According to the UN Charter, the Security Council has primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security. For decades, the situation in Iraq has presented complex and changing challenges to the Council, ranging from concerns about Iraq’s relations with its neighbors (during the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s and the 1990 Iraqi invasion of Kuwait); to Iraq’s development of weapons of mass destruction and attacks on Iraqi civilians (during the 1980s and 1990s); the 2003 invasion and occupation of Iraq by the US and UK, which resulted in an Iraqi insurgency and civil war; and the conflict between domestic political opponents, specifically the more recent actions by Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (ISIS) against the Iraqi government.

The situation in Iraq is far from stable. Unresolved ethnic tensions among Iraq’s main ethnic groups — the Shiites, Sunni, and Kurds — could exacerbate the present crisis or lead to further conflicts in the future. Finally, there are concerns about regional stability.

The situation within Iraq is also far from resolved from the point of view of Iraqi civilians, who suffered both under the authoritarian government of Saddam Hussein, in the eight years of war that began with the US invasion, and under the attacks by insurgents that followed the US’s withdrawal. Because the US and Iraqi governments refused for many years to release data on civilian casualties, the number of civilian deaths can only be estimated. The most reliable estimates are considered to be those of the Iraq Body Count (IBC), which bases its estimates on media reports. According to the IBC, between the US invasion in 2003 and August 2014, 127,500 to 143,000 civilians died from war-related violence. About 9,000 of these civilian deaths occurred after the US withdrawal in December 2011. The IBC estimates the total body count, including combatants, at 193,000.

Compared to the situation at the height of the insurgency and during the Saddam years, considerable progress has been made in Iraqi living standards. For example, electrical, sewage, and water services have been improved (though some of this progress has been reversed as a result of the ISIS insurgency), and oil production has returned to prewar levels. But many serious problems remain. The two most vexing are the continuation of violence and the refugee situation, which are closely related. Until the conflict between ISIS and the Iraqi government ends, many Iraqi civilians cannot return safely to their homes.

Today the Security Council faces the difficult task of assuring the sovereignty of the Iraqi government while assuring domestic human rights and regional stability. This is a tall order.

History and Current Events

Historically, various empires have ruled Iraq, including the Sumerian, Akkadian, Assyrian, Babylonian, Persian, Macedonian, Parthian, Arab, Ottoman, and British. At the end of World War I, control of Iraq passed from the Ottoman Empire located in contemporary Turkey to the British. In 1920, the League of Nations (the precursor to
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the United Nations) declared Iraq “a League of Nations mandate under UK administration.”

During the 1920s, the UK engaged in a military campaign against Iraqi independence forces, using an array of means to eliminate opposition to its continued control of the country, including firebombs and mustard gas.

Iraq did not attain independence until 1932. It was then a kingdom until 1958, when King Faisal II was assassinated and the monarchy was overthrown in a military coup led by Abd-al-Karim Qasim. When Qasim became prime minister, Iraq was declared a republic, but it continued to function as an authoritarian state. From 1958 to 1968, there were six coups or attempted revolts. In 1968, supporters of the Baath Party, including Saddam Hussein, overthrew the government. The Arab Baath Socialist Party, which means “renaissance” in Arabic, formed in the 1930s to advocate secular government and socialist economic policies to achieve Arab unity.

In 1979, after ten years as Iraq’s security chief, Saddam Hussein ousted the president and became the leader of Iraq. Hussein brought to regional relations the same ruthlessness he had become known for in domestic circles. In 1980, Iraq attacked Iran, where a Shiite Muslim revolution had overthrown the US-supported Shah. During the war, the US supported Iraq. The war lasted until 1988 and killed about 200,000 people on each side; hundreds of thousands more were wounded. During the war, Iraq used chemical weapons on Iranian soldiers. The Iran-Iraq war ended when Iran accepted UN Security Council Resolution 598, which called for a ceasefire.

In 1988, Hussein used airplanes to shell Kurds in the Iraqi village of Halabja with poison gas, killing 5,000 and wounding 10,000. By 2002, the town had experienced a significant increase in cancer, birth defects, stillborn babies and miscarriages. The international community did little to respond.

On August 2, 1990, Iraq invaded and occupied Kuwait. The UN Security Council immediately condemned the attack. In Resolution 660, the SC called for Iraq’s full and immediate withdrawal from Kuwait and imposed economic sanctions. In November of 1990, the UN authorized the states cooperating with Kuwait, known as the coalition forces, to use “all necessary means” to uphold Resolution 660. The Gulf War began when US-led coalition forces began aerial bombing of Iraq in Operation Desert Storm. By February 1991, Kuwait was liberated, and the SC began passing resolutions to eliminate Iraqi WMD programs.
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Through all of this, plus 10 years of Security Council sanctions, Hussein managed to hold the state of Iraq together. Deliberately fashioned by the British to be weak, the Iraqi population is 32-37% Sunni Muslim, 60-65% Shiite Muslim, and 15-20%Kurd. In addition, there are several small ethnic and religious minorities, such as Christians and Hindus. In recent weeks, members of the Yazidi religion have become particularly vulnerable. Under Saddam, Sunnis were favored. Since the US invasion in 2003, Shiites have dominated, reflecting their majority status.

The Security Council’s (SC) relationship with Iraq, via resolutions, dates back to the Iran-Iraq war and Iraq’s use of chemical weapons during that conflict. In 1988, in Resolution 612 the Security Council condemned the use of chemical weapons, demanded Iraq to cease the practice immediately, and warned Iraq that the Council would remain vigilant. Over the next several decades, the majority of SC resolutions regarding Iraq were related to the country’s development of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, which are together often referred to as weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

On August 6, 1990, the UN Security Council imposed comprehensive economic sanctions against Iraq after the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. After the Gulf War, the Council maintained the sanctions to press Iraq into disarmament and other goals. According to the Gulf War cease-fire conditions, Iraq promised to destroy all of its WMD, not to develop WMD, and to agree to on-site inspections of its military facilities. Two organizations monitored Iraq’s compliance with the provisions, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which monitors compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and the UN Monitoring and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC), established solely to monitor the situation in Iraq. From 1991 to 2003, the IAEA and UNMOVIC repeatedly told the Council that Iraq had declared an end to its biological, chemical, and nuclear programs and that no evidence of such programs had been found, but that Iraq was unwilling to grant inspectors unlimited access.

In November 2002, the Security Council passed S/RES/1441, which gave Iraq a final chance to comply with its disarmament promises. The resolution stated that Saddam Hussein had to fully disclose and destroy Iraq’s WMD and submit to all efforts to verify his compliance or face severe consequences.
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In December 2002, UN weapons inspectors were once again in Iraq looking for WMD. In January 2003, UN Weapons Inspector Dr. Hans Blix said the Iraqi government “at times has hindered UN officials in their work” but had also “cooperated a great deal on procedural matters, such as access to sites within Iraq.” Dr. Blix and Mohamed El Baradei, then head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, said they had found no evidence that Iraq had revived its nuclear program since the Gulf War in the 1990s. The inspectors recommended that their investigation be allowed to continue and “run its natural course.” The US was less impressed by Iraq’s minor concessions to UN inspectors and responded by saying, “nothing we have heard…gives us hope that Iraq intends to fully comply with resolution 1441 or any of the 16 resolutions that preceded it over the last 12 years.”

Concern that Iraq had not ended its WMD program was part of the reason the US and UK invaded Iraq in 2003. The US noted several reasons for the invasion, but according to Paul Wolfowitz, “… the one issue that everyone could agree on which was weapons of mass destruction as the core reason.”

The war began on March 19, 2003, when “President George W. Bush ordered missiles fired at a bunker in Baghdad where he believed that Saddam Hussein was hiding.” Unlike the Gulf War in 1991, the US and UK invaded Iraq without Security Council approval. France, Russia and Germany, argued that Iraq’s compliance was satisfactory and that invading Iraq without Security Council support would be a violation of violation of international law. The US responded by saying that allowing Iraq to be in violation of “umpteen” SC resolutions, threats and final warnings, was a “queer way to uphold global order.”

No evidence of biological, chemical, or nuclear programs was found, either during or after the invasion. When the US captured and interrogated Hussein and other Iraqi officials, the US Defense Department learned that Iraq had indeed eliminated its nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons programs in 1991 but wanted to create the sense that the programs remained in force to deter Iran and other hostile states from attacking Iraq.

After the US invasion of Iraq in May 2003, the UN Security Council passed S/RES/1483, which recognized the US and the UK as occupying powers under international law. The UK and US sought this resolution to legitimize their occupation both internationally and within Iraq. The other members of the Council agreed to it in exchange for US and UK promises to abide by international law on occupations, for example by providing public order and agreeing not to profit from Iraq’s natural resources.

US Withdrawal and Iraqi Crisis
On January 1, 2009, the US transferred sovereignty to the new Iraqi government upon the negotiation of a security agreement. Following the agreement, US-led forces were authorized to conduct military operations only at the


request of the Iraqi government.\textsuperscript{32} US occupation and military presence in Iraq ended officially in December 2011 when the US pulled the last of its troops from Iraq.\textsuperscript{33}

According to Ned Parker, Baghdad Bureau Chief for Reuters, the serious problems facing Iraq continued following the US withdrawal. Iraq still lacked basic services such as clean reliable electricity, clean water, and adequate healthcare. Nor had Iraq developed a strong democracy as the US had hoped. Political corruption and sectarian violence between domestic political groups (including violent suppression by the ruling Shiites) brought Iraq to the brink of becoming a failed state. Parker notes these problems persisted because the US’s goals were jeopardized from day one of the U.S. occupation by a series of debilitating blunders: not sending enough U.S. forces to secure the country, dissolving the old Iraqi military, and allowing a draconian purge of Baath Party members from civilian ministries... [R]ather than concentrat[ing] on shoring up democratic principles, as it had during the [2007 troop] surge. Washington has instead focused on securing its long-term strategic relationship with Baghdad, especially with the prime minister, so that it could more easily withdraw U.S. forces. In the process, the United States failed to capitalize on the gains of the U.S. troop surge -- the Iraqi people's renunciation of religious extremists and desire for normalcy -- thereby damaging the chances that a unified, nonsectarian government could emerge.\textsuperscript{34}

In the years after the US withdrawal, insurgents carried out a number of bombings and other attacks in Iraq, particularly against the Shiite population. In January 2012 alone, bombings and other attacks killed 200 Iraqi civilians. In December 2012, sectarian violence intensified. As the conflict in Syria continued, Sunni Muslims began to protest against the Shia-led Iraqi government. The protesters claimed that the government had marginalized them. Clashes broke out in several cities in April 2013 after the Iraqi government raided a protest camp in the town of Hawija, killing approximately 50 people. This resulted in government clashes with insurgents in several other cities, and civilian deaths rose to nearly 1,000 per month, levels of civilian death that had not occurred since 2008.\textsuperscript{35}

In September 2013, the (then) Al-Qaeda affiliate, Islamic State in Iraq and Syria (formerly Al Qaeda in Iraq), one of the rebel groups fighting in Syria, began a bombing campaign in the Iraqi-Kurdistan capital of Irbil. Although ISIS had performed attacks in Iraq for a decade, the confluence of the US withdrawal and regional instability due to the Syrian conflict allowed ISIS to accelerate attacks.\textsuperscript{36} ISIS claimed that the bombings were retaliation for Iraqi-Kurdish attacks on rebels in Syria. Months of violence in the predominantly Sunni region of Anbar ensued before ISIS took control of the cities of Fallujah and Ramadi in January 2014. The movement has been particularly successful in the Sunni region, where Sunni leaders have supported the movement, and people have resented exclusion from participation in the primarily Shiite government. In June 2014, ISIS rebels moved outside of Anbar to capture the city of Mosul, as well as Iraq’s largest oil refinery in Baiji.\textsuperscript{37}
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ISIS aims to establish an Islamic state with borders that comprises much of the current Syrian and Iraqi territory. ISIS intends for the borders to reflect those of the Ottoman Empire. Already, the group “has taken over a stretch of territory the size of Jordan” (or larger than Minnesota), which has “helped it pick up more recruits, weapons, and money...[I]t has gone from terrorist group to terrorist army.” 35 The group plans to use its growing size and capabilities to expand its control to locations such as Iraq’s capital, Baghdad. 36

ISIS’s plans extend beyond the Middle East, though. Not only has it implemented attacks in four Middle-Eastern states (Iraq, Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon), but experts have linked it to three attacks and several assassination attempts in Europe, as well as efforts to smuggle chemical weapons into Western states, including the US and Canada. According to Barak Mendelson, ISIS is “even less compromising” than its former affiliate, Al Qaeda. 40 In addition the insurgency could have the potential to destabilize the region further (similar to the Syrian conflict’s influence on Iraq). Specifically, advancement by ISIS into eastern Iraq would put Sunnis on the border of Iran, inciting conflicts on the states’ border, as Iran has traditionally fought to place or keep Shiites in power in Iraq. 41

In addition to efforts by the Iraqi government to resist the ISIS insurgency, several domestic groups have initiated resistance movements. Kurdish forces in the north, known as the peshmegra, have launched a resistance against the ISIS under the authority of the semi-autonomous Kurdish government. In August 2014, the Iraqi government agreed to work with Kurds, who have sought greater independence from Iraq for years, in the north to battle the Sunni extremists. 42 Grand Ayatollah Ali al-Sistani, a Shiite religious leader also called on his followers to “take up arms” against the Sunni-led ISIS. His followers responded by reinforcing the front lines and entry points to Baghdad, indicating a reemerging confrontation between Sunnis and Shiites. 43

The new war has become increasingly lethal since it began. In June and July 2014, civilian deaths exceeded 1,000 per month; there were 1531 civilian casualties in June and 1186 in July. 44 These represented levels of violence significantly greater than the already high levels reported in April and May 2013, as noted above.

In addition to casualties resulting directly or indirectly as a result of conflict, ISIS has executed a number of soldiers and civilians outside of conflict. According to UN High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay,

[b]ased on corroborated reports from a number of sources, it appears that hundreds of non-combatant men were summarily executed over the past five days, including surrendered or captured soldiers, military conscripts, police and others associated with the Government... this apparently systematic series of cold-blooded executions... almost certainly amounts to war crimes. The provocative language used by [ISIS]... is
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clearly intended to sow further chaos and bloodshed in the country. This new wave of fighting and extreme violence is very dangerous, not just to Iraq but to the entire region.\(^{45}\)

According to the UN, these executions comprise only one example of a broader list of human rights violations performed by ISIS, and humanitarian issues within Iraq. Other issues include the abduction, sexual assault of, and potential genocide of ethnic, cultural, and religious groups, such as the Yazidi, Shabak, Turkomen, and Christians, carried out by ISIS; the abduction and rape of women, boys (who ISIS has used as soldiers), and girls (who ISIS has sold as slaves and sexually abused); and 20,000-50,000 people trapped without food and water on Mount Sinjar.\(^{46}\)

As of August 2014, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) states that 400,000 Iraqis were refugees in other countries, and another 1 million Iraqis were displaced within Iraq (i.e. became Internally Displaced Persons, or IDPs). Jordan and Syria host the largest number of Iraqi refugees.\(^{47}\) Other sources within the UN have placed the number of IDPs resulting from the conflict slightly higher at 1.2 million people.\(^{48}\) Organizations such as the UNHCR have also raised concern over refugees from other countries, particularly Syrians that fled the Syrian war to the Iraqi Anbar province, which could suffer from further violence within Iraq as the conflict continues.\(^{49}\)

International Response

Several States have intervened to prevent further violence and humanitarian issues in the Iraqi conflict. In June 2014, Iran sent several thousand forces from its revolutionary guard to assist with the resistance against the ISIS.\(^{50}\) The US has contributed by providing humanitarian aid (e.g. the provision of food and water to civilians trapped on Mount Sinjar) and performing airstrikes in regions controlled by ISIS. As of August 2014, the US has not sent ground troops to Iraq, and states that it has no intention of sending troops. According to President Obama, the bombings and aid drops could “last months,” as they (and creating an inclusive government in which Sunnis “feel connected to and well served by a national government”) are a “long-term project.”\(^{51}\) The bombings have, however, already bolstered Iraq’s fight against ISIS, as it has allowed Kurdish militias in the North to retake the towns of Gwer and Mahmour.\(^{52}\) Finally, the UK has committed more than $5 million in humanitarian aid to Iraqs.\(^{53}\)
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Michael O’Hanlon, Research Director at Foreign Policy, argues that US air strikes will not be enough. According to O’Hanlon, the US may push ISIS back from assaults on Kurds in the northeast and Shiites in the southeast easily, but the US will need to eliminate ISIS from western Sunni territories, where they are more entrenched due to public support. O’Hanlon suggests that ground troops, through either small operations forces or large groups of militants will be necessary to accomplish this. This also suggests that if UN states hope to resolve the immediate crisis, particularly if the US decides not to take further action, it will require the Security Council or UN Member States to prevent further incursions from ISIS and potentially push the group out of Iraq.

To achieve long-term stability, states will also need to ensure a cooperative and inclusive Iraqi government. The US has called on Iraq to create a more inclusive government to assuage sectarian violence. Ned Parker argues, however, that the US has had difficulty persuading the Iraqi government to take actions that could have avoided or reduced the impact of the conflict. According to Parker, the US lost its influence in Iraq after its withdrawal. Thus, when it suggested that Iraq try to include other ethnic sects into the government and military, particularly the Sunnis, the US failed to convince Iraq and decrease the potential for conflict. Thus, not only will it be difficult for the US to convince Iraq not to exacerbate the conflict, but it may not have the ability to dissuade Iraq from actions that could cause future sectarian violence even if the current crisis is abated or resolved.

Previous and Possible Security Council Work on This Topic

On August 14, 2003, the UN Security Council passed S/RES/1500, which created the United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) to assist the Iraqi people. UNAMI’s mandate was to “play a leading role” in negotiations to establish a new government, including drafting a constitution and determining a process for elections. In addition, UNAMI was to advise the Iraqi government on “reconstruction, development, and humanitarian assistance; … human rights, national reconciliation, and judicial and legal reform.”

On August 19, 2003, five days after UNAMI was authorized, Special Representative Viera de Mello, 14 other UN officials, and seven civilians were killed in a terrorist attack on UN headquarters in Baghdad. After a subsequent attack in September 2003, the UN pulled out of Iraq. Nevertheless, the Security Council repeatedly reauthorized UNAMI when its annual mandates expired. Until 2007, UNAMI operated from Jordan.
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On July 30, 2014, the Security Council passed resolution 2169, which extended the mandate of UNAMI. In contrast to previous mandate extensions, though, the 2014 renewal of UNAMI made specific references to the need of the force to assist the Iraqi government in preventing the continued insurgency of ISIS. It specifically “express[ed] grave concern at the current security situation in Iraq as a result of large-scale offensive carried out by terrorist groups, in particular the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) [also known as ISIS],” but otherwise changed the mandate of UNAMI little.62

As of August 2014, UNAMI employed 170 international staff and 420 Iraqis and worked in all 18 provinces of Iraq to coordinate the activities of UN organizations and agencies, including the UNHCR, the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF), and the UN Development Programme (UNDP).63

With the withdrawal of US military forces and the continuance of sectarian conflict, the Security Council must decide what its role in Iraq will be and how it can ensure peace and security for Iraq and its neighbors. Doing so will require balancing the human rights and humanitarian needs of the Iraqi people with the need for the Iraqi government to obtain compliance and achieve stability and sovereignty. In addition, the Iraqi military must be strengthened without frightening Iraq’s neighbors: Iran, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Syria, and Turkey.

The most immediate challenges involve training Iraqi security forces, preventing further insurgent attacks and expansion, and resolving issues around creating a more inclusive government to prevent increased sectarian tensions. Elections are especially important for the last challenge. The elections in 2005, for instance, were boycotted by Sunni Arabs and resulted in easy victories for the Shiite and Kurdish candidates. Since the 2003 invasion, when Sunnis were ousted from power by the fall of Hussein and lost jobs during the US’s implementation of “de-Baathification” in the civilian and military bureaucracies, the majority of insurgent fighters have been Sunni.64 Thus electoral participation by Sunnis and the creation of a coalition government including Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds, would signal improvement in the civil war. Although this result would be desirable, it is by no means assured. It could be derailed by the fears of Iraqi Sunnis that the Shiite majority will not respect their rights, by the desire of insurgents for oil revenues, and by the financial strength of the insurgency.65

Thus far in 2014, the Security Council has passed two resolutions on Iraq. The first is the aforementioned extension of the UNAMI mandate. The second was Resolution 2170, passed on 15 August 2014, which primarily focuses on ISIS financing, and places sanctions on six individuals known to have affiliations with the organization.66 Still, neither resolution fully or specifically addresses the broader issues of Iraqi instability due to ISIS attacks, sectarian violence and political exclusion, and humanitarian issues. Even when the UNAMI mandate does address these issues, it may not have the personnel or capabilities to adequately address these issues.

Conclusion

Once again the situation in Iraq poses complex challenges to the Security Council. Today the challenge is not restraining the power of an authoritarian leader, but preventing unstable military and political movements and encouraging Shiites, Sunnis, and Kurds to live together in a democratic state. If this cannot be achieved, recurring civil war among the factions is possible. What can the Council do to improve Iraqi security, while respecting the interests of the US and other Council members, the sovereignty of the Iraqi government, and the Iraqi sects?


In developing your country’s position on this issue, consider the following questions:
-- What relationship does your country have with Iraq? What was its position on the US invasion of Iraq?
-- How has your country been affected by the war in Iraq from 2003 to the present?
-- What direct or indirect effects has the war with ISIS, or could the war with ISIS, have on your country?
-- What role has your country played in previous UN resolutions and programs in Iraq?
-- What precedents and principles should the Security Council consider in addressing the situation in Iraq?
-- What can and should the Security Council do to ensure that Iraq is peaceful and secure? Could the Security Council, for example, broaden the mandate and purpose of UNAMI, or approve a UN coalition of forces to defend or even push ISIS out of Iraq?
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This Op-ed by two Sunni political elites claims ISIS does not represent the views of Sunnis (or Muslims) more broadly, and Sunnis see ISIS as the “lesser of two evils” when compared with the Iraqi government.


This “explainer” by the news website Vox.com provides an updated summary of ISIS, its role in the conflict in Syria and Iraq, and the difficulty of containing them.


This article by Ned Parker discusses Iraq after the US left, including political tensions and the policies of Prime Minister al-Malaki. Also see Parker’s interview with the Council on Foreign Relations, available at [http://www.cfr.org/iraq/historic-iraq-election-brings-new-uncertainties/p32873](http://www.cfr.org/iraq/historic-iraq-election-brings-new-uncertainties/p32873).


A chronology of recent events in Iraq, as well as links to full articles regarding the summaries.


This website provides information on the UN’s work in Iraq, including the work carried out by UNAMI and authorized by the Security Council. It is an excellent source for understanding the many challenges facing Iraq today, as well as understanding UNAMI’s current work and mandate.


This site summarizes the situation facing Iraqi refugees and internally-displaced persons. The UNHCR site is a good source for ideas about how the UN could help these people return to their homes. It also details the challenges faced by host countries such as Jordan and Syria.


This website provides links to all UN press releases summarizing Security Council discussions on Iraq since 2006. It is a good source for information on your country’s position, as well as recommendations for improving the situation in Iraq.