



## Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2937  
18 August 1990

ENGLISH

---

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND  
NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Saturday, 18 August 1990, at 10.45 p.m.

President: Mr. MUNTEANU (Romania)

Members:

|   |                        |
|---|------------------------|
| Canada  | Mr. FORTIER            |
| China   | Mr. YU Mengjia         |
| Colombia  | Mr. PEÑALOSA           |
| Côte d'Ivoire   | Mr. ANET               |
| Cuba  | Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA |
| Ethiopia  | Mr. HAGOSS             |
| Finland   | Ms. RASI               |
| France  | Mr. BLANC              |
| Malaysia  | Mr. REDZUAN            |
| Union of Soviet Socialist Republics                     | Mr. LOZINSKY           |
| United Kingdom of Great Britain and<br>Northern Ireland | Sir Crispin TICKELL    |
| United States of America                                | Mr. PICKERING          |
| Yemen   | Mr. AL-ASHTAL          |
| Zaire   | Mr. KIBIDI NGOWUKA     |

---

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 10.45 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAQ AND KUWAIT

LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF KUWAIT TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21423)

LETTER DATED 2 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21424)

LETTER DATED 8 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES OF BAHRAIN, KUWAIT, OMAN, QATAR, SAUDI ARABIA AND THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21470)

LETTER DATED 18 AUGUST 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ITALY TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21561)

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2932nd meeting, I invite the representatives of Iraq and Kuwait to take places at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Al-Anbari (Iraq) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Al-Sallal (Kuwait) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Italy in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative 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. Traxler (Italy) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the request contained in a letter dated 18 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/21561).

Members of the Council have before them document S/21562, which contains the text of a draft resolution which has been prepared in the course of the Council's prior consultations.

I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/21548, which contains a letter dated 16 August 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I shall first call upon those members of the Council who wish to make statements before the voting.

Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): The delegation of the Republic of Yemen will vote in favour of the draft resolution before us. However, we should like to make it clear that the vote of the Republic of Yemen on draft resolution S/21562 reflects our interest in the safety, security and well-being of all third-State nationals in Iraq and Kuwait. This interest is in keeping with humanitarian concerns and relates to all third-State nationals without exception, including Arab nationals.

Secondly, on the basis of the same humanitarian principles, we also affirm that we intend to safeguard the security and well-being of our brothers and sisters

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

in Iraq and Kuwait, in particular children, women and the elderly who may be affected by famine and illness due to the embargo on foodstuffs that has been imposed upon Iraq and Kuwait.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

It is for these humanitarian reasons that we call for the lifting of the embargo on food, a measure that should provide a serious index that would lead to the reduction of tension and military confrontation in the region.

Thirdly, the crisis in the region is far more deep-seated and dangerous than some believe. Moreover, it is becoming increasingly complicated because of the military and economic blockade that is being set up by one country against Iraq and Kuwait under Article 51 of the Charter. We believe that utilization of this military blockade by one State without taking into consideration the role assumed by the Security Council for the safeguarding of international peace and security is an act that is not defensive in character.

Fourthly, within this context the Republic of Yemen believes that an increase in the foreign military presence and its growing intensity in the region, a region that is near our own territorial waters and territory, is one that is not in any way in accordance with the political objectives cited as a pretext for sending foreign armed forces to the region. Moreover, it exceeds the estimates that were made for that massive presence. No one can doubt that some Powers, or indeed the same Powers that have sent the aforementioned forces, have asserted that they will remain in the region for a long time.

Fifthly, since the outbreak of the crisis the Republic of Yemen has called for a peaceful solution within an Arab context. Thus, my country has made efforts in the past and will continue doing so in future with a view to extricating ourselves from this crisis and finding political and diplomatic solutions to it.

On the basis of the said principle, we welcomed the Iraqi initiative because we saw in it an indication that Iraq wishes to settle this crisis by peaceful means. We still consider it necessary to seize this initiative so as to follow up the actions taken, with a view to reaching a peaceful settlement of all problems

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

confronting our region, because we are convinced of the interdependence of all problems in the region, and it is necessary not to lose sight of the general context of our problems in the Middle East, in particular the Israeli policy of expansion and settlement that has been continued in Palestinian territory, in the Golan Heights and in southern Lebanon.

Yemeni leaders, in their contacts and efforts to reach a solution to these problems in the region, are working towards developing that Iraqi initiative so that it will indeed provide a good basis making it possible to arrive at a political solution that will guarantee the peace, security, stability and well-being of the peoples and States of the region and also guarantee a balance of local, region and international interests in that region.

We consider this an excellent opportunity for the Security Council to invite all parties concerned to evince moderation and use all options existing for reaching a political solution in order to ensure that our region will not be confronted with a war whose scope would be tremendous and indeed terribly grave for our region.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/21562.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT: There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 664 (1990).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): At the outset, let me express the gratification of my Government at the unanimous adoption of this very important resolution.

Yesterday this Council expressed its concern and anxiety over the situation regarding foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait. In the succeeding 24 hours the Iraqi régime answered the deep and unanimous concern of the Security Council with new actions and threats against those innocent people, which we find dismaying and revolting.

In the mean time, the Secretary-General has moved swiftly. We warmly welcome his announcement that he will immediately send a special mission to the area.

Following our meeting yesterday, Baghdad continued to deny consular access to American and other nationals in Kuwait and in Iraq. Just a few hours later, Iraq crossed the Rubicon when the speaker of the Iraqi Parliament announced that foreign nationals were being detained and sent to camps and other housing, either inside or close to military and other strategic installations in Iraq.

As if that were not enough, we heard this morning that Iraq was also going to take special action against the weakest and most innocent of this group of foreign visitors and residents in Iraq and Kuwait. The régime of Saddam Hussein singled out infants for special food restrictions. It also pointed to the aged and their special needs and indicated that they would be denied food. The announcement did not distinguish between foreigners. It made it clear that all foreigners in those categories would be treated alike.

Finally, the announcement completely ignored the major concern of the Security Council that those foreign nationals who wish to leave Iraq and Kuwait should be permitted to do so. Obviously, instead of talk about the mutual sharing of food shortages under sanctions, such persons should be permitted to leave Iraq and Kuwait immediately, as is their right under international law and in accordance

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

with all common standards of human decency. Instead, we were told that they are being placed in the most sensitive areas, militarily speaking, of Iraq and Kuwait. The lesson is obvious: blatant Iraqi rejection of the concern and appeal of the Council is clear. That is why we are back, meeting here again today.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

This adds one more serious insult and injury to the many which the Iraqi régime has already heaped upon the family of nations:

It attacked without provocation a State Member of the United Nations.

It then, contrary to its own protestations, baldly annexed the territory of that State.

It has attempted in all possible ways to flout the Security Council resolution calling for immediate and unconditional withdrawal of its forces.

It has attempted to find all possible means to escape the sanctions imposed upon it under Security Council resolution 661 (1990).

It has continued in other ways flagrantly to violate international law and its obligations with respect to its treatment of the third-State citizen community in Iraq and Kuwait, including an order to shut down embassies and consulates in Kuwait and withdraw the diplomatic immunities of their personnel.

It has rejected the international community's condemnation of its invasion and aggression.

And now it has begun to round up and concentrate in Kuwait the innocent citizens of the United States and other countries friendly to the United States. It has begun also to relocate the civilian citizens of third countries, obviously separating them from the protection of their Governments, and is planning to use them as human shields around military and strategic installations in Iraq and Kuwait.

Each of the above actions is unacceptable to the international community. The cumulative effect of all these actions is intolerable. No nation can allow such steps to be taken against its own citizens without the fullest possible response. This is an action on the part of Iraq which requires the full and concerted solidarity of all States. This Council is the place where that action can and must be taken.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

In that regard, the Security Council's resolution will send an unequivocal and clear message to Saddam Hussein. He and his régime must bear the responsibility for the health, security and safety of third country citizens now locked up in his country. He must bear full responsibility before the family of nations and international public opinion for his treatment of those human beings. It is contrary to international law and to all the norms of Arab hospitality to use guests as military shields. Both the civil rights and the human rights of these individuals are clearly being violated, and we believe that the international community should speak out clearly, with one voice - and now - about the problem.

Throughout this crisis the international community, as represented here in this Council, has remained united in its resolve. Now it is time to continue to show that resolve. It is imperative, in the view of my Government, that the Security Council should record clearly and forcefully that Iraq has solemn obligations under the Charter of the United Nations which it must respect. We must call a spade a spade. When Iraq tears up international law, seeks to use innocent civilians as a military shield and indicates that it no longer respects its solemn obligations under the Charter and international law, we must speak clearly, firmly and forcefully, as we have.

In particular, we can do no less today because the lives of hundreds of thousands of foreign nationals from countries all over the world are being put at risk. We must move now to put on the record our clear efforts to secure their release. The resolution the Council has just adopted is a solid document. It calls on Iraq immediately to permit such persons to depart from Iraq and Kuwait, and it rejects fully and completely the efforts of Iraq to close the diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait which help to protect those people.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Each of us has a duty and an obligation to protect our own citizens. Today we make it clear that it is not only our individual but our collective determination to do all we can to protect the lives, the safety, the security and the health of innocent citizens now caught up in this malign conspiracy of aggression and prevarication. My delegation worked hard to help prepare the resolution just adopted by the Security Council; we supported its adoption and will support its full implementation.

Mr. YU Mengjia (China) (interpretation from Chinese): We wish to express our sympathy with respect to the plight of foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait. Their safety and security should be guaranteed, and they should not be harmed in any way.

In its handling of this matter, the country concerned should abide by the principles of international law to guarantee the safety and security of all foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait and to guarantee their safe exit from those two countries if that is their choice.

On the basis of that position, we voted in favour of the draft resolution before the Council this evening. In that connection, we wish to convey our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his prompt response to the request by Council members to appoint representatives to engage in activities of good offices.

We believe that to solve the present serious crisis in the Gulf, it is necessary to implement the three relevant resolutions of the Security Council in a serious and effective manner. The occupying forces should immediately, unconditionally and completely withdraw from Kuwait. We support all efforts aimed at seeking a political settlement by peaceful means.

We are deeply disturbed by the mounting tension in the Gulf region. It is our belief that military involvement by the great Powers is not conducive to the settlement of the present crisis.

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

We appeal once again to the parties concerned to exercise restraint, so as to avoid any action that could cause a further deterioration of the situation.

Lastly, I wish to point out that this meeting is focused on the consideration of the situation of foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait rather than on the crisis as a whole. We therefore express reservations about the reference in the resolution to Chapter VII of the Charter, which has broader implications.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada): The situation faced by the nationals of third countries in Iraq and Kuwait is totally unacceptable. It is in clear and flagrant violation of the norms of international law, in particular of the Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and of the Fourth Geneva Convention, to both of which Iraq is a party. The Iraqi authorities have consistently and repeatedly chosen to ignore the démarches made by many Member States on behalf of their nationals, and it is for that reason that this body has responded quickly, clearly and unanimously to the plight of those many individuals.

As a result, Canada fully supports the text of the resolution we have just adopted, which demands that the Iraqi authorities should live up to their acknowledged responsibilities under international law and permit and facilitate the immediate departure from Kuwait and Iraq of the nationals of third countries. On this occasion I also wish to reiterate Canada's full and unqualified support for Security Council resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990). In particular, resolution 662 (1990) declared the annexation of Kuwait by Iraq to be null and void. As a consequence, we cannot accept the Iraqi Government's decision that diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait must be closed and that the personnel of those missions will lose their immunity.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

Hundreds of Canadians remain unable to leave either Iraq or Kuwait. They went to Iraq and Kuwait in good faith to contribute to the development of those countries. Their situation is causing the greatest distress to their families and their loved ones, and all Canadians profoundly sympathize with them, as well as with the citizens of all countries whose nationals remain in Kuwait or Iraq against their will.

(spoke in French)

This humanitarian crisis must not continue. Our Council has now unanimously condemned these contraventions by Iraq of its most elementary obligations under international humanitarian law, as it had to do. Canada welcomes all efforts, in particular those of the Secretary-General, to enable those third-country nationals who wish to do so to leave Iraq and Kuwait without delay.

Ms. RASI (Finland): We are all aware of the prolonged diplomatic efforts of numerous countries regarding the situation of foreigners in the territories of Iraq and Kuwait. Finland itself has used and continues to use all available diplomatic channels to secure the safe exit of Finnish citizens from those two countries. Regrettably, our efforts, like the efforts of many others, have so far been of little avail. We trust that there is no immediate threat to foreigners residing in Iraq and occupied Kuwait. However, the situation is a cause of ever more serious concern to us. Prohibiting foreigners to leave is in flagrant violation of international norms generally accepted and specifically undertaken by Iraq itself.

We expect Iraq to comply promptly with its international legal obligations and permit the departure of all foreigners who wish to leave. We also expect Iraq not to interfere in the status and functioning of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait.

(Ms. Rasi, Finland)

Finland voted in favour of the humanitarian resolution under consideration in order to urge Iraq in the strongest possible terms to refrain from any action that might endanger the safety and health of foreigners and to guarantee their departure and other rights, in accordance with the norms of international law.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): France has approached the Iraqi authorities in a series of démarches in order to ensure that French citizens who so wish might freely leave Iraq and Kuwait, in accordance with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and in accordance with the Geneva Conventions, to which Iraq is a party. International law requires Iraq not only to protect foreign citizens within its territory but also to guarantee their freedom of movement.

Similar démarches have been made by other countries or groups of countries, as well as by the International Committee of the Red Cross. The only response of the Iraqi Government has been a succession of statements announcing ever more draconian measures against foreign nationals, whose freedom has today very clearly been trampled, in a discriminatory manner according to their nationalities.

Such methods, today accompanied by threats, elicit the greatest possible indignation on the part of France, not only because they violate international commitments, to which Iraq has subscribed, but also because they evidence deliberate scorn for the most fundamental humanitarian considerations.

My Government has explicitly instructed me to state that it denounces in the firmest possible way the unacceptable conduct of Iraq against foreign nationals detained in Iraq and Kuwait.

The Iraqi Ambassador in France was called this morning to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which told him to warn his authorities about the serious

(Mr. Blanc, France)

consequences which would surely result from any failure to ensure the safety of French nationals. That is why France fully supported the resolution just adopted, and we are very pleased that it was adopted unanimously.

Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation supports the draft resolution on the need for ensuring the safety of foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait, since we cannot fail to share the concern at the situation in which nationals of numerous countries find themselves, having become involved in the present situation, the beginning of which, as we all know, resulted from the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq.

Yesterday the members of the Security Council, through the President of the Council, expressed their concern at the fate of the foreign nationals there and requested the Secretary-General to take all necessary steps to resolve the matter. However, the situation continues to deteriorate. The Soviet delegation is convinced that it is necessary to continue efforts to find an early solution to the problem, in accordance with the principles of humanitarianism and respect for human rights, on the basis of the norms of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

In that connection, we should like to express our special hope for the success of the efforts of the Secretary-General and his representatives. Of course, everything possible will continue to be done by the Soviet Union as well, and, as we understand it, by other members of the international community, in order to bring about a successful settlement of the matter.

At the same time, one cannot help seeing that what is at issue is not only the safety of thousands of people and their freedom to leave those countries, but also the possibility that events might develop in such a way as to lead to a new escalation of tension there with unforeseeable consequences. In this situation it

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

is important to stop military activities, to prevent them from spreading to other countries and to restore respect for international law.

As was emphasized by President Gorbachev of the Soviet Union, we are relying on the reasonableness and responsibility of Arab States and their regional organization and on the rights and powers of the United Nations and the Security Council, and we intend to act exclusively within the context of collective efforts for a settlement of this conflict. We would like to see political methods employed to prevent a military confrontation involving even greater dangers.

Sir Crispin TICKELL (United Kingdom): I think the resolution has said it all, and speakers so far have put with eloquence the main points and arguments which are to buttress it, but I feel that today in approaching this problem we must continue always to keep the essentials in mind. There was an unprovoked invasion of a brother-Arab State. There was the creation of a bogus Government of laughable implausibility. There was the rapid extinction of that Government. There was the annexation of that brother-Arab State. Meanwhile, that State knew loss of life. It has known destruction. It has seen its wealth removed to the aggressor capital. It has seen threats to its neighbours.

Against that background, we are today dealing with a strictly humanitarian problem.

Yesterday, members of the Council gathered and they asked you, Mr. President, to express their concern and anxiety about the foreign nationals caught in Kuwait to the Secretary-General and also to the Permanent Representative of Iraq. That was done and we know that the Secretary-General, who has this problem very much on his agenda, has already decided to send two emissaries to the Government of Iraq to secure the release of those who are caught in Iraq and Kuwait.

That was the situation yesterday. Since then there have been two acts which outrage international law and international opinion. The first was the use of innocent civilians, justified by nauseating rhetoric about their status as "guests", to act as a human shield to protect strategic sites. The second was the punishment of the hundreds of thousands of civilians caught in Kuwait and Iraq - a sort of act of retaliation against the Security Council for having adopted resolution 661 (1990) imposing economic sanctions upon Iraq.

Whom did they choose to retaliate against? They chose the weakest members of the community: the children, the women, the sick, the old and anyone who was sufficiently foreign to be blamed and caught up in the chariot wheels of history.

(Sir Crispin Tickell,  
United Kingdom)

I can hardly think of a more outrageous act that any of us in any generation has seen than that which is now taking place at the hands of the Iraqi Government.

We had hoped for an Arab solution to what has often been called an Arab problem. We saw particular attention given to the role of the League of Arab States in resolution 660 (1990), and I think we still must have a few lingering hopes. We have also heard some very sensible remarks about the wider dangers which are taking place in the region, and we have heard appeals for negotiation.

Any sensible person wants a peaceful solution, but I think that before closing I should remind this Council of what the basis of any such negotiations should be. It is set out in the recent acts of this Council:

"... that Iraq withdraw immediately and unconditionally all its forces to the positions in which they were located on 1 August 1990." (resolution 660 (1990), para. 2)

and

"... that annexation of Kuwait by Iraq under any form and whatever pretext has no legal validity, and is considered null and void" (resolution 662 (1990), para. 1)).

In dealing with this humanitarian problem let us never lose our grip on its essentials, and let us keep that grip until this problem is resolved.

Mr. HAGOSS (Ethiopia): As the statements made by the previous speakers clearly indicate, these are difficult moments. Given the alarming situation in which third-country nationals find themselves in Iraq and Kuwait, and in view of the escalating tension in the Gulf as a whole, we consider it timely and appropriate that the Council has seen fit to adopt the resolution before us. Indeed, the attitude manifested by Iraq as regards foreign nationals, particularly

(Mr. Haqoss, Ethiopia)

as of this morning, clearly warrants a timely decision on the part of the Security Council.

There is no doubt that the foreign nationals trapped in Iraq and Kuwait are in need of the Council's support and protection. Ethiopia believes that the adoption of this resolution constitutes the collective response of the international community to the alarming broadcast that emanated from Baghdad pertaining to the predicament of third-country nationals.

Although Iraq's response to the Security Council's recent decisions has not been encouraging thus far, we should like to express our hope that Iraq would comply with the request contained in operative paragraph 1 of the resolution we have just adopted.

Mr. RADZUAN (Malaysia): My delegation shares the deep concern of the Council over the deteriorating situation with regard to the status of foreign nationals in Kuwait and Iraq. Malaysia regrets that thousands of foreign nationals in both countries are now under the threat of further danger to their safety and security. This situation is clearly in contravention of the principles of international law. Under the circumstances we believe that all foreign nationals should be allowed to leave Kuwait and Iraq and proper facilities should be provided for them to do so. These foreign nationals should be able to maintain contact with and receive the assistance of their consular representatives.

My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to express our appreciation to the Secretary-General for his prompt response to your message, Mr. President, on behalf of the Council yesterday. We support the initiative taken by the Secretary-General to send his special emissaries immediately to Baghdad to address this humanitarian problem. At the same time, we believe it appropriate, in the light of the alarming deterioration in the situation today, that the Council has adopted this resolution unanimously.

(Mr. Radzuan, Malaysia)

In the interest of peace Malaysia hopes that the Government of Iraq will respond positively to this resolution, as well as to resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990), so that we can have an early and peaceful settlement to this unfortunate crisis.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): The Security Council has voted in favour of resolution 664 (1990). Bearing in mind the views expressed by some members of our Council and Organization, to the effect that the resolution is based on exclusively humanitarian considerations, Cuba voted in favour of it. My delegation naturally shares the concerns for the fate of any innocent civilian involved in the conflict.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

We believe that it is legitimate to express this concern in regard to certain nationals of other countries who are currently on Iraqi and Kuwaiti territory. But we believe also that if there is a legitimate humanitarian concern, it should apply equally to the nationals of Iraq and Kuwait.

In the light of those considerations, we voted in favour of the draft resolution. We are concerned about the situation of innocent people involved in any conflict. We are concerned about improper treatment being meted out to the nationals of one or another country. We share this concern, which has been expressed by mankind on other occasions. It is not a new concern.

Indeed, not long ago in this country we were reminded of what had been done to persons of Japanese origin, who were interned in concentration camps merely because of their national origin and because the United States was involved in a war with Japan. We remember that much more recently severe limitations were placed on the possibility of diplomats leaving Panama, and, what is more, tanks, heavy artillery and major military concentrations were used to impede their leaving their diplomatic missions and even their moving from one embassy to another. Although the situation was particularly grievous with regard to the diplomats of my country, we cannot complain of discrimination since similar treatment was meted out to the Papal Nuncio and his colleagues in the Vatican Mission in Panama and to representatives of other countries that had nothing to do with the conflict.

Having voted for the resolution, we are duty bound, however, to draw attention to some of its elements on which we have misgivings.

First, operative paragraph 1

"Demands that Iraq permit and facilitate the immediate departure from Kuwait and Iraq of the nationals of third countries ...". (resolution

664 (1990), para. 1) In our informal consultations, references were made to

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

the national origins of these individuals, and figures were given. But we have not yet received an answer to the question we have asked from the very outset: What is to happen to the large number of nationals of Palestine who are in the territory of Kuwait? Is the Council asking that they be permitted and assisted to return to their lands, which, as the Council well knows, have been illegally occupied for so many years? Does the Council contemplate any action to ensure that the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinians, which pre-date the conflict with which we are now dealing, are fulfilled? Perhaps we shall have to wait a while to get an answer to that question, which from a statistical point of view seems to be rather important, according to the data with which we have been provided.

The resolution welcomes

"the efforts of the Secretary-General to pursue urgent consultations with the Government of Iraq following the concern and anxiety expressed by ... the Council [yesterday]". (resolution 664 (1990), fourth preambular paragraph)

But we were rather hastily called upon to adopt this resolution that we have just adopted, when, clearly, the Secretary-General has had very little time to engage in these diplomatic efforts that we all want him to engage in.

In operative paragraph 2 the Council

"Further demands that Iraq take no action to jeopardize the safety, security or health of such nationals". (ibid, para. 2)

We believe that neither Iraq nor anyone else should take any measures that will affect or jeopardize the safety, security or health of these nationals or any other nationals in the area. It seems to us that this is a rather unilateral way of looking at the matter. Iraq is being asked to guarantee the health of foreign nationals on its territories, but we do not state in this resolution that the main

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

factor that could place at risk the ability of the nationals of third countries or the nationals of Kuwait and Iraq to get sufficient food or medicine is that, with the full knowledge of the Security Council, one Power, a permanent member of the Council, has abrogated to itself the power to decide what goes into or out of the territory of Kuwait and Iraq. The United States has not received any authorization from anyone to impede the arrival of food and medicine to Iraq. Despite the fact that resolution 661 (1990), of which the United States was a sponsor, clearly excludes medicine from the embargo or the sanctions and recognizes that there must be humanitarian considerations with regard to foodstuffs, and despite the fact that nowhere in that resolution is it stated that it is for the United States Government to determine when there are humanitarian circumstances and when there are not, we have now been informed unilaterally that from now on Washington will not take such requirements into account, and such products will not enter the area in question.

Hence, if the Security Council wishes to be the least bit objective, it should demand that the United States Government put an immediate end to its illegal activities - not authorized by anyone - in the region, activities that are affecting the security and health of the nationals of various countries, including the nationals of Iraq and Kuwait.

There have been other developments in recent days which, unfortunately, have not yet prompted the Security Council to take any action. Originally we were convened to consider the imposition of sanctions against Iraq - when we all knew that such sanctions had already been applied by some developed countries. The Council adopted resolution 661 (1990) and immediately - without any request from any quarter, without any authorization from anywhere - the United States Government sent its navy, its air force, its soldiers to the region and began to guarantee the

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

implementation of the resolution. That constitutes, inter alia, not only a violation of the Charter but a violation of resolution 661 (1990) itself. And yet it is a resolution that the United States Government is very much in favour of.

Subsequently, a de facto naval blockade was put into place. And barely 48 hours ago something rather strange happened: the members of the Council became aware of a communication dated 16 August 1990 and sent by Ambassador Watson, at that time acting as head of the United States Mission. That communication informed us that the United States was applying blockade measures and alleged that it was doing so under Article 51 of the Charter and Security Council resolution 661 (1990). I have already said that nowhere does that resolution authorize anyone or ask anyone - the United States or any other State - to implement the resolution by military means.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

Article 51 is undoubtedly known to any "first-grader" in the United Nations system. It refers to a very old principle of mankind - the right to self-defence. But it is also crystal clear in recognizing the right to self-defence

"until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security".

What we are witnessing now is a new and interesting phenomenon, which should prompt the Council to take very clear decisions.

The Charter is being amended. We see a twisting of the terms of the original concept of the Charter with regard to self-defence: the Charter is being used, deceitfully, as something to be implemented unilaterally by one State after the Security Council has taken the decisions it deems appropriate. Does that mean that the United States is not really in agreement with resolution 661 (1990), which it promoted? Does it believe that the Security Council has not taken the steps it should? Or, contrary to Article 51, does it feel that it has the right to infringe the authority and responsibility of the Security Council?

It has been alleged on other occasions, because the United States delegation has used a variety of arguments, that the United States is implementing resolution 661 (1990), which clearly is based on Article 41 of the Charter, and that Article could not be clearer either. It refers to measures "not involving the use of armed force". We believe that the Council will lose some of its credibility and moral authority if it refers to only some aspects of the complex and serious conflict with which we are dealing on the basis of a decision which may be taken by a permanent member which then decides when we should be convened, for what purpose and to discuss which part of a given conflict, in order to take a speedy decision on the matter.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

So far the Security Council has been unable to act in a situation which is extremely clear, where one of its members is using the resolutions of the Security Council in the manner it deems most suitable to protect its own interests.

I have before me the text of an important statement, a message from a distinguished Arab leader, President Ben Ali of the Republic of Tunisia, to his people a few days ago. I shall read out part of the message, as follows:

"The situation makes us wonder with bitterness about the proper foundation of the pretext of international legality to send foreign troops to Arab soil. We have tested this legality through the now chronic Palestinian matter, the occupation of Arab territories, the invasion of Lebanon and the repression of the intifadah, despite the many resolutions adopted by the United Nations and the successive votes against those who are clamouring for their legitimate rights.

"Events have demonstrated that legality and the principles which should back it up are not adequate in the face of the vital interests of the major powers, and that this legality changes depending on those interests and their relations with the party to be condemned."

In expressing our agreement with that statement made by the President of the Republic of Tunisia, we should like once again to call the Council's attention to the need to take measures that will really make it possible to resolve the conflict peacefully. At the very least we should make sure that the Council's resolutions or decisions are implemented in the manner in which the Council itself decides.

My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution because of the humanitarian considerations, which we consider to be legitimate. Some of our colleagues have explained their concerns with regard to their own nationals in the region. We also did so because we believe that it might, if the Council's

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

authority is respected, help ensure that this element is not used as one more excuse - not to seek peace, but to continue along the course of war and military intervention.

The representative of the United States concluded his statement by saying something which may be quite normal, but which at the same time could be a terrible threat. He said that the United States was not only supporting the draft resolution, but would seek its full implementation. I am not quoting exactly, because the United States delegation did not circulate the text of the statement. Earlier, saying that it sought full implementation of sanctions, the United States sent the fleet and deployed major military units, which continue to grow in the area. Now will the United States also implement this resolution by using force? Will it use the resolution to take unilateral measures, or will United States action be kept strictly within the parameters of this resolution, adopted unanimously? We shall wait and see.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): For a resolution for which he voted, the representative of Cuba spent a long time telling us about all the portions of it which he disliked. I wish to respond to only one issue that he raised - the application of Article 51 of the Charter.

I shall be brief; I shall read from a document I recently submitted to the Council, document S/21492, the first paragraph of which reads as follows:

"As I informed you yesterday, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, I wish on behalf of my Government, to report that the United States has deployed military forces to the Persian Gulf region. These forces have been dispatched in exercise of the inherent right of individual and collective self-defence, recognized in Article 51, in response to developments and requests from Governments in the region,

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

including requests from Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, for assistance. The application of this inherent right in response to the Iraqi armed attack on Kuwait has been affirmed in resolution 661 (1990)."

I should like now to turn to a second document, resolution 661 (1990) and to read out the penultimate preambular paragraph, as follows:

"Affirming the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence, in response to the armed attack by Iraq against Kuwait, in accordance with Article 51 of the Charter".

I believe that that makes sufficiently clear the position of my Government in this regard.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): Far be it from me at this stage to embark upon a legal discussion, but we still have the same concern - whether Article 51 can be construed to allow, on the decision of any Member State, actions which have not been agreed upon by the Security Council, including the use of armed force, and whether resolution 661 (1990) can be construed as allowing the United States to use military means for an unauthorized purpose. I think we are right to express our profound concern that the United States will also try to promote the full implementation of the resolution we have just adopted by taking aggressive military action, including the use of warships and bombers.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

I think what is most important about the article and resolution from which he has quoted is that both assert this Council's authority to handle the crisis. Here we have a delegation that comes here, as it frequently does, and calls upon us to take a decision so that the Council may act and then goes on to say it is acting as it must act, irrespective of decisions of the Council. Either one follows decisions of the Council or one does not.

We cannot accept having a member of the Council manipulate the Council's decisions according to its own interests.

The only special privilege of permanent members is the one unfortunately set forth in the Charter: the right of veto. But please: I think it would be a most serious matter for all Members of the Organization if we were to tolerate their using the Charter and the Council to do as they please.

The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Romania.

The delegation of Romania associated itself with the expression of concern and anxiety voiced by the Security Council in connection with the situation of foreign nationals in Kuwait and Iraq. In this respect my delegation shares the views of other members of the Council concerning the necessity of the Iraqi Government's abiding by the obligations assumed under the relevant international legal instruments. Thus, article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights of 16 December 1966 clearly states that everyone lawfully within the territory of a State shall within that territory have the right to liberty of movement and freedom to choose his residence. Moreover, in conformity with the same article everyone shall be free to leave any country including his own.

Mention could also be made of the Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War of 12 August 1949. That Convention binds the

(The President)

authorities of any party to the conflict. Section 2 of the Convention is devoted to the situation of aliens in the territory of a party to a conflict. Article 35 of the Convention deals specifically with the right to leave the territory. It states that all protected persons who may desire to leave the territory at the outset of or during a conflict shall be entitled to do so.

We think that any action undertaken by the Security Council on this sensitive issue could contribute to decrease the tension in the region, and therefore my delegation fully supports its draft resolution in document S/21562 and the efforts of the Secretary-General on the present item.

Finally we reiterate our conviction that under the given circumstances it is necessary for all States to display moderation and responsibility and to undertake nothing which may further aggravate the situation.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

The Council will now hear other statements. I call on the representative of Kuwait.

Mr. AL-SALLAL (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): We have convened today for the fourth time in two weeks to grapple with the evil that was unleashed on the second of this month with the aim of destroying an oasis of safety and a haven of stability and security in the region, spreading among citizens and residents murder, terrorist acts and oppression. The intolerable situation there impels thousands of foreigners to seek to flee.

The essence of this issue is the barbaric aggression perpetrated by the Iraqi régime against my country. It has trampled upon all the norms and principles of international law. Each day that passes reveals another black chapter in the bleak record of that régime in Kuwait, replete with crimes against the people, proving to the whole world that there is no end to its flouting of world peace and security and humanity as a whole.

(Mr. Al-Sallal, Kuwait)

The resolution the Council has adopted grapples with a political, legal and humanitarian issue unprecedented in the history of the international community in which millions of citizens are being held hostage to aggressive, expansionist policies that threaten world peace and security, compromising the interests of all the countries of the world.

At a time when Iraq is calling for the easing of sanctions for humanitarian reasons, it threatens to deprive foreigners in Iraq of food. This is hideous blackmail. The attitude of the Iraqi régime towards innocent, defenceless citizens and its threats to use them as a human shield to protect the aggressive military institutions of Iraq represents human behaviour at its basest and requires that the international community respond resolutely and unhesitatingly to stop the aggressor.

The international community must take more stringent measures to stop that régime's madness and to end its trampling upon and riding roughshod over the norms of the international community. Delay, shortsightedness and preoccupation with temporary interests will wreak havoc all over the world, to an extent that is unpredictable at this stage. Therefore we fully support the efforts of the Secretary-General aimed at finding a satisfactory solution for the problem of the detainees. We hope that the representatives of the International Red Cross will be able to get permission to enter Kuwait from the occupying authorities, which at present, in contravention of the Geneva Convention, are preventing them from doing so. Iraq is trying to cover up the crimes perpetrated there.

The resolution just adopted by the Council also calls on Iraq to refrain from changing the legal status of the consular offices there, based on resolution 662 (1990), which stated that the annexation of Iraq is null and void.

(Mr. Al-Sallal, Kuwait)

Any attempt on the part of the Iraqi régime to change the constitutional and legal status of Kuwait and to continue the destruction of its economy as well as of the social fibre of its citizens, demands the fullest condemnation by the Security Council and by all States of the world, rejecting the decisions issued by the occupation by Iraqi troops there that call for closing the consular offices in Kuwait. Resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 664 (1990) are all binding, and we must respect their provisions. International legality must be maintained.

The whole world is looking to the Security Council. Its responsibility is tremendous, commensurate with the risks confronting us. Thus, it is imperative to close ranks, to co-operate, to take joint action to protect the present and pave the way for a world that seeks to be free from aggression and from aggressors, a world in which relations between peoples and States will be based on justice, peace and mutual respect.

What has been described by one member just a few moments ago as "an Iraqi initiative" is no more than a simple-minded and flimsy device aimed at distracting world attention and preventing decisive action to implement resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990), which call for the immediate and complete withdrawal of the invading aggressor troops of Iraq from Kuwait and for the return of the legitimate authority, namely, the Sheikh Jabir Al-Ahmad Al-Jabir Al-Sabah.

The state of tension that now prevails in the Gulf region is a direct result of Iraq's aggressive actions against the sovereignty, security and territorial integrity of Kuwait. The so-called initiative is no more than a continuation of the Iraqi authorities' mind-set against foreign nationals in Kuwait and Iraq, that is, simply the mentality of detaining hostages there.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. AL ANBARI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): First of all, I wish to draw the Security Council's attention to the position adopted by the United States concerning resolution 660 (1990), and to its special interpretation of how that resolution is to be implemented.

The United States has arrogated to itself the right to impose a maritime blockade against Iraq without calling it by that name. The United States Secretary of State announced on 10 August 1990 at a meeting of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) held at Brussels that the United States had the right to resort to the use of force in order to prevent any commercial relations between third-party countries and Iraq. The United Kingdom followed the example of the United States and announced on 13 August 1990 that the United Kingdom would use its warships to prevent what it called any violation of the sanctions adopted in accordance with resolution 661 (1990).

Despite the speed with which that resolution was adopted and the pressures exerted for its adoption, and despite the flagrant injustice of its provisions, we note that the United States of America and its ally the United Kingdom are attempting, by taking the position I have just mentioned, to impose a certain interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations. That position is based on the allegation that that Article allows the natural right of individual or collective self-defence and that resolution 661 (1990) refers to that Article. Those two States have declared that they had been given the right to make use of that right on behalf of what they called the legitimate Government of Kuwait; they claim that this entitles them to implement resolution 661 (1990).

As members know, Article 51 grants the right of individual or collective self-defence "until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security". The Security Council took such measures by its

(Mr. Al Anbari, Iraq)

hasty and unjust resolution 661 (1990) requesting all States to respect that Article, and it established a Committee in order to guarantee the implementation of the resolution.

It is clear from this that the position of the United States of America and the United Kingdom is based on a totally fallacious pretext: the interpretation envisaged by them is only a partial interpretation of Article 51 of the Charter.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

By their positions, to which I have referred, the United States and the United Kingdom have transformed the way in which the unjust resolution 661 (1990) is to be implemented. Rather than inviting States to implement the sanctions as those States understand them, the United States and the United Kingdom would have States implement the resolution as those two countries understand them. Thus, the machinery for implementing the unjust provisions of the resolution is no longer the invitation to States to implement sanctions as they interpret them, under the supervision of a committee established by the Council to that end. The United States and the United Kingdom have transformed that machinery into a military blockade by force of arms.

By adopting that dangerous position, the United States and the United Kingdom have appointed themselves the policemen of the region, acting in the name of the Security Council, under the cover of the United Nations, even though the Security Council and the Charter of the United Nations do not grant them that right.

Iraq vigorously protests against that conduct by the United States of America and the United Kingdom and believes that it constitutes aggression against Iraq. Iraq will do everything in its power to counter that aggression and to prevent it from being imposed on the world and on the United Nations.

Worse still, the United States and its allies have continued their acts of aggression in contravention of international law and of the letter and spirit of resolution 661 (1990) concerning the embargo, which made an explicit exception in respect of food and medicine. That resolution gives no party the right to resort to the use of force, to encircle Iraqi ports or to intercept Iraqi ships on the high seas.

Despite this, and in contravention of the international will - which a few weeks ago attempted to protect Palestinian Arabs in Kuwait - the United States has

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

resorted to the veto to undermine that international will. Today, the United States is using pretexts to defy the resolutions of the Security Council, and it is declaring to the entire world that it will resort to force to prevent the delivery of food and medicine to Iraq.

The United States is not concerned in the least about the suffering this will impose on the Iraqi people and on Arab and foreign nationals residing in Kuwait City and in other Iraqi cities. While stressing the importance of ensuring the safety and well-being of all foreign nationals residing in Iraq, Iraq believes that their departure depends on the cessation of armed acts of aggression by the United States and the United Kingdom and on the cessation of terrorist acts. It also depends on the unhindered delivery of food and medicine to Iraq and on the provision of genuine guarantees in that regard.

I wish further to say that Iraq will not prevent foreign nationals from obtaining food and medicine. It will share with foreign nationals whatever food and medicine enter the country. We guarantee the elderly, children and others of foreign nationality full medical care on an equal footing with Iraqi citizens.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

Foreign and Arab nationals residing in all of Iraq's cities are not hostages in Iraq. However, the Iraqi people as a whole is the hostage of American terrorism and is the victim of the food and medicine blockade, which runs counter to the most fundamental principles of international law and to the resolutions of the Security Council.

In conclusion, Iraq will take no measure other than defending itself if the United States or one of its allies should attack it. The security and safety of foreign nationals is guaranteed if the United States and its allies guarantee that they will not attack Iraq. However, if the United States of America and its allies should persist in their policy of aggression and attack Iraq with their military forces - meaning, of course, the military forces of the United States - making Iraqi women, children and old men victims, then whatever the Iraqi people would be subjected to would also be applied to its foreign guests. The responsibility would rest with the aggressors and their allies, their accomplices. That is why we fear that the resolution adopted by the Security Council this evening, instead of guaranteeing the safety of foreign nationals in the region, will be a new pretext for further aggression by the United States against Iraq.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): The hour is late and I have just a few points to make on the amazing discourse to which we have just been treated.

The discomfort of my colleague from Iraq is obvious, because he has clearly once again been given an opportunity to provide us with Iraqi public relations. Indeed, over the last three or four weeks Iraqi public relations have been renowned for their ineptitude. In fact, what we have seen in the last few days, and what we have just heard, rank among the most difficult and unusual aspects of Iraqi public relations. Indeed, "Iraqi public relations" has probably become the oxymoron of the year here in New York.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

I shall make only a few comments on the words he spoke about the United States.

It is obvious that he believes that there is only one, or perhaps two, votes against him in the Council. He should re-examine the votes on the recent resolutions, where the Council has spoken with unanimity, and I hope that he and his Government will recognize, take heed of and listen to the views of the Council.

We also need no lessons from the representative of Iraq about interpreting the resolutions which we have adopted. His enthusiasm for interpreting them is a reflection, I think, of the attention he has been paying to what we have been saying, and of his own Government's willingness to heed what we have adopted here. Perhaps all this has somehow escaped their notice. Obviously we should like to have the representative of Iraq continue to pay close attention to what we are saying. Indeed, that he presumes to interpret our resolutions for us is the equivalent of the old English adage about setting the fox to watch the hen house.

We have also had the opportunity to hear Iraq's view about the United States provision of assistance under Article 51 of the Charter. I should be delighted, and indeed very interested, to hear Iraq's view of its own conduct in the light of Article 2, paragraph 4 of the Charter and resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990), 662 (1990) and today's resolution 664 (1990).

Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): The hour is late and I shall be even briefer.

We have just heard an extraordinary, and I must say brazen, statement by the representative of Iraq which bore no relation to the concerns which have been expressed in this debate, on to the resolution which the Council has just adopted unanimously.

He has rejected, or appears to have rejected, the very strong message and signals that the Council has given him this evening. I hope very much that he and his Government will reflect carefully before they continue down that course.

The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Italy. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TRAXLER (Italy): My delegation's request to participate in this meeting of the Security Council is the expression of the utmost concern with which my Government is following the deterioration of the political situation in the Gulf region resulting from the Iraqi aggression and subsequent annexation of Kuwait.

Italy has always unreservedly condemned the use of force by a Member State of the United Nations against the territorial integrity of another State as constituting a breach of the Charter of the United Nations and an unacceptable means of resolving international differences.

Consequently, Italy strongly rejects the act of aggression against Kuwait and regards the proclaimed annexation of Kuwait as null and void - as stated in Security Council resolution 662 (1990). Italy therefore rejects the Iraqi request for the closure of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait and regards as unacceptable any attempt by the Iraqi authorities to exercise powers of government within the territory of Kuwait.

The behaviour of the Iraqi authorities is causing unacceptable hardship to foreigners in Iraq and in Kuwait. Italy, on a national basis and as the current President of the 12 States members of the European Community, has repeatedly voiced its deepest concern about the untenable situation of foreigners in both those countries.

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

In this context, Italy wishes to express its utmost dismay at the unacceptable treatment meted out by the Iraqi authorities to Italian citizens who have gone to the two countries concerned in a spirit of friendship aimed at consolidating the relations of co-operation which have traditionally existed between Italy on the one hand and Iraq and Kuwait on the other. In view of the dramatic situation of its citizens in Iraq and Kuwait, Italy requests the Iraqi authorities, whom we hold fully accountable for the safety of foreign citizens, to permit and facilitate their immediate departure from Iraq and Kuwait and to grant them continuing access to their consular officials.

Italy further demands that the Iraqi authorities take no action to jeopardize the safety, security or health of our citizens. In this context, we should like to remind Iraq of its obligations under the international conventions it has ratified, in particular - and it has been quoted by others before me - the Fourth Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, as well as the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

In this same context, we hope that the prompt action undertaken by the Secretary-General will be successful. In fact, while expressing our sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General for the prompt way in which he has responded to the anxieties expressed by a number of countries, we shall continue to follow the situation of our citizens in Iraq and Kuwait with the utmost attention and concern.

We sincerely hope that the Iraqi authorities will abide by the fundamental provisions of the aforementioned international treaties and that they will allow all foreigners in Iraq and Kuwait full and unconditional freedom of movement within and outside those countries, thus demonstrating their willingness to search for a political solution to the crisis.

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

For its part, Italy, while fully supporting the implementation of Security Council resolutions 660 (1990), 661 (1990) and 662 (1990) and today's resolution, 664 (1990), reiterates its deep commitment to contribute to the prompt achievement of such a political solution by peaceful means. Indeed, we hope that the adoption by the Council of today's resolution may constitute a first step in that direction.

The PRESIDENT: There are no further names on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 12.35 a.m., Sunday, 19 August 1990.