

Example of gulf war research paper

[Sociology](#), [Violence](#)



The demonized biased supportive nature of Gulf War is often seen in books and interviews with scholars published internationally. However, the debate demands an unbiased background that gives a person living in 21st century the eyes to understand the before and after of the Gulf War era. The chain of essential events is long and begins from the very start of 20th century but it is better to start with the political relations between the two main stakeholders, U. S and Iraq. The United States of America knew about the strength of the relationship between Iraq and Soviet Union in the Cold War and this deep relationship was behind a lot of decisions made by the American government during the Gulf-War era. The birth of ' State Sponsor Terrorism' in international media was not before an obvious appearance of private military contractors and unregistered individuals working in favor of the government such as Abu Nidal. Iraq, after making it to the list State Sponsors of terrorism by U. S, was in a major regional war with Iran. The diplomatic unofficial support for Iraq using ' non-military' aircrafts and a lot of weapons and men made U. S pro-Iraqi for the time being which led to a successful war for Iraq. By the end of the Iran-Iraq war, Iraq was in heavy debts from Saudi-Arabia and Kuwait. These debts were asked to be forgotten because of the international ties between the three Muslim states but were denied and rejected firmly by Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and Daulat ul Kuwait. The sense of belonging to any particular state or empire has been an important factor for the start of a lot of wars in history. The enmity between the states brought forth a lot of questions challenging the Kuwait's belonging to Ottoman Empire which rightfully fell under Iraqi control (Scales). The state-structure was disturbed and the scattered government was incapable

of making wise decisions under Saddam Husain's leadership, eventually lead to toughen its unauthorized military with an intention to seize and declare Kuwaiti territory. In 1986, the economic warfare consisting of legal implications and accusations of Oil trade between Iraq and Saudi-Arab was at its peak. The world saw the destruction of Iran-Iraq war and was frozen to unbalanced reactions of Saddam's government. The development of this war had an impact on thousands of lives of not only retired soldiers but millions of innocent refugees and civilians of the involved states. Iraqi establishment became a prominent international stress for U. N after carrying out ill-treatment towards refugees including the ruthless killing of Farzad Bazoft. Iraq was now removed from the international support because of its small but regular war crimes; United states of America's help to Iraq was stopped immediately after a few important events that took place. Mutual policy makers were unofficially working on Iraq's compromise on international peace after Iraq openly threatened Kuwait to solve the issue with military warfare. Kuwait set talks with Iran and US for their support in the predictable yet unwanted war (Blumberg and French).

Talks were now being openly held among the involved parties allowing the world to see nature and purpose of Iraqi establishment. Saddam's statement, in a meeting with April Glaspie, was quite clear about what Iraq was going to do;

" So what can it mean when America says it will now protect its friends? It can only mean prejudice against Iraq. This stance plus maneuvers and statements which have been made has encouraged the UAE and Kuwait to disregard Iraqi rights. If you use pressure, we will deploy pressure and force.

We know that you can harm us although we do not threaten you. But we too can harm you. Everyone can cause harm according to their ability and their size. We cannot come all the way to you in the United States, but individual Arabs may reach you. We do not place America among the enemies. We place it where we want our friends to be and we try to be friends. But repeated American statements last year made it apparent that America did not regard us as friends." (New York Times)

On August 2nd 1990, Iraq bombed the capital of Kuwait, Kuwait city. The Iraqi army, which was fourth largest at the time, carried out a highly planned and programmed divided-in-two attack on the city seizing almost instantly. It took only 2 days to capture Kuwait city for Iraqi commandos. Gulf War was intense in a sense of killing of innocent civilians, capturing of Royal Residence, shame for Kuwait and the helplessness of international community to support the actions of Iraq of time. The Borders of Kuwait intersecting the plains of Egypt were dripping with blood, fled soldiers or refugees. People of Kuwait were mentally scarred by this defeat for the rest of their lives. A lot of soldiers took refuge in Saudi Arab despite the failed contract with the international community and inefficacy of United States of America to protect its' so called ' Friend'. Gulf War was not just about these two days, it was more about definition of territories and inefficiency of the grand alliance established by UN to completely cancel out the purpose of Iraqi government. This War could have not ended this way because internationalism involved was of no small importance. In January 1991, U. S started its aerial bombing campaign. This was not just one-fold attacks since Iraq was able to sufficiently impact the situation by carrying out missile

strikes on Israel and Saudi Arab and later invading them. It had been a year U. S was under pressure to maintain its strength in the Kuwait region. Hitting when iron was hot, United States of America liberated Kuwait in February 1991. Now was the time when Iraq's expansion into the Saudi region was brought down to a close by out-powering them on the battlefield. The sudden shift of power from Iraqi forces to Coalition was shocking but highly planned. The countries in coalition finally were enter into Iraq for the sake of eliminating the causes from the grass root level. The captured land was subjected to two-sided talks between the coalition countries and Iraq which later proved to be successful in 2004.

The Gulf-War had a lot of costs on the international community. The role of media was essentially noticeable since it was evolving during the modern era. From the Sandy warfare in the Arabian deserts to above ground bombing on Iraqi lands the world still regrets the unavailability of war. World was now more welcoming towards tougher situations despite the unimaginable loss and casualties during the war because the sanctions were more defined and United Nations Organization developed substitute organizations for specifically the refugees in the Saudi Arab, especially Egypt, and Kuwait. Iraqi population was promised ceasefire and safety during and after the War. The identification of the international criminals such as Saddam Husain is still believed to be more of a independent criteria. The Major Oil spill carried out by Iraq is an evidence of the existing anger with the coalition despite of certain measures decided by UN in favor of Iraq itself. It is still safe to say that agreements will not work because removing a criminal alone can never lead to elimination of crime. At the end of the day

there are some moral necessities that international community and every sovereign government needs to maintain for the sake of its contract/promise with ' people'. The idiosyncrasy of a war like this comprises of multiple symptoms which may include a war of the ideology since it was the most influential war after the Second World War. The fascinating fact about the absence of Soviet power in the act of gulf war has been a hub attention for writers for a long time. Summarizing the war without mentioning the imminent use of chemical weapons would be unfair; chemical warfare was later a subject requiring attention of several other nations to decide some important factors regarding their use. On a statistical scale, gulf war was the reason for loss of 10000 Kuwaitis. Similar figure goes for Iraqi combatants except 75000 Iraqi military personal were wounded badly. Apart from analyzing the defeat or win for any one ' side' would be criminal for any writer to justify but the fact that the blood spill was worth of achieving the purpose? Was the mandate of the coalition protected at the end of the day? Was the peace purpose of UN fulfilled? Questions one must answer before giving a ruling.

References

Blumberg, Herbert H, and Christopher C French. The Persian Gulf War.

Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1994. Print.

New York Times,. 'CONFRONTATION IN THE GULF; Excerpts From Iraqi

Document On Meeting With U. S. Envoy'. 1990. Web. 8 Dec. 2014.

Scales, Robert H. Certain Victory. Fort Leavenworth, Kan.: U. S. Army

Command and General Staff College Press, 1994. Print.

The Interview

<https://assignbuster.com/example-of-gulf-war-research-paper/>

Interviewer: Hello, Sir. What is your name, age and where were you during the Gulf War?

Interviewee: My name is Abdul, I am sixty years old and I was in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Interviewer: Were you comfortable and did you have a reasonable standard of living during and after the war?

Interviewee: Every war has its toll on the citizens of the state, however, living in Saudi Arabia, life continued to be the same. The living standards weren't affected and life remained pretty much the same in terms of living standard. If somebody was in the service, he was getting paid for it and hence improving the living standards of his family.

Interviewer: What effect did the war have on your physical or mental health?

Interviewee: I was worried, generally. Many people and youngsters I knew had registered for service and that was worrying not only for me but also for the people around me. I would often see reports on Television and worry about the lives of the people involved in this war. It was stressing. I couldn't sleep sometimes which had some adverse effects on my health. I grew a bit weaker over the years.

Interviewer: Did you think it was right for America to be at war?

Interviewee: Of course it was. A country was threatening to take over another country, and I believe as an international super power it was an obligation on the part of America to intervene in such actions. Saddam Hussein was threatening to take over Kuwait. One had to put a stop to it and U. S with its allies did it, took the first step.

Interviewer: How did you feel about war news from television?

Interviewee: The war was covered massively. Some news reports were faked; some were subjective while others merely pondered over the consequences of the war. It is hard to discern between a good coverage and a bad coverage. It was all the same to me.

Interviewer: How did you feel about antiwar protests?

Interviewee: I was confused. One hand this war was causing collateral damage, however, it was a war against oppression and collective decision by the allied countries. Maybe in short run, the war caused damage, however, in the long run; it carved a way for international forces to put a stop to the actions of Saddam Hussein. I believe people will always protest. One cannot clap with just one hand. A war always has two sides.

Interviewer: Did you trust and support American civilian and military leaders?

Interviewee: It's not just about America and its military. Many countries were involved in the war. It was a coalition among countries and forces who collectively decided to engage in war. I trusted U. S but mostly I trusted the coalition and its decisions.

Interviewer: Did you change your views over the span of the war?

Interviewee: The war caused a lot of damage. It also failed to dethrone Saddam Hussein, however I believe it was inevitable and necessary. My views did not change over the span of over. Yes, my emotions were subjected to many variant factors and I might have switched sides for a bit but I said earlier, this war was inevitable.

Interviewer: During the war, did you live with family, friends, or coworkers?

Interviewee: Yes, I was living with my family. My elder son enlisted himself in

the army and my daughter looked after me. My wife had died just a few years back and younger son was working. I had some friends who find it hard to meet ends; we gave them room at our house and supported their families for a short while. It was a hard time for some people.

Interviewer: In what ways did the war change your activities or habits?

Interviewee: Usually, I wouldn't care about world events. I was limited to books, sleep and local news; however the war significantly changed my habits. I began to found myself spending more and more time in front of the televisions, watching news reports. The war became a core topic of our domestic day to day discussions. I began to read a lot about war and its reasons. It also made me weary and stressed.

Interviewer: Did you worry that our side might not win?

Interviewee: There's always a chance of losing, but I did not doubt the coalition. I knew we would win, or perhaps impact what this war was about.

Interviewer: Have you visited any memorials or participated in any commemorations of the war?

Interviewee: Many. I had friends, sons of friends who lost their lives at war. There were memorials set to remember the ones who lost their lives and believe me, I didn't miss one.

Interviewer: Is there anything that you would like to add on this subject?

Interviewee: War is bad. It kills and causes damage, but in certain situations it is justifiable and inevitable. I believe this was one of those situations.