



## Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2709  
3 October 1986

ENGLISH

---

### PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Friday, 3 October 1986, at 11.45 a.m.

President: Mr. AL-SHAALI

(United Arab Emirates)

Members: Australia  
Bulgaria  
China  
Congo  
Denmark  
France  
Ghana  
Madagascar  
Thailand  
Trinidad and Tobago  
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics  
United Kingdom of Great Britain and  
Northern Ireland  
United States of America  
Venezuela

Mr. WOOLCOTT  
Mr. TSVETROV  
Mr. LI Luye  
Mr. BALE  
Mr. BIERRING  
Mr. de KEMOULARIA  
Mr. GBEHO  
Mr. RABETAFIKA  
Mr. KASEMSRI  
Mr. ALLEYNE  
Mr. BELONOGOV  
  
Sir John THOMSON  
Mr. OKUN  
Mr. AGUILAR

---

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

The meeting was called to order at 12 noon.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the outset of this meeting to pay a tribute on behalf of the Council to His Excellency Mr. Alesksandr Mikhailovich Belonogov, Permanent Representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations, for his service as President of the Security Council for the month of September. I am sure I speak for all members in expressing deep appreciation to Ambassador Belonogov for the great diplomatic skill with which he conducted the Council's business last month.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAN AND IRAQ

LETTER DATED 30 SEPTEMBER 1986 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES OF IRAQ, JORDAN, KUWAIT, MOROCCO, SAUDI ARABIA, TUNISIA AND YEMEN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/18372)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Oman, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Tunisia and Zambia, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Azis (Iraq) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Abdel Meguid (Egypt), Mr. Salah (Jordan), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Al-Ansi (Oman), Mr. Kabanda (Rwanda), Mr. Shihabi (Saudi Arabia), Mr. Sarre (Senegal), Mr. Bouziri (Tunisia) and Mr. Mwananshiku (Zambia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 3 October 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Oman to the United Nations, which reads as follows:

"In my capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group for the month of October 1986, I have the honour to request you to invite Mr. Farouk Kaddoumi, Chief of the Political Department of the Palestine Liberation Organization, to participate in the Security Council's meetings to consider the item entitled 'The situation between Iran and Iraq', in conformity with the Council's usual practice."

That letter will be circulated as document S/18377.

The proposal by Oman is not made pursuant to rule 37 or rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, but if approved by the Council the invitation to participate in the debate would confer on the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights of participation as those conferred on Member States when invited to participate pursuant to rule 37.

Does any member of the Council wish to speak on this proposal?

Mr. ORIN (United States of America): The United States has consistently taken the position that under the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council the only legal basis on which the Council may grant a hearing to persons speaking on behalf of non-governmental entities is rule 39. For 39 years the

(Mr. Okun, United States)

United States has supported a generous interpretation of rule 39, and would certainly not object had this matter been raised under that rule. We are, however, opposed to special ad hoc departures from orderly procedure. The United States, consequently, opposes extending to the Palestine Liberation Organization the same rights to participate in the proceedings of the Security Council as if that organization represented a Member State of the United Nations. We certainly believe in listening to all points of view, but none of that requires violating the rules. In particular, the United States does not agree with the recent practice of the Security Council, which appears selectively to try to enhance the prestige of those who wish to speak in the Council through a departure from the rules of procedure. We consider this special practice to be without legal foundation and to constitute an abuse of the rules.

For those reasons, the United States requests that the terms of the proposed invitation be put to the vote. Of course, the United States will vote against the proposal.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): If no other member of the Council wishes to speak at this stage, I shall take it that the Council is ready to vote on the proposal by Oman.

It is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Bulgaria, China, Congo, Chana, Madagascar, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, Venezuela

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Australia, Denmark, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The result of the voting is as follows: 10 votes in favour, 1 against and 4 abstentions. The proposal has therefore been adopted.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kaddoumi (Palestine Liberation Organisation) took a place at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform members of the Council that I have received a letter dated 2 October 1986 from the Permanent Representative of Oman to the United Nations, which reads as follows:

"In my capacity as Chairman of the Arab Group at the United Nations for the month of October 1986, I have the honour to request that the Security Council, during its discussion of the item entitled 'The situation between Iran and Iraq', currently on its agenda, extend an invitation to His Excellency Mr. Chedli Klibi, Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, to participate, under rule 39 of the provisional rules of procedure."

That letter has been issued as document S/18375.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Council agrees to extend an invitation to Mr. Klibi under rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

The Security Council will now begin consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting today in response to the request contained in a letter dated 30 September 1986 from the Permanent Representatives of Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia and Yemen to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council. That letter is contained in document S/18372.

I wish to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/18376, which contains the text of a letter dated 2 October 1986 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

The Secretary-General wishes to make a statement, and I call on him.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: The extent and depth of international alarm over the continuation of the bloody conflict between Iran and Iraq into its seventh year have been evident from numerous statements in the General Assembly and are underscored by the Security Council's decision to meet today.

The war's devastation in lives and in material terms is known above all to the two peoples that must bear those losses, but it has also caused deep distress beyond their borders. The carnage alone would be sufficient cause for the repeated appeals for an end to this destructive war. But, further, the international community has a legitimate concern over the dangers of the expansion of the boundaries of the conflict, which could bring unpredictable and perhaps uncontrollable consequences.

This meeting of the Security Council takes on special significance because of this year's military operations. The sharp escalation in attacks on commercial vessels from third countries and the widening area in which they occur are perceived by neighbouring States in particular as threats to security in their region, with potential repercussions which could draw in Powers from beyond. Iran's declared intention to launch another major offensive to bring a military conclusion to the conflict gives renewed urgency to the situation.

The Council is aware that, with its support, I have spared no effort to bring this conflict to an end. Some of my initiatives have dealt with humanitarian aspects under international instruments designed to mitigate some of the worst features of warfare. All such moves are aimed at one goal - the early cessation of hostilities and an advance towards negotiations. The eight-point plan that I proposed to the two parties last year envisaged a step-by-step approach towards that end. Unfortunately, it is evident now that so far those efforts have not achieved substantive progress towards the intended goal - the ending of the war.

(The Secretary-General)

The vital question, of course, is what new efforts can be deployed to secure a negotiated settlement. Six resolutions of the Security Council remain as part of the record, without satisfactory implementation. Iraq has stated that it is willing to comply with all of them. Iran has indicated that it is not prepared to accept them, on the ground that the Council has not dealt with Iran's fundamental grievances. I have repeatedly urged Iran to present its case to the Council. I did so again as recently as yesterday.

The Council will recall that after my talks in Baghdad and Tehran last year I reported on the position of the two parties, including Iran's complaints towards the Council, which are cited by its Government as the reason for its distancing itself from the Council. Since then both parties have made declarations of policy which are in the knowledge of Council members. Nevertheless, I would, of course, undertake a new assessment if the Council so wished.

I feel, however, in view of repeated requests from many quarters that I take new initiatives to end the war, that it has become increasingly necessary for the Security Council to establish a basis upon which both sides will find it possible to extend their co-operation to the United Nations in dealing with the threat to regional and international peace and security and to promote the prospects for a settlement.

For my part, I remain at the Council's disposal and will unstintingly attempt to carry out its wishes to the extent that the two States facilitate my endeavours.

The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is Mr. Chedli Klibi, Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, whom I invite to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.



Mr. KLIBI (interpretation from Arabic): I personally wish warmly to thank you, Sir, and through you to extend my warmest thanks to the Council for being allowed to speak on the war between Iran and Iraq.

I welcome the fact that you are presiding over the Council for this month, Sir. We are familiar with your wisdom and great experience. You ably represent a fraternal country, the United Arab Emirates, which has made many efforts to put an end to the conflict, in keeping with international law.

(Mr. Klibi)

The Security Council is meeting today to resume consideration of Iran's continued aggression against Iraqi territory, and the renewed threats by Iran to launch another wide-scale attack on Iraq. That is a very serious threat to the security of the region and international peace and security.

The Committee of Seven, which is part of the League of Arab States and which is closely following the developments in the Iran-Iraq war, has asked the Security Council to resume its consideration of this explosive situation because it is aware of the dangers to that nerve centre of the world and because it believes that the international community will sincerely, firmly and effectively shoulder its responsibilities to achieve peace in the world.

Iran is determined to continue this deadly war and is deaf to all international initiatives on all sides designed to put an end to the conflict. That is a serious challenge to the international community and to the international Organization. Iran's defiance is also clear from its refusal to abide by Security Council resolution 582 (1986), in particular paragraph 3, in which the Council

"Calls upon Iran and Iraq to observe an immediate cease-fire, a cessation of all hostilities on land, at sea and in the air and withdrawal of all forces to the internationally recognized boundaries without delay".

(resolution 582 (1986), para. 3)

In paragraph 5 of the resolution, the Council

"Calls upon both parties to submit immediately all aspects of the conflict to mediation or to any other means of peaceful settlement of disputes". (resolution 582 (1986), para. 5)

I already had an opportunity of stating in the Security Council, at its meeting on 18 February 1986, that the League of Arab States, in keeping with its responsibilities to the Arab nation and the international community and in keeping with its charter, has always, at all levels, supported efforts to achieve a

(Mr. Ribi)

peaceful and just settlement of the conflict that would respect the legitimate rights of both parties and would conform with the requirements of harmony and co-operation that flow from the principles of good-neighbourliness and mutual advantage. For that reason, and because of the special importance that we attach to the Security Council's role, we believe that at this series of meetings the Council should go beyond the stage of speeches and high-sounding words and should very quickly agree on effective actions and the implementation thereof.

Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Charter provides that

"All Members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered".

Therefore, the international community and all peace-loving forces throughout the world have the right to ask what happens if a Member of the United Nations does not abide by that principle, and what should be done in the particular case of the continuing war between Iran and Iraq, which is causing death and desolation and, in addition, seriously threatening international peace and security.

We believe that it is high time for the Security Council to implement the provisions of Chapter VI of the Charter regarding the peaceful settlement of disputes, in particular Articles 33 (2), 34, 36 (1) and 37 (2). If, however, the Council's efforts do not achieve the desired results, the international community, as represented in the Security Council, should not become discouraged but should continue to shoulder its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, so that a peaceful settlement preserving the rights of both parties can be achieved.

The experience of the Second World War, which caused untold suffering to mankind, prompted the drafters of the Charter to call on the international

(Mr. Klibi)

community to stand together and co-ordinate its efforts to prevent the use of force in inter-State relations.

We all know that war is not the ideal way of settling problems between States. Indeed, it can be said that war is the worst of choices, even when it appears to be the only one. In the case before the Council now, one of the two parties constantly demonstrates its willingness to solve the problem quickly, within the framework of the United Nations. I am of course referring to Iraq. There is no political, military or moral justification for continuing this war, which has already lasted longer than the Second World War and whose prolongation can only sow more death and desolation in both countries and make it impossible for either of them to devote its efforts to development and bringing an end to underdevelopment.

No one can doubt that the continuation of this conflict will threaten the security of the region and, at the same time, the economic interests of the international community. There is therefore a risk of the internationalization of the conflict. That would sorely test international peace and security.

That is why we believe that the international community has the duty to take whatever action is necessary now, before it is too late, to put an end to the hostilities and thereby lay the groundwork for a just settlement under United Nations supervision.

The Security Council, now more than ever before, must examine the conflict between Iran and Iraq as a whole, as a problem related to peace in the world and affecting the international community as a whole.

In this atmosphere of hostilities, we have to make a choice between a world governed by chaos, by the rule that might makes right and by aggression - where the supreme values of mankind would be placed in jeopardy - and a world in which the values and principles contained in the Charter of our Organization are respected.

(Mr. Klibi)

As far as we in the Arab nation are concerned, we have always cherished international law - whatever the sacrifices and suffering involved. That is why we have had recourse to the Security Council, in an effort to put an end to this conflict. We are convinced that the Council will spare no effort to ensure that the peace so ardently desired is established.

(Mr. Klibi)

The conflict between Iran and Iraq has entered its seventh year, which is an indication of the level of suffering both peoples have endured. Once again, therefore, we call upon the leaders of Iran to give a favourable response to the appeals of the international community, to put an end to the bloodshed and to enter on a new cause that will return peace to the region and divert the energies of both countries to the service of development and national reconstruction. We urge the two belligerent parties to resume their efforts for the enrichment of world civilization and add lustre to their cultural heritage.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank Mr. Klibi for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, upon whom I now call.

Mr. AZIZ (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): Allow me to extend to you, Mr. President, and through you to the other members of the Council, our thanks for having acceded to our request to participate in this meeting. In view of your well-known wisdom and experience, I am confident that under your leadership the meetings of the Council will deal both seriously and effectively with the topic of which it is seized.

Today, we are once again here to discuss the conflict between Iran and Iraq at the request of the Committee of the League of Arab States entrusted with following the development of the war between Iran and Iraq. Seven months after the Council's discussion of this same issue following a similar request after the invasion of the south of Iraq on the night of 9-10 February of this year and the subsequent occupation by Iran of the Iraqi port of Al Faw, we have to discuss the situation yet again.

I must remind members that Iraq has drawn the Council's attention to the fact that the Iranian invasion not only constituted a dangerous escalation of the

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

situation in the area but also demonstrated several facts and explained many of the realities of the situation and the events of the past seven years. The Iranian régime has used in relation to that aggression phrases such as "the liberation of Iraq" and has threatened the Arab Gulf States, demanding that they "deal with the invasion forces as with a new neighbour". Thus the aggression and the expansionist tendency of the Iranian régime have been laid bare. We have always drawn attention to that posture and made it clear that the purpose of the Iranian régime's continued occupation of Iraq soil, particularly the region adjacent to the Gulf, is the creation of a new military, political and economic situation in the region that would make it possible for that régime to pursue its expansionist aims. Those very aims were the principal reason for the outbreak of war on 4 September 1980 and are the reason it continues to this day.

The Security Council debated the question for several days. In the course of that discussion it reiterated yet again that the situation must be dealt with in accordance with the Charter, the rules of international law and the norms of international behaviour. We pointed out the futility of selective and partial solutions. We also stressed the dangers inherent in diverting our efforts from the focal point of the problem: namely, the necessity of putting an end to the war according to an internationally agreed procedure. In the meantime, the Iranian régime continued to wage a war of aggression that has threatened the safety and security not only of Iraq but of all the other States in the region for the past six years, despite all the efforts at appeasement.

The outcome of the Council's discussions was the unanimous adoption of resolution 582 (1986), on 24 February of this year. That resolution was not based on an Iraqi or Arab-sponsored draft. The Council formulated resolution 582 (1986) free from the influence of either of the parties to the dispute and it was drafted in the conviction that a comprehensive framework for the peaceful settlement of

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

the dispute should take into account the rights and interests of both parties, in accordance with the United Nations Charter and the norms of international law governing relations between States.

Although resolution 583 (1986) did not satisfy all the requirements of Iraq, we stated our readiness to co-operate with the Council in implementing it, in good faith and on the basis of a clear understanding of its focal points, provided the Iranian régime also made a formal pledge to accept it and implement it unconditionally and in good faith. The Iranian régime, as members know, refused to apply resolution 582 (1986) and has claimed that it amounts to an endorsement by the Security Council of the military option.

The spokesmen for the Iranian régime have waged a fierce campaign in favour of continuing the war on the basis of what they call a "divine duty" to liberate the Iraqi people. They now declare openly and arrogantly that they are preparing for yet another invasion of Iraq to carry out that so-called duty. Since September they have been carrying out a series of military attacks against Iraq, stating that such actions are merely a prelude to what they refer to as a final and decisive strike. Fortunately, all such attacks have been speedily and effectively crushed.

In Article 24 of the United Nations Charter the States Members of the Organization clearly entrust the Security Council with the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and agree that in carrying out its duties in accordance with that responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf in conformity with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. We had hoped that Security Council resolution 582 (1986) - adopted unanimously and, as I have said, independently of any influence exerted by either of the two parties to the conflict - would meet with approval and that its adoption would be followed by implementation. This, however, has not so far been the case



(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

owing to the clear reluctance to put the onus of responsibility for continuing the war on Iran. This is the more regrettable in that the Council has been able to identify the essential differences which distinguished the positions of the two parties over the past six years and has become well aware of the differences in the positions they have taken with regard to the questions of security and stability in the region.

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Equality in terms of State sovereignty means equality not only in rights but also in shouldering the obligations imposed by the Charter and international law. For the first time in this Organization's history, the Iranian régime has declared that the military option is the only means of solving a dispute with a fellow Member of the United Nations. It insists on that course, disregarding all legal and moral obligations. The Iranian régime has rejected this Council's mandate as provided in the Charter; it has treated the Council's resolutions with contempt and adopted an opportunistic approach in the search for peace, seeking only to serve its own plans to perpetuate the war and dominate Iraq and other countries of the region.

The Iranian régime has adopted a selective approach to the United Nations Charter and international law: it accepts only what serves its own selfish interests and its aim of continuing the war, and rejects those provisions that call for peace, justice, respect for sovereignty, good-neighbourliness, non-interference in the internal affairs of other States, and renunciation of the concepts of hegemony, violence, terrorism and aggression.

In my statement to the General Assembly on 25 September I exposed the lies the Iranian régime is using to justify its abnormal stand. I have also explained the proposals we have put to it over the past six years here in the Security Council, in the General Assembly and at meetings of the Non-Aligned Movement, proposals calling on that régime to accept the mandate and arbitration of the international community, of the international organizations and of the rules of international law. But that régime has turned a deaf ear and persisted with its prevarications and with the flimsy pretexts it tries to use to explain its abnormal stand and its insistence on continuing the war. All the proposals that we have put forward during the years of the conflict have been based on our acceptance of the

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

Security Council's mandate to solve the dispute and our readiness to settle it by peaceful means, in accordance with the Charter and the rules of international law, on respect for sovereignty and for the right of each and every people to choose its own political and social systems.

The essential difference between the two positions of the parties to the conflict is very clear in their stance on the question of security and stability in the area. Representatives must be well aware that all the countries of the area have now been complaining for several years about the approach adopted by the Iranian régime, which is designed to destabilize the whole region. Let us not forget that Security Council resolution 552 (1984) was adopted as a result of the complaint to the Council by the States of the Gulf Co-operation Council against the Iranian régime for its acts of aggression against commercial vessels heading for ports of the countries of the area, and let us bear in mind the statements made by those States in March and August of this year.

The essential differences between the positions of Iraq and the Iranian régime need no further demonstration in the Council; they have become only too clear, and all the members of the Council are well aware of them. On the basis of the experience of over six years, all the members know full well that the only obstacle to a just and honourable peace that would safeguard the rights and interests of the two parties in accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Charter and the rules of international law governing the relationship among States has always been the abnormal stand adopted by the Iranian régime, which is in total contradiction with its legal obligations.

In view of the foregoing observations, the Council should not and must not remain silent or adopt a neutral attitude towards the two positions adopted: the position of a country which accepts the Council's mandate and believes in the

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

United Nations Charter and its principles; and that of a country which rejects the Council's mandate and resolutions, treats the Organization with contempt, uses its rostrum for the purposes of lies, prevarication and deceit in order to be able to continue the war, and endangers the stability and security of the area in its pursuance of openly aggressive and expansionist aims.

It is not only a moral but also a legal obligation imposed by the Charter on the Council and on both the parties to the dispute to conduct the discussions in the Council on the conflict between Iraq and Iran on the basis of a clear awareness of those differences between the positions taken by Iraq on the one hand and Iran on the other. To adopt that approach does not mean the Council is taking sides, for whoever takes the side of peace and works seriously to achieve peace is merely taking the side of the Charter, and upholding its provisions and the authority of the Organization.

Only thus can the Council fulfil the responsibility for ending the war that the international community has so often called upon it to shoulder, for instance, at the summit Conference held at Harare, Zimbabwe, at the beginning of September, and in the general debate at the current session of the General Assembly. The international community as a whole, and the States which have requested the Council to consider the matter on this occasion, have a right to call upon the Council to intensify its efforts to bring about peace.

We call upon the Council today - and we have a right to do so as a founding Member of the United Nations - to assume the responsibility of implementing the resolutions for peace that it has adopted in the interests of peace and in accordance with the United Nations Charter. If it does so, we can justify to our people - which has been heroically standing up to Iranian expansionist aggression for six years in defence of its independence and sovereignty, and yet has been

(Mr. Aziz, Iraq)

willing to extend the hand of peace once more - the Council's existence, the effectiveness of the Charter and the need to trust the United Nations.

On this occasion I should like to affirm once again our readiness to co-operate with the Council in reaching a just, comprehensive and permanent settlement of the dispute.

I should also like to reaffirm Iraq's appreciation for the efforts of the United Nations Secretary-General and our readiness now, as in the past, to co-operate with him to facilitate his task of reaching the goal that we all desire, namely, a comprehensive, just and lasting peace.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Mr. Ahmed Esmat Abdel Meguid. I welcome him to the Council, invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ABDEL MEGUID (Egypt) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like first to congratulate you sincerely, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of October. The Egyptian delegation is happy to see the representative of the United Arab Emirates, a sister country, occupying the Chair. I am absolutely convinced that your great competence is a guarantee of the success of the Council's deliberations.

I wish also to congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Belonogov, on the highly skilled way in which he conducted the Council's work last month. He was for a long time the Ambassador of the Soviet Union in Cairo.

The Security Council has often met to consider the armed conflict between Iraq and Iran and has adopted a number of resolutions on the subject, the most recent being Security Council resolution 582 (1986), which was adopted unanimously on 24 February 1986 and which contains all the elements of a just and lasting settlement of the conflict. The resolution calls for an immediate cease-fire, a cessation of all hostilities on land, at sea and in the air and withdrawal of all forces to the internationally recognized boundaries without delay. It also calls upon the two parties to submit immediately all aspects of the conflict to mediation or to any other means of peaceful settlement of disputes, and requests the Secretary-General to continue his ongoing efforts to assist the two parties to give effect to the resolution.

A few months have elapsed since the adoption of that resolution but the situation remains explosive and new threats are constantly being made that a large-scale military attack is to be launched against Iraq. These meetings of the Security Council have been convened to consider this very dangerous situation.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

It is regrettable that the Security Council resolutions have so far had no effect while the Iran-Iraq conflict is in its seventh year and the blood of those two neighbouring Muslim peoples, so closely bound by their religious beliefs, continues to flow. The media report every day not only a resumption and intensification of hostilities, which take a heavy toll of life and cause much material damage, but also bellicose declarations that there will be new acts of aggression despite the appeals of this Organization.

The consequences of the conflict between Iraq and Iran have spilled over the borders of these two countries and into the entire Gulf region. It is now clear that the economic and security interests of the region, the world in general are threatened. Speakers at previous Council meetings have emphasized the seriousness of this explosive situation and urged the Security Council, the supreme organ charged with maintaining international peace and security, to shoulder its responsibilities under the Charter. We assure those speakers that Egypt shares their great concern at the worsening of the conflict, which means that we must all redouble our efforts at all levels to put an end to the conflict. Efforts to this end have been dragging on for more than six years now without any progress, but we must not be discouraged and must continue our efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict and re-establish peace, security and stability throughout the Gulf region.

Ever since the outbreak of war between Iran and Iraq, Egypt has taken a clear, consistent and public position: it deplores the shedding of the blood by the two peoples and the draining of their precious economic resources, and asks that prudence and moderation be shown to bring about a climate conducive to the solution of this problem by peaceful means.

(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

Egypt has also given a warning against the spreading of this military confrontation to the entire region, a situation which Egypt could not tolerate. Egypt has never spared any effort, here in the United Nations or outside it, within the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, the Organization of the Islamic Conference or in the framework of its bilateral contacts, to mobilize all efforts to bring about a peaceful settlement of the conflict, which would restore the rights of those properly entitled to them with full respect for the basic principles of international law, the United Nations Charter, the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, and, above all, the right of each State to independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and to non-interference in its internal affairs.

Egypt has reaffirmed its position by subscribing to all the resolutions adopted by the Security Council and the General Assembly in connection with the Iraq-Iran conflict, and to the decisions adopted by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of the Islamic Conference. Today, we again ask that the content of these resolutions and the elements of a just, comprehensive and lasting settlement of the conflict set out therein be respected.

Egypt fully endorses the sustained efforts being made by the Secretary-General and asks him to continue his contacts with the two parties in order to reach the desired objective.

We listened to the statement made by the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, who said that his country is anxious to put an end to this lethal war and that it is the sincere wish of Iraq to respond to any initiative, whether within this Organization or outside it, to put an end to the bloody, lethal conflict, and to have recourse to the principles of international



(Mr. Abdel Meguid, Egypt)

law to reach a settlement by peaceful means. Furthermore, Iraq has made peace offers to the Iranian authorities. In fact, last August the President of Iraq, Mr. Saddam Hussein, sent them a letter setting out the essential principles of a comprehensive settlement of the conflict by peaceful means.

Iraq has therefore taken initiatives and made proposals to ease the burden of war. In 1983 Iraq proposed the conclusion of a special agreement between itself and Iran, under the auspices of the United Nations, not to attack civilian targets. The Iraqi Government also welcomed favourably the appeal of the Secretary-General that no attacks be made on civilian targets, and permanent observers of the United Nations and a special mission of inquiry into the conditions of detention of prisoners of war were welcomed in Baghdad.

Nevertheless, Iran is still unwilling to respond to the efforts being made by the international community and is boycotting the Security Council, stepping up its attacks and continuing to occupy Iraqi land, thus violating international law, the United Nations Charter and the principles of the Non-Aligned Movement and the Organization of the Islamic Conference.

In conclusion, it is high time for Iran to review and to reconsider its position and respond to the desire expressed by Iraq since the beginning of the conflict that it be ended.

I wish to associate myself with all those who have already asked the Security Council to adopt all possible measures likely to result in the implementation of resolutions previously adopted by the Council on the ending of the armed conflict between Iran and Iraq, and above all resolution 582 (1986).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Egypt for the kind words he addressed to me.

In view of the lateness of the hour, I intend to adjourn the meeting now.

The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place at 3.30 this afternoon.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.