

Arab Position on the First Gulf War, 1980-1988

Assistant Professor Dr. FATIMAH HUSSEIN SALLOOMI

History Department / College of Education / Al-Mustansiriya University

dr. fatma2007@uomustansiriyah. edu.iq

Abstract

This paper which is entitled (Arab position on the first Gulf War, 1980-1988) summarizes the real reasons for the outbreak of the Iraq-Iran War, the border dispute, and the crisis in political relations between the two countries, which led to a reduction in the level of diplomatic representation after the start of the war on 4 September 1980 by bombing border areas, which caused Iraq to revoke the Algiers Agreement between the two states in 1975 and to consider the Shatt al-Arab as part of Iraq's territorial waters. Besides, it affected the interests of the two parties, specifically oil interests, represented by disruption of oil ports, which defined the determinants of this war, which was one of the wars of the Middle East with a difficult equation in terms of beginnings and endings of the nature and interests of each country with the world. According to these facts, Iraq declared on 22 September 1980 the beginning of the war, after an eight-year fight to end on 8 August 1988, to set a model for a long military war, which had taken a heavy toll on both countries to draw a new policy and strategy in the Middle East region. This has been demonstrated by the Arab position on this war, which has been supported and rejected, as well as by other global positions, some of which have been consistent and changing, as it has changed the general framework for clear support for the parties to the conflict and international developments in the Arab region, which have defined the status of the two States in the world and the extent of their political influence and its consequences.

Introduction

At the outbreak of the 1979 Iranian Revolution, led by Ruhollah Khomeini and the fears that it would be exported to Iraq, not to mention the increased disagreement between the two States over border demarcation, specifically regarding the Shatt al-Arab and the crisis of political relations, which had reached the point of withdrawing ambassadors in 1980, in reducing the level of diplomatic representation, which had led to the outbreak of war between

the two States. Iraq accused Iran in September 1980 of bombing border areas, causing Iraq to cancel its 1975 Algiers Convention and consider Shatt Arab waters as part of Iraq's territorial waters. As tension continued, on 22 September 1980, Iraq declared the start of a military war against Iran, which would start according to these data and foundations that made the war last for eight years, to end on August 8, 1988, to set a model for the long military war that both sides had suffered from its continuation and left nearly 1 million dead to both sides to form one of the important wars of the twentieth century that changed the political equation with all the regional and international variables that it experienced, it affected the evolution of the conflict into other conflicts that later showed the magnitude of the damage to the Middle East region. As a result of this war, which has resulted in great human, material and moral losses, a variety of strategies and different positions have been devised, the effects of which to date remain, despite the fact that there is no profit in this war. Arab positions are not united. Gulf positions are also different in terms of support for and rejection of this war. There is considerable Iraqi support for this war and Iran's support, as required by the interests of each country. From this point of view, our research entitled "The Arab Position on the Iraq-Iran War 1980-1988" highlights this war through the two research chapters, the first chapter entitled "the General Framework for the First Gulf War", which includes two requirements: The First Root of War, while the second requirement entitled, "The Consequences of War for Both Parties". As for the second chapter, it is entitled "The International Position on the War" which includes two requirements: The First is entitled "The Most Important and Most Prominent Positions in War", including:

1. The American position and strategy towards the war.
2. The Russian and Chinese positions and other international positions.

The second requirement is entitled the Arab position on the war that contains:

1. The Gulf position.
2. The Arab position.

Finally, we have the conclusion, findings, and the most important references adopted in the research.

Research importance

The importance of research comes in explaining the causes of this eight-year war, which has caused material and moral damage to the parties without either side winning, especially since it was the only long war in the Middle East region.

Research objectives

Several research objectives include:

1. Defining the general historical framework of this war.
2. Clarify the most important Arab and international positions on the war.
3. Show how different Arab positions are between a supporter and an opponent
4. Highlighting the magnitude of the losses suffered by both parties.

Research problem

Many questions need to be answered in this research:

1. Is it true that the war represented the eastern gate of the Arab region?
2. Does the international strategy in the war differ from the Arab strategy, especially since most of the Arab countries differ in their positions between opponents, supporters, and neutrals?
3. Defining the winner and loser in the war between the two parties.
4. Defining the reality of the States that stood by Iraq and the States that stood by Iran.
5. Show the true history of its outbreak and explain problematic of who started the war and who ended it.
6. Explain the great variation in Arab and Gulf attitudes towards the war.

Research Methodology:

The research was based on one of the most important approaches, and the historical approach, which highlights the first roots of the war, its consequences and causes through the general framework, the demonstration of its outbreak, and the historical sequence of its most important variables. It marked the beginning and end of this war, which began on 4 September 1980 and ended on 8 August 1988, marking an important stage in the history of the political system in modern Iraq with all its different variables and positions.

Chapter one: the general framework of the first Gulf War

The first requirement: the first roots of the war

In early 1968, the Ba'ath Party in Iraq came to power. Border differences between Iraq and Iran began after the Shah of Iran, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, in 1969, rescinded the border agreement signed between the two countries in 1937, demanding that the mid-Shatt Arab line be the boundary. With the beginning of 1971 and the outbreak of disagreement in the Arabian Gulf over the three Arab islands of Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb, and Abu Musa, and Iran's occupation of them, Iraq decided to break diplomatic relations with Iran¹. In 1972, the military clash between the two countries began at the border, leading to increased activity by Kurdish armed movements in the north. After many attempts to calm the situation, Iraq and Iran signed what is known as the 1975 Algiers Agreement².

After the Islamic Revolution in Iran in 1979³, relations between the two countries were deteriorated, with the withdrawal of ambassadors in March 1980, and on September 4 of the same year, the parties exchanged accusations to bomb border areas. This marked the beginning of the military war, after which Algeria was abolished in 1975 and the entire waters of the Shatt al-Arab were considered part of Iraq's territorial waters. With ongoing tension and intermittent fighting at the border, on 22 September, Iraq decided to launch an all-out military campaign against Iran, believing that it would be swift, but it became an all-out war after Iraqi forces invaded Iranian territory. The situation continued despite the demands of the Security Council in its resolution (479)⁴

On 28 September 1980, the parties called for a cessation of hostilities and move towards dialogue, negotiation, and international understandings, however, the two States showed no interest in the resolution, and with the

¹Ibrahim Nafi 'The Great Sedition, Gulf Storm, Al-Ahram Center for Translation and Publishing, Cairo, 1993, p. 45.

²The agreement signed on March 16 between Iraq and Iran in 1975 between the Iraqi Vice President Saddam Hussein and the Shah of Iran, Muhammad Reza Pahlavi and under the supervision of the President of Algeria, Hawari Boumediene, and included Baghdad's recognition of Shatt al-Arab as equitably between the two countries, or the so-called Taluk line to its previous era. For more see: Berlazux, The Iran-Iraq War 1980-1988, Edition 1, 2015, p.10.

³It is the revolution that erupted in 1979 to change the royal regime of Muhammad Reza Pahlavi to the republican system under the leadership of Ruhollah Khomeini and was supported by many left-wing organizations and student movements. For more, see Abdul Karim Al-Alouji, Iran and Iraq, the border struggle or existence, Cultural House for Publishing, I, Cairo, 2007, p. 21.

⁴Sabah Salman, Spotlight on the Iran-Iraq War, Ministry of Culture and Information, Baghdad, 1980, p. 21.

beginning of 1981, or the so-called reciprocal tanker war, which was targeting oil tankers and all commercial sea tankers to cut off military and economic supplies for both warring sides. On 13 May, Iran attacked a Kuwaiti commercial vessel, calling on Kuwait to seek international protection and assistance for the protection of its ships.¹

By the beginning of February 1982, the Iranian army had regained the area of Abadan, Kermanshah, and other areas and started advancing towards Basra to begin the so-called War of the Cities.

Tensions and skirmishes between the two countries continued until 1983 and 1984, in which Iran concentrated control of Basra City with a process of city warfare, following which the war continued, and the parties undertook numerous military operations that caused material and moral damage until the end of the war on 8 August 2020, after Iran approved Security Council resolution 598, which stopped the war between the two countries, following which a series of negotiations in Geneva on 25 September 1988, during which the points contained in the United Nations resolution containing a ceasefire and withdrawal to the international border were addressed, besides, prisoner-to-prisoner exchange process began, and the peace negotiations were conducted and the two countries were rebuilt through international assistance.²

The second requirement: The Consequences of War for Both Parties

The consequences of the war were numerous for both sides, as it was one of the longest conventional wars of the twentieth century, lasting eight years and resulting in the death of nearly a million of both parties in addition to material and moral losses of up to 10.19 trillion.

Moreover, this battle changed the model of the known battles in the political world of the Middle East, which later caused significant damage, particularly in the infrastructure and oil extraction of the conflicting parties. Iraq's debt was estimated to be \$14 billion granted to Iraq by Kuwait, while Iran's losses range from \$350 billion³. Furthermore, Iraq's failure to include some of the territory on the eastern bank of the Shatt al-Arab, as well as its failure to promote its vision and secession project in Iran's Khuzestan

¹Same source, p. 15.

²Ali Muhafaza, the Gulf War in the Memoirs of Western Politicians and Militaryists, the Arab Encyclopedia, Beirut, 2012, p. 4.

³Jamal Abdul Razzaq Al-Badri, The Gulf in National Perspective, 1980, p.60.

province. On the one hand, Iran also failed to topple the Baath regime and destroy Iraq's military forces, so that the consequences of the war to both sides were material and moral damage and loss of life, including dead, prisoners, or refugees until oil exports before the war for Iraq reached approximately 3.3 million barrels per day. However, during the war, they were reduced by the inability to export oil from seaports in the Arabian Gulf and by the mere sufficiency of the Kirkuk Ceyhan pipeline for export.

Since the beginning of the war in 1980, Iran has produced approximately 10.48 million barrels per day and exports approximately 762 thousand barrels. This export has declined to 700,000 barrels because of the extensive damage to Iranian installations on Kharg Island¹.

It did not stop that far. Even refineries were severely affected by the war, including the Abadan refinery, the world's largest refinery. The refinery had an estimated refinery capacity of 630,000, 000 barrels of oil. The Iranian economy was affected by approximately 450 billion dollars, which covered the entire infrastructure. On this basis, the loss of war involving both countries and its causes is numerous as interpretations of historical origins and different ideologies, and one finds the danger of the Islamic Revolution on Iraq and the regional order² so that the war caused damage that inflicted both parties in 1986 and the beginning of the attrition of battle for the parties, especially after the deterioration of the economies of the two countries, until the acceptance of Security Council resolution 598 (1988), which calls for a cessation of the war. On 18 July of the same year, Imam Khomeini approved this decision, bringing the war to an end on 8 August 1988 after eight years of combat.³

Chapter two: the international position on the war

The first requirement: The Most Important and Most Prominent Positions in War

1. The American position and strategy towards the war

The United States strategy is arguably one of the most important strategies that played a role in the war, finding the Middle East and the Arabian Gulf

¹Ghassan Charbel, Notebooks of the Present and the Past, Baghdad, 2002, pg. 12.

²Diana johntone, Little satan stuck in the Arms Export Trap, 1987, pp.8.9

³Maher Abdul Wahid Khalil Al-Douri, United Arab Emirates, Study of Political Developments and the Political System, Unpublished Master Thesis, College of Political Sciences, University of Baghdad, 1990, p. 122.

in general to be one of the most important areas in which many American countries and products are interested in finding its importance in this vital region. Thus, it seeks in every way to prevent any party vying for this interest, especially since the United States is afraid of the former Soviet Union now Russia, to deploy or threaten it in any way in the region, it was finding a real guarantee of oil sources and its continued flow through the shipping routes of the states, Western Europe and Japan at agreed prices¹. That's why when the war broke out, the United States was providing absolute support to Iraq against Iran, specifically intelligence, information, and military support. Besides, imposing a blockade on Iran and not importing American weapons, let alone intervening to adjust the balance of war under a strategy and policy that it wishes to implement because it is a great opportunity to weaken both sides and a war of attrition that is prolonged in scope and damage. In 1987, for example, the United States attacked Iranian tankers in the Gulf States, destroying two, especially since Washington supported plans for new oil pipes west from Iraq through the territory to Aqaba, Jordan. Therefore, we find the American strategy and position on this war represented in secret cooperation with Iraq, and ostensibly it exercises a policy of neutrality, especially since it defined its policy and strategy from the beginning of the war in 1980, or what is known as the Carter Principle², which guarantees protection of American interests through rapid intervention in the Arab Gulf region. Concerning the security of oil supplies and navigation, the United States believes that its interests in this war remain due to its lack of extension to other countries with which it has close relations, and through that, we can determine the stages that the American strategy towards the war went through³.

1. The first stage, as it is called, is an early one based on the neutrality of the attitude to war while adhering to the relationship of interests.
2. The second logistical stage is based on the relative relationship.
3. The third stage is the unlimited military support to Iraq against Iran in terms of weapons and equipment.

¹Parsalinger, *The Gulf War*, 11th edition, Beirut, 1993, p. 3.

²Salem Saadoun, *the Arabian Gulf, A Study in Regional Geography*, Freedom House for Printing, Baghdad, 1981, p. 87.

³Alaeddin Hussein Makki Khamas, *Tanker Wars in the Arabian Gulf*, Al-Rumman Publishing House, Oman, 2017, p. 21.

4. The counter-attack phase, which includes a surprise attack against vital military installations in Iran.¹

On this basis, the attitude of the United States towards war is unstable, which has led it to try to change its policies towards Iran to contain it and create a policy of neutrality, especially since it is an important obstacle to peace in the region.²

2. The Russian position

The Russian position during the Iraq-Iran War represented the support for Iraq's arms. At the same time, tensions between the two countries prevailed because of the divergent position of Russian military intervention in Afghanistan, which was rejected in Tehran and promised by unjustified interference, not to mention the differences between Tehran and Russia over its recent relationship with Israel, which greatly affected the nature of the relationship between the two states. After the break-up of the Soviet Union, the separation of some Muslim republics, and the reluctance of Russia to support these republics, a new relationship between the two countries began with the visit of Iranian President Hashemi Rafsanjani to Russia and the start of a new relationship despite the fear of Russian President Boris Yeltsin's rapprochement with Iran in 1992. Tehran signed a cooperation agreement to build the Bushehr nuclear reactor as part of a long-standing agreement. Russia's relationship with the Iraqi and Iranian parties continued throughout the war and both were supplied with weapons.³

3. The Chinese position:

The Chinese position was reflected in the Iraq-Iran War, in neutrality while adhering to the ongoing relationship of friendship and trade with all warring parties. On the second day of the outbreak of the war, China declared its clear and frank position that the war was not in the interests of both parties. It called for a settlement, for negotiations to be held at its table, and for fear that the conflict would have an impact on the security of the Arab region⁴.

¹Talal Araibi, War and Iran, Common Interests and Unstable Relationships, 1st Edition, Arab Center for Research and Political Studies, Beirut, 2012, pg 75.

²Yevgeny Primakov, Primakov's Diary in the First Gulf War, 1st Edition, Beirut, 1991, pg. 30.

³Imad Abdul Salam, The Iraq-Persian Conflict, Baghdad, 1983, p. 13.

⁴Abd al-Wahhab al-Qassab, The Iran-Iraq War, Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, 1st Edition, Beirut, 2014, pg.50.

4. Other international situations

The other positions were certainly war, and Britain tried to offer a so-called dual-use that would allow Iraq to develop its missile systems and also its defense radar. As for France, which was an important partner of Iraq in terms of trade, it sought throughout the war to supply Iraq with weapons through its sale, especially since France had a balanced policy in the Middle East region¹. Moreover, Iraq used French war advisers in the war if France trained Iraqi pilots on Mirage F-planes on the ground. France also sold Iraq nearly 200 laser-guided missiles (As-30) from 1983-1986².

Chapter two: the Arab position on the war

The second requirement: the most important Arab positions on the war

1. The Gulf position

The Arab position on the Iraq-Iran War from 1980 to 1988 reflected the discrepancy between the pro-Iraq war and the anti-Iran opposition and other Arab positions that wanted to continue the war, drain the parties and ignite the region with this costly war. At the level of the Gulf position, Iraq was neutral, biased, and provided assistance, estimated at \$200 billion.³

Saudi Arabia's position represents support for Iraq and acceptance of this war by allowing the construction of a pipeline capable of transporting approximately 1.5 billion barrels of oil per day on the Saudi coast in the Red Sea. Saudi Arabia's policy of lowering oil prices⁴ caused significant losses to Iran and eventually severed Saudi relations with Iran in April 1988. The Kuwaiti position was supported by Iraq in this war if it assembled approximately 300,000 barrels of oil per day to compensate Iraq for the decline caused by the war, particularly the destruction of its oil installations and fields, which were targeted by Iran⁵. This Gulf position is precise because of the strategic interests of the Gulf region. That is why the Gulf Cooperation Council's position on the war is changing, depending on the course and the developments on the ground and the extent to which it relates

¹Hussein Turki Amir Mesir Al-Awsi, *Iran and Arab Issues 1976-1991*, unpublished doctoral thesis, 2008, p.91.

²Abd al-Khaleq Abdullah, *Tension in the Regional System*, *Journal of International Politics*, Al-Ahram Foundation, *Sunnah* (132), Cairo, April, 1998, p. 66.

³Khalil Elias Murad, *The Gulf War and its Implications for Arab National Security*, Freedom House for Printing, Baghdad, 1987, pg. 24.

⁴Iman Ahmed Rajab, *The Arab Regional System, The Post-American Occupation of Iraq*, Edition 1, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, 2010, p. 41.

⁵Marshal Abdel Halim Abu Ghazaleh, *The Iran-Iraq War 1980-1988*, Cairo, 1994, p. 3.

to the general interest of these countries, while the position of the United Arab Emirates was embodied in a clear position on the basis that the UAE was closer to the arena of combat operations between Iraq and Iran, and this is what made it take a quiet diplomatic stance to contain this crisis in accordance with the policy of balance although Iraq put forward with the beginning of the war in 1980 that one of its demands was that Iran returns the three Arab islands, Greater Tunb, Lesser Tunb, and Abu Musa¹, which Iran occupied in 1971. On this basis, and due to the limited military and population capabilities of the UAE, it tried to contain this war through diplomacy and neutrality. Bahrain and Qatar called for the early cessation of hostilities. Together with the United Arab Emirates, they submitted a draft resolution to the United Nations General Assembly calling for the cessation of hostilities, the withdrawal of warring forces, and the beginning of a peaceful settlement of the parties². The Sultanate of Oman's position was to develop a relationship with the two States, not to neglect dialogue with the parties, not to boycott Iran, not to allow Iraq to use its territory, to provide military formations in attacks on the three Arab islands, or to participate in and plan its attack. Based on the foregoing, the Gulf position is based on the position of the Cooperation Council. Nine months after the war, their positions have been clear, even since the first summit of the Council, held in Abu Dhabi on 25 May 1981, and the final communiqué calls for the cessation of this war, which threatens the security of the region and promotes foreign intervention in it³.

2. The Arab position:

One of the most important Arab positions was Egypt that supported this war and stood by Iraq and constituted for it the most important source of human and military support. By the beginning of the war, it had sold the weapons to Iraq, operated the power of its military plants, and placed them in front of Iraq. (\$1 billion) As well as supporting Iraq with Egyptian advisers who developed Al-Fao liberation plans, Egypt was an important ally of Iraq in its war with Iran⁴, although it was suffering from international isolation after signing the Camp David Convention in 1979. The Sudan and Algeria

¹Mustafa Jabbar Al-Taie, Iranian-Saudi Relations, a study on the most prominent factors and influencing issues, an unpublished master's thesis, College of Political Sciences, Baghdad 2005, p.95.

²Ibrahim Nawar, Omani foreign policy from isolation to diplomacy in the middle of international politics, Al-Ahram Foundation, Year (24), Issue (92), Cairo, April 1, 1988, p. 24.

³The Lebanese Al-Sayyad Newspaper, No. (1885) on 12/19/1980, p. 4.

⁴Gulf Emirates newspaper, Issue (15), 1983, p. 3.

rejected this war, especially since Algeria was the first to sign the 1975 Algiers Agreement between Iraq and Iran, which was canceled by Iraq during the outbreak of the war in 1980. This led Algeria to call for an end to this war through dialogue, understandings, and various contacts between Iraq and Iran to bring it closer together. However, it failed and continued to support the war. It was congratulated in 1988 after Iraq regained Al-Fao 1988¹. While Tunisia rejected the war, especially since it was accusing Iran of supporting some Islamic organizations, including Rashed El Ghannouchi, which had led to its ban in 1987, it considered everything that Iraq is exposed to, would also be exposed to Tunisia. The other Arab positions that supported Iran in the war were Syria and Libya. Syria went to stop exporting Iraqi oil and bought Iranian oil. It considered Iraq the assailant of Iran, making it easier for Iranian aircraft to use Syrian airspace to bomb important Iraqi targets and installations such as Al-Walid military base near the Syrian border, Iran supported Syria's campaign against the Muslim Brotherhood, which left the relationship between Syria and Iraq tense, while Libya was one of the important pillars of assistance to and support for Iran and declared its rejection of the war.² Jordan's position did not differ by supporting Iraq in its war against Iran, especially since Jordan considered Iraq to be the eastern gateway to the Arab region.

Mauritania has confirmed its continued support for Iraq and its readiness to provide whatever it needs in this war. Moreover, the Palestine Liberation Organization has declared its support for Iraq in its war against Iran since its inception. Lebanon also strongly supported this war, so that most of the Lebanese media were keen to broadcast military data to Iraqi forces while ignoring Iranian statements. So it can be said that Arab support for this war was mixed. Some stood with Iraq, others stood with Iran.³

Conclusion

That's why we can say that the Iraq-Iran War of 1980, called the first Gulf War, represented one of the most difficult wars in the Middle East, lasting eight years after Iran approved the Security Council resolution 598 to stop the war with Iraq on August 8, 1988, which caused significant human and economic losses and claimed nearly half a million Iraqi and Iranian soldiers

¹Naji Sadiq Sharab, Foreign Policy of the United Arab Emirates, University Book House, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates, 1987, 256-258.

²Same source, p. 12.

³Abdul-Jalil Zaid Marhoon, Gulf Security After the Cold War, Dar An-Nahar, Beirut, 1997, pg. 51.

and used a consistent strategy of confrontation that in which there was no winner from the two countries. However, it allowed many countries to step in and highlight their role to preserve their interests, including the United States and the Soviet Union, which tried to exploit the war for the greatest benefit. Nevertheless, the interests of Iraq and Iran, specifically oil interests, were affected by the disruption of export ports and the closure of access to the Gulf. That is why this research has highlighted the first roots of the war and its most important positive and negative consequences for the two countries. This has been reflected in the region, in particular in the Arab case, the Palestinian issue, on which the focus has been lost. On that basis, the war had demonstrated the parties' ability to come up with the slogan of victory, despite the heavy toll, and both states had exercised their policy in the region as an active force capable of assembling the resolution to confront Israel. The most significant threat to the Arab region, therefore, was one of the long military wars that militarily strained the powers of the two States, draining the parties' capabilities, their great loss, and the damage they caused to vital installations and infrastructure, which were estimated to have damaged approximately \$400 billion, as well as human losses. Consequently, there is no winner out of the war, on the contrary, it has resulted in hundreds of victims, prisoners, and detainees, and the widows and orphans it left behind. Thus, I demonstrated the ort and rejection of the Arab and international positions and the actors, just as Iraq has failed to take the territories on the eastern bank of the Shatt al-Arab. At the same time, Iran failed to topple Saddam Hussein's rule, thus ending the war to be one of the important wars that changed the equation in the Middle East in terms of demonstrating the constant and changing positions of war. The Gulf and Arab positions, in which there was a wide variety of differences between supporters, opponents, and supporters, as well as international positions, which gave a definition of the scope of this war and a clear amount of support to both parties until the end of 1988 and the start of a new phase in Iraq's modern and contemporary history.

References

1. Abd al-Khaliq Abdullah, Tension in the Regional System, Journal of International Politics, Al-Ahram Foundation, Issue (132), Sunnah (34), Cairo, April 1998, p. 66.
2. Abd al-Wahhab al-Qassab, The Iran-Iraq War, Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, First Edition, Beirut, 2014, p. 50.

3. Abdul Karim Al-Alouji, Iran and Iraq, the border struggle or existence, Cultural House for Publishing, Cairo, 2007, p. 21.
4. Abdul-Jalil Zaid Marhoon, Gulf Security After the Cold War, Dar An-Nahar, Beirut, 1997, p. 51.
5. Al Khaleej Emirates Newspaper, Issue 15, 1983, p. 3.
6. Alaa Al-Din Hussein Makki Khamas, Tanker War in the Arabian Gulf, Al-Rimal Publishing House, Oman, 2017, p. 21.
7. Ali Muhafaza, The Gulf War in the Memoirs of Western Politicians and Military Personnel, The Arab Foundation, Beirut, 2013, p. 4.
8. Diana johanstone, little satanstuckin the Arms Exparttrap, 1987.pp. 8.
9. Ghassan Charbel, Notebooks of the Present and the Past, Baghdad, 2002, p. 12.
- 10.Hassan Turki Amir Mesir Al-Awsi, Iran and Arab Issues 1979-1991, unpublished doctoral thesis, 2008, p. 91.
- 11.Ibrahim Nafi 'The Great Sedition, Gulf Storm, Al-Ahram Center for Translation and Publishing, Cairo, 1993, p. 45.
- 12.Ibrahim Nawar, Omani Foreign Policy from Isolation to Middle Diplomacy, International Politics, Al-Ahram Foundation, Year (24) Issue (192), Cairo, April 1988, p. 24.
- 13.Imad Abd al-Salam, The Iraq-Persian Conflict, Baghdad, 1983, p. 13.
- 14.Iman Ahmed Rajab, The Arab Regional System, The Post-American Occupation of Iraq, First Edition, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Beirut, 2010, p. 41.
- 15.Jamal Abdul-Razzaq Al-Badri, The Gulf in a National Perspective, 1980, Baghdad, p. 60.
- 16.Khalil Elias Murad, The Gulf War and its Implications for Arab National Security, Freedom House for Printing, Baghdad, 1987, p. 24.
- 17.Marshal Abd Al-Halim Abu Ghazaleh, The Iran-Iraq War, 1980-1988, Cairo, 1994, p. 31.
- 18.Naji Sadiq Sharab, The Foreign Policy of the United Arab Emirates, University Book House, Al Ain, 1987-206-258.
- 19.Pierre Razdix, the Iran-Iraq War 1980-1988, France, 2015, p. 10.
- 20.Pierre Salinger, The Gulf War, 11th edition, Beirut, 1993, p. 17.
- 21.Sabah Salman, Highlights of the Iran-Iraq War, Ministry of Culture and Information, Baghdad, Iraq, 1980, p. 21.
- 22.Salem Saadoun, The Arabian Gulf, A Study in Regional Geography, Freedom House for Printing, Baghdad, 1981, p. 78.

23. Talal Araibi, *The Arabs and Iran, Common Interests and Unstable Relationships*, First Edition, Arab Center for Research and Political Studies, Beirut, 2012, p. 75.
24. *The Lebanese Al-Sayyad Newspaper*, No. (1885), on 12/19/80 p. 4.
25. Yevgeny Primakov, *Primakov's Diaries of the Gulf War* First Edition, Beirut, 1991, p. 30.