



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/20376
8 January 1989
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC

LETTER DATED 7 JANUARY 1989 FROM THE ACTING PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF IRAQ TO THE
UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

On instruction from my Government, I have the honour to transmit herewith excerpts from the speech delivered by Mr. Saddam Hussein, President of the Republic of Iraq, on 6 January 1989, on the occasion of the sixty-eighth anniversary of the establishment of the Iraqi Army. It deals with the position of Iraq with regard to Iran's procrastination in implementing Security Council resolution 598 (1987).

I should be grateful if you would have the text of this letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Ali Mahmoud SUMAIDA
Ambassador
Acting Permanent Representative

ANNEX

Nearly five months have elapsed since the cease-fire was proclaimed. Direct negotiations were initiated on 20 August 1988 under the auspices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, but no substantial progress has been achieved towards a comprehensive and lasting peace.

For eight years, the Iranian régime has refused to end the war, has rejected out of hand all the Security Council resolutions and has refused to conform to international law and deal with the Organization. Then, suddenly, the Iranian régime accepted resolution 598 (1987) and the cease-fire. The reasons for this volte-face were clear to us and to the entire world. Between April and July 1988, the forces of the Iranian oppressor and its military apparatus suffered a crushing defeat in the major liberation battles of Al-Fao, Shalamcheh, Zubaydat and in the battles which were fought in the north of our beloved homeland. Having been routed each time and threatened with collapse, the Iranian régime had no choice but to pin all its hopes on resolution 598 (1987), not because it agreed with the provisions of this resolution and the fundamental principles on which it is based and not because it intended to act in accordance with this resolution with a view to achieving a comprehensive and lasting peace, but because it views the resolution as a life-saving device. We welcomed Iran's realistic and responsible acceptance of resolution 598 (1987), for our goal was and continues to be the attainment of peace and because, from the outset, we had hoped to avoid armed confrontation, bloodshed and sacrifice.

After accepting the cease-fire, the Iranian régime failed to indicate clearly and unequivocally its stance with regard to a comprehensive and lasting peace. On the contrary, true to character, it entered into the negotiations without abandoning its trickery and its manoeuvres, not agreeing to adopt any clear rule but acting ambiguously with respect to the implementation of resolution 598 (1987). It also persisted in its selective approach, accepting what was advantageous for it and refusing any binding commitment contained in the provisions of the resolution and the agreement relating to the cease-fire and the direct negotiations concluded on 8 August 1988 under the auspices of the Secretary-General.

We, the other countries of the region and the international community must particularly take very seriously the statements and communiqués of Iranian officials who are, at times implicitly and at times explicitly, brandishing the threat of renewed aggression and war and of a military settlement of the questions which are supposed to be resolved through political negotiations and are issuing repeated calls for the mobilization and dispatch of troops to the front.

In the thick of the war, we issued warnings to the Iranian leaders on many occasions and advised them that there was no other option but peace, political dialogue and understanding between the two countries and that their persistent pursuit of war would not lead them anywhere. It is incumbent on us today, in keeping with our sense of responsibility and our desire to arrive at a peaceful settlement and safeguard the future of the region, to reiterate our advice and our

warnings to the Iranian leaders and to tell them, if they have any intention of resuming the war of aggression, or if they are preparing to so, that Iraq remains vigilant. It is fully prepared to defend itself, and they will find themselves facing a wall of impregnability. Any further wild ventures on their part will be doomed to the same fate as the previous ones. They should therefore refrain from getting themselves into an inextricable situation as they did eight years ago.

We warn them of the consequences of concentrating troops on our borders, and we advise them to cease threatening to resume hostilities in order to attain political or other objectives. We cannot accept the concentration of troops on our borders. We do not take such a manoeuvre lightly. We view it as a genuine threat and a prelude to resumption of the war of aggression, and it obliges us to take legitimate precautions and to make the necessary arrangements for the exercise of our right of self-defence. The Iranian leaders must realize that the geography of Iraq does not lend itself to games of this kind and that, consequently, they should not make miscalculations. We also call on the international community to appreciate the full seriousness of the situation.

The most sensible policy would be to work seriously and earnestly within the framework of political negotiations, towards a comprehensive and lasting peace between Iraq and Iran and in the region. The manoeuvres of the Iranian régime, aimed at twisting the provisions of resolution 598 (1987) and turning its plan for a comprehensive and lasting peace into an instrument of political warfare and a pretext for resuming the aggression, are doomed to failure. Iraq, which displayed firmness and determination throughout the years during which it was subjected to Iranian aggression, must not be expected to abandon its principles, within the framework of political negotiations, and allow the defeated aggressor to carry out its illegitimate political designs. We will reject and counter all the dubious suggestions from certain circles that the Iranian régime needs to win political gains in order to compensate for its military defeat. That defeat was wanted by the Iranian régime itself. The Iranians were the ones who began the war of aggression, endangered the security and stability of the region, attacked the countries located in the region and undermined their interests. The Iranians were the ones who stubbornly insisted on continuing the war, rejecting all peace proposals. What else could be expected but defeat?

In no way do we seek to achieve political or other gains through the negotiations. We seek only recognition of legitimate, historical and well-established rights, in conformity with international law and the principles of justice and equity. We adhere firmly to our position of principle, which is the attainment of a comprehensive and lasting peace based on the rules which we proclaimed on 2 August 1986. These rules are consistent with the spirit and letter of resolution 598 (1987), which, from the practical viewpoint, constitutes a plan for a comprehensive and lasting peace. The Iranian régime, which is entirely responsible for the outbreak of the war of aggression and the continuation of this war for eight years, is likewise responsible for the negotiations being bogged down and for the delaying of arrival at a comprehensive and durable peace.

The fraternal Arab States which, throughout the war of aggression, showed vigilance and foresight and demonstrated numerous ways their solidarity with Iraq,

S/20376

English

Page 4

must maintain this attitude during the cease-fire. Until such time as a comprehensive and lasting peace of which we may all reap the fruits has been established on clear and solid bases, we must not think that the danger is entirely over or that the intentions of Iran have completely changed.

