 million worth of
arms and equipment including 75 mm artillery pieces, vehicles and radio communication equipments in late 1981. When the Iraq campaigned against Iran this ran into unexpected difficulties. As a consequence the urge was given in the United States for restoring relations with Iraq, which broken off in 1967, after the six day war.

During the previous years, Baghdad had signalled of its wish to re-establish links with America. A pro-Iraqi lobby in Washington had been trying in the past. On 25th November, 1984, full diplomatic relations were restored between the two countries. Two years prior to that, however, in 1982, sixty Hughes 300 C and 500 D helicopters were sold to Iraq. When delivered in 1983, these air crafts were apparently intended for use by the Iraqi Ministry of Communication and Transport. After this sale followed in 1985 another arms deal worth $27.4 million. The United States companies supplied twenty six MC Donnell Dougals MD-530 MF helicopters. In 1986 seventeen Bell 214 at helicopters, as a part of an order for a total of forty five air craft were delivered to Iraq.

Despite the fact that these air craft were sold in configuration, they would have required little or no modification for military use. One of Iraq's principal suppliers of arms had been Egypt. During the early part of the Gulf War, when the Soviet Union refused to continue supplying Iraq with arms, Iraq rushed to Cairo for help. In addition to providing Iraq with technical assistance for its missile, nuclear and chemical weapon
development programmes, Egypt had acted as a major supplier of arms during the beginning of the Gulf War. This was despite the absence of diplomatic relations between two countries which had broken off in 1977, when Egypt signed comp David agreement with Israel, and which was not resumed officially until November, 1987. In 1981 Iraqi import of arms from Egypt was estimated at $700 million further rising to $1.5 billion in 1982. By the end of the conflict Iraq paid to Egypt, an estimated $11 billion, with Iraq still owing the Egyptians over $3.5 billions in 1990. Most of the arms supplied to Iraq were American weapons assembled or manufactured under licence in Egypt. This was done with the full knowledge of Washington and after obtaining the relevant licences from America (27).

South America has also played a major part in the supply of conventional weapon system Iraq, such as Brazil, Chile and Argentina. During the war with Iran and subsequently until early 1990, Iraq was Brazil’s largest customer. On 1984, it was reported that the value of deliveries of Brazilian arms to Iraq had reached a level of $100 million per annum. The total value of deliveries over the last fourteen years had since been estimated at $3 billion.

The Brazilian company which had exported large quantities of its products to Iraq was Engesa. The company’s sales to Baghdad included 500 EE-11 Uratu armoured personnel carriers, 1026 EE-9 Cascavel armoured cars and 300 EE-3 Jararaca reconnaissance vehicles. The company also provided about fifty technical staffs, who were based in Iraq to provide after sales technical support.
In November 1986, an Iraqi delegation went to Brazil to negotiate a $2 billion contract for the supply of 300 Osario tanks, 300 Cascavel, Armoured cars, and unspecified quantity of Airbas astros II multiple rocket launchers. These last items, manufactured by Airbras aerospacial were subsequently used by Iraqi forces in the later stages of the Gulf war. The launchers supplied were 127mm, 180mm calibre version to fire thirty-two SS-30, sixteen SS-40 and four SS-60, rockets respectively and which have ranges of thirty five and sixty kilometres. The SS-30 carries had a high explosive warhead, whilst two larger rockets had cluster munition warheads, which contained dual effect anti personnel and anti armour bombs. During the period between 1980 to 1985 Iraq purchased seventy eight Astras II SS-30 rockets launchers. In addition, unspecified number of SS-30 rockets, thirteen Arose Guidance fire control radar, twenty Astros II SS-60 multiple rocket launchers, 960 SS-60 rockets and 100 cobra 2000 anti-tank guided weapons were also purchased by Iraq.

As a result of having lost the American and Egyptian airborne surveillance support which was proved until the end of the gulf war, Iraq was keen to replace it with its own capability as soon as possible. The decision was taken to develop satellite system which could providre Iraq with surveillance of Isreal, Syria and Iran as well as the mountainous region of northern Iraq, where Kurdish gurrilas were active. In this direction Iraq turned to Brazil and in particular to the Brazilian space agency, the instituto de pesquisas Espaciais (INPE) to negotiate for it.
The discussion took place between INPE and Iraq's scientific research centre (SRC), in addition contact was established with orbita space system, the Brazilian rocket manufacturer, for the proposed satellite. In orbit at height of 700Km. weighting 150kg. in addition to the satellite itself, Brazil also featured in the Iraqi missile programme, Aretired. Brazilian Airforce General named Hugo De Oliveria piva was contacted by Iraqi authority to produce an air-to-air missile called "Piramha". In October 1989, he took a team of engineer and technicians to the Saad-16 research and development centre at Mousal, where, in addition to their work on "Piramha" they carried out upgrading work on Scud-B missiles.

Chile's cordon industries was also reported to be building a 60 million factory for the manufacturing of fuses situated near Baghdad. Argentina also supplied weapons and equipments to Baghdad during the Gulf war in the form of vehicles, morters, rifles and ammunition. Reportedly there have been extensive links between South Africa and Iraq before the outbreak of Gulf War. During late 1970s and throughout 1980s, South Africa bought considerable amounts of acid from Iraq and stockpiled them. Because of its uncertainty over the outcome of the American Presidential elections in 1980, 1984 and 1988, Pretoria was nervous that a democratic President might increase sanction as a result of South African operations in Angola. From 1984 to 1986, South Africa supplied Iraq with considerable quantity of artillery ammunition, all the consignment through third parties namely, Jordan, Saudia Arabia, and Kuwait.
POWER RIVALRY ON REGIONAL LEVEL:

During the cold war era because of mutual distrust and rivalries there was rapidly increase among the developing country to have an arms build up to safeguard their national security. The bipolar international system had permitted states to acquire arms for their legitimate self defence. The arms build up in their Third World countries had taken a very sharp competitive dimension, when two states or group of nations entered into a virtual arms race for superiority or regional hegemony at regional level. The keen consent of arms race till recently had been by and large, European phenomenon which had resulted in two devastating World Wars.

This increasing arms race, had eluminated in mad nuclear arms race between two super-powers. Both the super-powers had to defined arms race within the broad spectrum of strategic rivalries globally. The developing countries devided in two camps joined this arms race either through joining friendly relations with arms producing countries or by acquiring minimum technological and industrial base sufficient for keeping the war machine in state of readiness for their national security by the support of militarily industrial powers. There was general competitive arms acquisition trends all over the world in every region. In pursuit of specific national objectives, like regional balance, security, prestige or to wage proxy wars the armed industries of both the blocs indiscriminately supplied arms to the Third World nations through sales, aid or transfer those lethal weapons to their client states.
The dynamics of regional arms race and acquisitions of arms had often resulted due to sheer domestic compulsions. Major outside powers influenced regional powers in the process of arms procurement from the West. The dumping of arms in the region was due to regional factors to preponderant role in the region.

**CAUSES OF ARMS RACE AMONG REGIONAL POWER:**

The competitive urge to acquire more and more weapons had been generally associated with number of domestic variables. It was closely related to the survival of the developing nations themselves. The basic pre-occupation of the ruling elites had remain establishing the specific type of political systems in order to acquire legitimacy from the people. Hypothetically, more a state feels insecure either from potential disintegrating forces from within the system itself, or from without, the more and more it was inclined to augment its military capability irrespective of the cost which the respective nation was to bear.

The practical need of having a strong military forces for a developing nation arises more on account of its being confronted seriously with the problem of self defence rather than on the mere consideration of international status which only some what economically advanced country can think of it to keep the internal system stable, cohesive and immune from disintegrating influences. A variety of measures to have arms have been prescribed according to the specific form of governments that has been established in each state. To have a powerful army is justified to protect internal security of the nation. The
question of defending the nation against any possible external aggression or threat of it have been legitimate alternative before such a nation. Either the nation that is being threatened with aggression decides possibility of unconditional surrender to the aggressor or it accepts the challenge to take up arms to defend itself the decision taken either way will have serious repercussions and risk involved in relation to the continued existence of the nation.

1. Internal Factors:

Majority of the developing countries are frequently threatened from within by forces, radical or revolutionary challenging the state and its socio-political systems itself. The tension created within the nation often contribute to internal pressures paving the way for acquiring weapons in order to suppress and crush dissident movements suspected of being a threat to the domination of traditional ruling class. This has been more true in cases of despotic, military dictatorship or monarchial regimes, which were caught between the forces of traditionalism and modernism. When ruling elite unresponsive to the surging national aspiration, tends to suppress the radicals by force of arms generally take places. The psychological alienation they feel or being subjected to force of arms help only to strengthen their determination to fight the oppressors on their own terms by acquiring arms from revolutionary and modern regimes in the neighbourhood. For example the Shi’ite dissidents in Iraq. It runs para-military training in Iran posed challenge to
Iraq. The internal conflict behaviour within developing nations, consist of developments such as demonstrations, riots, coups d'etat, guerrilla warfare, and national liberation movements.

2. Psychological Factor:

Another crucial factor responsible for the arms build-up in developing nations has been the psychological insecurity they have experienced as result of instability that ensured in the process of decentralization and national liberation. It was urgently felt that their security would be assured by creating an adequate defence structure that would ensure their territorial integrity and political independence. Hence, these states sought to acquire arms either through economic and military aid or through outright purchases. The increase in arms build-up became a constant source of psychological insecurity. When their mutual interests collided in conflicts each nation's strategy was to keep the other guessing as to its next moves and simultaneously try to convey the impression that it was powerful and indomitable.

3. Militarism Factor:

The countries which were subjected to military dictatorship have been guided by psychology of insecurity, invariably more prone to attack, and hence paid higher priority in the procurement of arms. The perpetrators of most of the coups d'etat in various parts of the world were associated with the military junta. They had their own perception of national interests and Hence, the urgency of military due to the responsibility that led
the military to view the state as the basic unit of political organization, to stress that continuing nature of the threat to the military security of the state and the continuing likelihood of war; to emphasize the magnitude and immediacy of the securing threats, to favour of strong, diverse and ready military forces; and to oppose the extension of state commitments and the involvement of the state in war except when victory is certain^{28}.

The impulse to have strong military force in Africa and Asian countries have been necessitated because of the weakness of civilian institutions and the imminent threat for collapse of parliamentary form of governments. Mostly in these regions the military officer developed a sense of public service and national guardianship. Hence, it was much easier for them to seize power than to exercise power in the large interest of people. It is very often true that countries ruled by the military Junta had constantly played with internal political disturbances and instability. The feeling of insecurity, the perception of a hostile environment facilitated them to have powerful army.

4. Environmental Factor:

The feeling of insecurity, the perception of a hostile environment prevailing as a result of authoritarianism, the general atmosphere of instability, mistrust, and fear would naturally make these ruling classes think of acquiring more arms, in order to escape from the problems of their own making, the military junta often have follow an adventurist policy of
attacking a neighbour in order to consolidate the internal forces and to forge a kind of national unity. This naturally have justified the rulers claims for acquisition of weapons:

5. **Economic Factor**

The economic backwardness of a military weak developing nations have never been seen as constraints on them to accumulate weapons. In the arms market of the West a military weak nation was encouraged to obtain armaments either free of cost or at least to have them purchased at economically reduced rate on easy conditions. In the process of dependence on industrialized states for arms requirements, very often recipient nations had become obliged to the supplier powerful nations in many ways which often easily hampered the recipients freedom to act in matters concerning their national interest. To fulfill wishes to foreign powers in order to secure more economic aid and armaments, this inevitably had led to a steady arms race in their region. Such an arms race have become a strong stimulant for the regional powers to transform their own antagonism and local disputes, into regional conflicts by attaching small neighbours.

6. **Regional Factors**

The nation states with diverse political systems, cultural differences, conflicting ideological and foreign policy objectives have interacted in a multiple of ways, giving rise to myriad patterns of inter state relationships. They have acted either in extreme co-operation or irreconciable antagonism. While, on the one heand, reciprocative behaviour serves to
provide nations a basis for peaceful co-existence and mutual respect in international affairs, hostile antagonism have paved the way gradually towards open conflicts between or among the nations. The peaceful and harmonious relations and co-existence of states have seldom been a reality. There remained possibility of actual threat to the security of a nation from a potential aggressor within the regional system itself.

A small nation, for examples, has subjected to perpetual fear if a big power or a developed nation in the neighbourhood, possessing disproportionate military strength became a source of either actual or potential threat to it. The threat might be directed to achieve various kind of pin pointed objectives, such as, outright annexation of a piece of territory, conversion of state into a satellite, imposition of an unpopular or puppet regime, encouragement to carry on subversive activities, open interference in the domestic affairs, and diplomatic or other pressures to follow a dependent foreign policy, etc. The unequal distribution of power in the present international system have provided conditions for every state to build up armaments to safeguard its national interest.

6-1. Conflict Potentials:

A constant and fairly consistent process of arms acquisition initiated by numerous states of a region have been necessitated by compulsions of diverse regional factors. They have been essentially centred on the crucial concept of conflicts. However, national interests not necessarily always be conflicting. But
most of times it did clash with the interests of other nation especially where vital national interests were involved if the pursuit of such objectives by one state is diametrically opposed to the interests of security of its neighbour, then the later would not hesitate to challenge the moves of the former, since unfriendly interactions among states are inherent in the present international system. The adoption of adequate measures of defence by every state against forces which might endanger national security is understandable.

The belligerent states have sought to extend the territorial limits of their sovereignty and to establish and impose upon the nations and peoples, upon whom they were in conflict. The political and economic order, which was not in the interest of the dominant party, adequate defence against aggressors was fairly well recognized and accepted as legitimate. The notion of adequate defence preparation, often tend to be guided by considerations based on extremely subjective perceptions and calculations. Hence, the states strived continuously to improve the quality and quantity of their arms to meet unforeseen challenges.

6.2. Hegemony:

The ambition to establish political and military hegemony in a region by infusing ethnic and racist controversies in inter-state relations, and playing up chauvinistic trans nationalism with its appeal to regional solidarity, have been the important causes of conflict formation causes leading to regional arms
race. The newly emerging nations or developing nations had often attempted to project inflated images of themselves to the other nations belonging to the same region, projecting the image of regional hegemonic power. One way of establishing hegemony has been to obtain a large inventory of military hardware. Therefore, it was natural that some of the developing nations were greatly preoccupied with the problem of augmenting their arms build-up qualitatively and quantitatively. A single state having hegemonic tendencies thus was able to destabilise and create tension in the region.

The hegemonial intentions appeared to be psychological imperatives behind adventurist policies based on mere self interest. But such tendencies were often not challenged. Still, there had been strong resistance from those nations, which could hope and manage to gain the support of any big power to initiate stiff counter measures against it. Equal exacerbating has been the ethnic-racist dimension which was pregnant with distortions in their state relations to the extent that ethnically related nations work out schemes to harass and if possible attempt to destroy other nations, populated predominantly by a different ethnic racial groups. A conflict situation created by the logic of ethnicism between states has been charged with a high degree of explosive emotion which has an inherent tendency to erupt with savage fury. Yet, still another interesting dimension has been the concept of transnationalism based on certain shared values.
In addition transnationalism, has been tinged with stigma of ethnic fanaticism and religious affinities. But if there occurred an armed conflict there was practical understanding among the member of states that if one among them was attacked by an aggressor or if a common danger looms over all of them, the entire group would undertake collective measures to face the aggressor or deal with the common enemy. Each nations in the group prepared to contribute whatever was necessary for common defence. As in a conflict victory over the enemy was victory for all and defeat was considered a misfortune for each one of them. A complex multi-lateral arms race begin when nations belonging to a transnational group perceive that a common enemy is to be fought.

The transnationalism has, however, remained an unpredictable political variable, especially when it was known that its contents were more supported by feelings than by principles in inter state relations.

iii. Territorial and Boundary Disputes:

Mere dispute among states generally involve and denote diverse competitive interests. Normally, actual use of force is absent in such disputes as they are generally concerned with incompatible political issues. Dispute can also arise out of border incidents, relating to territorial or boundry questions, etc.
Most of the territorial and boundary disputes concerning the developing nations have been colonial legacies, and they are of different genre from those described above. To suit their administrative purposes, the empire builders in the past, cut and divided kingdoms and principalities, which, most often changed the original boundary line beyond identification. Efforts are being made to find out the exact extent of their jurisdiction over territories, with decolonization after the Second World War. Many developing nations were locked up in interstate boundary and territorial disputes. Some even went to war on border questions. Hence, the natural course open to both sides would be further strengthen their forces by a spiral of arms race for another round of conflict over the same issue.

7. Extra-Regional Factors:

The extra-regional factors have been those specific determinants, which have a direct or indirect bearing on the course of arms build-up on which greatly depend the intensity and duration of regional arms race. However, compelling may be the domestic and regional factors in creating a climate for an arms race between two states. These extra-regional factors have been responsible for regional arms race.

7-1. Super Power Rivalry:

The intensify of regional arms race magnified disproportionatly when Superpowers took keen interest in supplying arms to the regional powers under one pretext or other. Armaments had become integral part of their global
strategy. Time and again it was argued that developing nations, even if they had the will to run an arms race, did not have the necessary pre-requisites, such as resources, industrial infrastructure, necessary technology or expertise to run such arms industry. The only possibility, therefore, by which they could think of enhancing their power position regionally was to embark on a serious competition with another in the region, to acquire weapons from developed nations, particularly the Superpowers. Hence, the major arms producing nations of the bipolar world have had definite role in the arms build-up of developing nations. The more Superpowers get themselves involved in the regional politics of developing nations, the greater was the possibility of a regional arms race occurring over there. The direct, as well as, indirect, involvement in regional politics appears to be 'a must' for the realization of their global objectives. The regional political conflicts were the levers through, which Superpowers rivalries were inducted into a region.

7-2. The Alliance System:

The alliance system worked out by the two Superpowers at the start of the cold war were themselves instrumental for the transfer of weapons in large scale to vulnerable regions. Under CENT and SEATO for example, some of the developing nations which were closely associated with them were provided with military assistance and economical aid. Moreover, it was a strong incentive for them to become partners in an alliance system and also to stimulate a regional arms race. The involvement of the
Superpowers directly or indirectly in Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Iraq, in Middle East enabled the local powers to acquire lethal weapons of masses destruction. Not only the wars fought in those places were bloodier than any one could have ever expected. It has been testified that wherever the developing country joined an alliance system after World War II, it had fuelled a regional arms race precipitating unstable socio-political conditions and resulting in local wars.

7-3. Limited Wars :

The Superpowers had common interest in maintaining the stability of centre as against the periphery. When their vital interests were deeply involved or their hegemony was challenged in the respective spheres of influence, they communicate to each other of their intentions in an effective manner by fighting proxy wars.

7-4. Armies Sales Competition :

Militarily developed nations were also engaged in a keen competition to sell their armaments in different parts of the world. The United States, the Soviet Union, France, and British mostly have had global arms trade everywhere in the world. After World War II, the chief considerations for supply of weapons was based on East-West divide and strategic rivalries between two power blocs. In both the blocs friends allies were eligible for military assistance and economic aid.
However, in the present time any nation can purchase weapons freely in the arms seller's market. The commercial consideration do not generally discriminate any customers, as lucrative business is the sole motive of the arms manufacturer industries. It is an open secret that major powers sell weapons to suit their own foreign policy as well as their self-interests, rather to benefit the economic recipient countries. In the past decades there open competition for this growing arms market in Middle East region. The US, UK, arms manufacturing companies tried hard through trade to sell arms in the region. So, the arms trade in this region had become an autonomous phenomenon. However, countries concerned were in the most cases capable to produce even some arms they wished to possesses. In majority of cases they purchased arms and ammunitions from military powers to which they were attached in alliance systems as a close ally for which they often paid invisible political or strategic price. Normally, when arms race was turned into conflicts in the region principal powers have had either direct or indirect involvement. This involvement could be either for traditional cause (historical) or for contemporary strategic advantages. For instance, the Middle East, particularly, the Persian Gulf region has been a cockpit of big power rivalries for several centuries.

More recently, the arms transfer policies of the big powers, feulled in encouraging militarisation of the Gulf area which manifested a more virulent syndrome of their naked involvement in the region. After the British decision in 1968 to withdraw from Middle East there emerged sharp contest among regional actors to
fill the vacuum. Remarkably both Iraq and Iran each of them have had their own claims for regional supremacy. Lately, Shah of Iran was surrogate par excellence to take care of US geo-strategic interest in the area. With fall of the Shah in 1979, the American policies got jolt and a set back in the Persian Gulf. Following Iraq utilized this opportunity to settle its old differences by attacking 'Iran'.

Iraq's aims in the Gulf region was intended with three inter-linked objectives. First, Baghdad wished to become a dominant power in the area. Secondly, it wanted greater say in regional affairs through a regional security structure, and, thirdly it wishes to nullify, or at least neutralize the influence of western powers particularly United State in the region.

In the war Iraq had strongly pleaded that Iran's ambition was to capture more lands from Arabs especially the island of Abu Musa and Tunb which belong to the United Arab Emirate, Baghdad further pleaded affirming its leadership role, adding that most Arabs were not showing sufficient awareness of Iran's expansionist goals in the Gulf.

During late 1970s, there came a sharp shifts in Iraq's foreign policy. Iraq shifted from leadership of Arab Asia to leadership of the Gulf Arabs. Iraq being the most progressive state of the region championed radical revolution throughout the Gulf region, when the Shah's of Iran vanished from the Iranian political scene, Iraq projected to emerge as the strongest
military power in the Gulf region. The very occupation of Kuwait by Iraq and its activity in the Gulf once again indicated instability which manifested in growing concern over the potential conflict among regional powers in the region. With rich experience in conducting war as well as, having sufficient amount of technocratic manpower with sound base of infrastructure Iraq wished to be most powerful country in the region.
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