

UNITED NATIONS
SECURITY
COUNCIL



Distr.
GENERAL

S/11325
25 June 1974

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 25 JUNE 1974 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
IRAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE
SECURITY COUNCIL

On instruction from my Government, I have the honour to refer to the letter addressed to you by the Deputy Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations dated 14 June 1974 (S/11323).

In an attempt to further snarl the relations of the two countries and to undermine the bilateral agreement reached between the two States, the Government of Iraq has seen fit to reply to the statement that I had the honour to transmit to you on behalf of my Government on 6 June (document S/11313), in which the view of Iran on resolution 348 (1974) had been expressed. In doing so, the representative of Iraq has lapsed into an uncunning analysis of the Security Council consensus of 28 February 1974 and resolution 348 (1974).

Resolution 348 (1974) does not make any recommendation to the parties concerned. It merely welcomes an agreement reached between them while expressing the hope that they will take steps to implement it. By so doing, the Council, in effect, takes cognizance of a major bilateral step taken by the two Governments to improve their relations. That cognizance does not affect the status of the bilateral agreement, which, as can clearly be seen from paragraph 7 of the report of the Secretary-General (S/11291) and from the language of paragraph 2 of resolution 348 (1974) itself, was already in existence when the Council met on 28 May 1974.

Thus, the manoeuvre of the Iraqi representative to confuse a bilateral agreement with a decision of the Council is characteristically deceptive.

The Iraqi contention that the Iranian Government's statement of 6 June 1974 constitutes a precondition for the acceptance of resolution 348 (1974) is just equally absurd. In substance, there is nothing in that resolution which Iran had not accepted previously. If, therefore, dissatisfaction has been voiced, it has been due not to what the resolution has provided but what it failed to provide, namely, the designation of aggressor by name.

Finally, in quoting from the consensus of the Security Council of 28 February, the representative of Iraq fails to distinguish between a "situation" with which the Council decided to deal as a result of a military confrontation last February and the substance of dispute between the two countries which is the subject matter of conversations between the two Governments in accordance with paragraph 4 of the bilateral agreement.

S/11325
English
Page 2

Since, none the less, it is hard to believe that a founding Member of the United Nations and an incumbent member of the Council fails to distinguish such nuances, one is bound to conclude that the purpose of the latest Iraqi letter is merely to present pretexts for its Government's non-compliance with the provisions of the bilateral agreement, a fact that is best evident in their continuation of a most virulent propaganda and hostile acts against Iran in contradiction of paragraph 3 of the bilateral agreement.

I have the honour to request that this letter be circulated as an official document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Fereydoun HOVEYDA
Permanent Representative of Iran
to the United Nations
