

UNITED NATIONS



# SECURITY COUNCIL

## OFFICIAL RECORDS

UN LIBRARY

2 4 1980

THIRTY-FIFTH YEAR

UN/SA COLLECTION

# 2251<sup>st</sup>

MEETING: 17 OCTOBER 1980

NEW YORK

---

### CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2251) .....	1
Expression of welcome to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh ...	1
Adoption of the agenda .....	1
The situation between Iran and Iraq .....	1

#### NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/...) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements of the Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

## 2251st MEETING

Held in New York on Friday, 17 October 1980, at 5 p.m.

**President:** Mr. Oleg A. TROYANOVSKY  
(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics).

**Present:** The representatives of the following States: Bangladesh, China, France, German Democratic Republic, Jamaica, Mexico, Niger, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Tunisia, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zambia.

### Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2251)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation between Iran and Iraq

*The meeting was called to order at 6.10 p.m.*

### Expression of welcome to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh

1. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I should like first to welcome the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bangladesh, Mr. Muhammad Shamsul Huq, who is present at this meeting of the Council.

### Adoption of the agenda

*The agenda was adopted.*

### The situation between Iran and Iraq

2. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): In accordance with previous decisions [2247th, 2248th and 2250th meetings], I invite the representatives of Iran and Iraq to take places at the Council table and I invite the representatives of Cuba and Japan to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

*At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rajai (Iran) and Mr. Hammadi (Iraq) took places at the Council table and Mr. Roa Kouri (Cuba) and Mr. Nisibori (Japan) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.*

3. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): Members of the Council have before them document S/14221, which contains the text of a letter dated 16 October 1980 from the Secretary-General to the President of the Council.

4. I welcome the Prime Minister of Iran, Mr. Mohammed Ali Rajai, and I invite him to make his statement.

5. Mr. RAJAI (Iran) (*interpretation from French*)\* No one can cry out his indignation unless he has been a victim of aggression. We have come here at a time when our country is engaged in a war which was initiated by the cruel, despotic Government of Iraq. We are here at a time when our Imam and our people have been greatly saddened by the many deaths that have been caused by the earthquake in Algeria. We regret the fact that the war has made it impossible for us to give the aid and the assistance that we would have liked to give to Algeria and to its fraternal Muslim people.

6. I have come here straight from the front. The spectacle of the dead and the wounded would have moved the most heartless of men. I saw that spectacle with my own eyes. The surface-to-surface missiles which struck the city of Dezful demolished a large part of the city and many of the courageous population perished. More than 30 babies are in hospital, babies who are less than six months old. I have seen those babies and they are fighting for their lives.

7. The Hussein army, using ridiculous pretexts—and perhaps it really should be added that they are no pretexts at all—has committed an act of aggression against our country. It has destroyed centres of production, the economy and towns including hospitals and schools, and it has killed innocent people.

8. The whole world must know that Saddam Hussein's army has acted without mercy, without pity, like Hitler's armies. To prolong his cruel régime, Saddam has engaged 12 divisions and more than 2,500 tanks, as well as large quantities of weapons and hundreds of war planes. He has used them to attack the people of our country—this at a time when the Islamic Republic was entering into a period of reconstruction.

9. Yesterday, during my flight, I learned that at Kermanshah, following a bombing against schools and universities, those buildings and the hospital were hit and more than 1,000 schoolchildren and civilians were victims of that raid.

\* Mr. Rajai spoke in Persian. The French version of his statement was supplied by the delegation.

10. Iraq's Baath army, which has no understanding whatsoever of humanity, spared no effort in those inhuman acts. They have plundered, they have even been guilty of rape. In the occupied areas, they have imprisoned all adult men and have in that way taken many prisoners of war, some of whom have been tortured and others killed in the prisons.

11. We would appeal to the conscience of the peoples of the world, in particular to the Muslim people, with whom we share a common ideology and common values. It is for them to pass judgement. It is surprising that those who profess belief in dignity remain aloof and say nothing, and, in the face of this open aggression, declare their neutrality in international forums. How can the representatives of those peoples speak of neutrality? We know that many revolutionaries have already come here to the Council and have asked that the rights of their peoples be defended. But, in the final analysis, it is always the peoples themselves who have defended their rights, by fighting the aggressor with their own hands. Our oppressed but heroic people, inspired by the potent ideology of Islam and under the leadership of the Imam Khomeini, will continue to fight and will determine their own future.

12. The resistance of the Iranian armed forces and the Iranian people in the face of Saddam's army has amazed the entire world. Our people are resolute and determined to fight, even if the people's war must be prolonged. We will not only expel the aggressor, but we will allow the friendly fraternal people of Iraq to become aware of the tyrannical and dependent nature of Saddam Hussein's régime. They will then be able to deal a lethal blow at American imperialism, which directly or indirectly has been helping the Baath Government of Iraq. The United States with its AWACS aircraft in Saudi Arabia controls the movements of Iranian troops and passes all information on to Iraq. It also misleads Iranian pilots. We warn all those who, through the port of Aqaba in Jordan, send arms and munitions and spare parts to Iraq so that all those weapons can be used to attack and bomb the anti-imperialist and revolutionary people of Iran.

13. Our people are determined to survive. They will protect the Islamic and humanitarian revolution. They will remain free. They will live, and with the help of God, they will win. The super-Powers wish to impose a new Israel on the Middle East. The crimes of the United States that have been committed against the peoples of Palestine and southern Lebanon should have been enough, but today they are trying to create a new Israel under the banner of an Arab nationalism. Were not the Zionists in Israel sufficiently criminal? Another Government led by Saddam Hussein has now been given a mandate to destroy humanitarian values and pursue its own ambitions. Saddam has brought destruction to the whole area. All those who help him will die in that destruction, as will he.

14. The true aim of the Iraqi régime and its masters is not to gain a few kilometres of territory. What they

are trying to do is mutilate the revolutionary movement of the Muslim Iranian people. They wish to destroy the Islamic Republic. They want to prevent the completion of the bond that mankind has begun to forge in Iran. They are trying to prevent us from building a free Iran on the foundation of Islamic and humanitarian values, for any victory for Iran spells the defeat of all the forces of evil throughout the world. The dispossessed peoples of the world, as well as those who have lost confidence in both the left and the right, must realize that our Islamic revolution has opened up a new path for all the disinherited peoples of the world. The Iranian revolution acquired independence thanks to the power of the people, and our people will guarantee its future by sacrifice and through self-sufficiency. We believe that the true winner of the war will be the revolutionary faith of the peoples, not arms and munitions. That is why we firmly declare that in this war, which has been imposed on us, the Islamic revolutionary faith of our people will prevail. It is not the American AWACS or the Russian Tupolevs that will bring about this victory. In this war we are defending not only our territorial integrity and our economy, but also human dignity and the honour of our Muslim people. We are leading mankind towards true humanitarian values. We know that this war which has been imposed on us will end with the victory of the forces of good over the forces of evil. We shall show the world that we can rely on our own strength, without allying ourselves with the colonialism of the East to fight the colonialism of the West, and that we will make every sacrifice to guarantee our independence. The Tabas raid, the planned *coup d'état* and the armed invasion of Saddam Hussein have shown the super-Powers that in their relations with the Islamic Republic any resort to force is doomed to failure.

15. That war has already cost us thousands of martyrs and wounded. Material reparations cannot compensate for that. We are looking forward to the day when the criminal Saddam Hussein will be judged by a revolutionary tribunal in Iraq, to the day when he will be punished for his deeds. We are looking forward to the day when the people of Iraq will rid themselves of him. Let all the oppressed peoples of the world learn this lesson: that dignity and independence cannot be obtained without sacrifice, for God is with the disinherited.

16. Let us now review the pretexts advanced by the Saddam régime for launching an aggression against the Islamic Republic of Iran. Saddam Hussein, mercenary of the oppressors of the world, recognizing that he himself was responsible for the military attack against Iran and its territorial integrity, invoked the non-applicability of the articles of the agreement concluded on 6 March 1975<sup>1</sup> as a pretext, to whitewash this open aggression. It should be pointed out that, following the Algiers negotiations, at the conference of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries, which was held from 4 to 6 March 1975, a Treaty con-

cerning the State Frontier and Neighbourly Relations, with three annexed protocols, was concluded on 13 June 1975, and four additional agreements were entered into on 26 December 1975.<sup>2</sup> A document serving as a final comprehensive settlement of the outstanding questions was signed on the same date,<sup>1</sup> and there was an exchange of the instruments of ratification between Iran and Iraq. All these agreements and documents were duly registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations. All these instruments make it perfectly clear that Iraq's totalitarian régime admitted at the time that it had no more claims regarding its rights and that the disputes had been terminated.

17. The peoples of the world must also know that the régime of the Islamic Republic of Iran, although it might have called for a review of all the agreements that had been concluded, since the time immediately following the victory of the revolution, has never strayed from the terms of the Treaty that I have just mentioned, and that it is those who governed the people of Iraq when the Treaty was being prepared and whose signatures appear on the Treaty who violated the provisions of the Treaty. Moreover, the Treaty itself provided for the means of settling whatever disputes might arise between the two parties.

18. Let me now turn to a possible explanation for the abrogation of the Treaty by Iraq. Perhaps the best explanation is that the Iraqi régime is acting irrationally, in an inhuman manner, or perhaps that it is blindly following its masters, namely, the Super-Powers, not so as to make changes in the borders but to deal a lethal blow to the Islamic revolution in Iran. Even before the unilateral announcement that the Treaty had been abrogated by Saddam Hussein, there were instances of flagrant violations, and here are a few: first, continual interference in the internal affairs of Iran since the victory of the Islamic revolution; secondly, the violation of articles pertaining to the security of borders by the continual dispatch of mercenaries and Baath agents and armed groups into the provinces of Kurdistan, Kermanshah, Ilam and Khuzistan and the provision of assistance to anti-revolutionary elements in the provinces I have just mentioned and also in Séistan and Baluchistan; thirdly, the provision of assistance to persons sought in Iran for having committed crimes against the population during the Shah's régime and guarantees that those individuals would have all material means and the use of propaganda to weaken the régime of the Islamic revolution. They now have two radio stations on Iraqi territory, it should be added, and are engaging in propaganda against the Iranian régime.

19. Now let me turn to the true aims of Iraq in its aggression against Iran and consider the nature and position of the Iraqi régime *vis-à-vis* the Islamic revolution and the role of the super-Powers. Why did the Baghdad régime reject the Treaty and commit aggression against Iran? What were its aims and purposes?

20. First, the very nature of the régime should be clarified, and we should briefly review the positions taken by Saddam Hussein in respect of the Islamic revolution. The Baath Party in power in Iraq is made up of the supporters of the notorious Michel Aflak. He was a Freemason and a cunning Zionist. He diverted the anti-Zionist, anti-imperialist struggles of the Muslim peoples, of the disinherited Arab peoples, and he founded institutions that were in appearance nationalist and socialist but in fact inspired by racist ideals. After the victory of Abdel Nasser in Egypt and his attacks on the interests of the puppet régimes in the Arab Middle East—in view of the fact that the reactionary régimes such as those of King Hussein and King Hassan, for example, were not in a position to counter those attacks individually—the West, in order to fight against Nasser and Nasserism, undertook to set up so-called leftist régimes whose slogans sounded much more revolutionary than did Nasser's but which were in practice much more conservative than those of King Hussein-type régimes. One of those régimes, as the Council is aware, was the Baath régime in Iraq. The history of the struggle of the Arab Muslim peoples shows that that régime, which today is using its full military might to destroy the Islamic revolution, never sent its troops to combat the invaders of Jerusalem, except, perhaps, at the last moment, when the war was already over. That Party, notwithstanding its anti-Zionist slogans, never took any practical action to combat the interests of Zionism. Is there really any need to add that it will never do so?

21. Inside the country, the Iraqi régime has taken dictatorship and oppression to such limits that it has even dared to imprison and kill Ayatollah Mohammad Bagher Sadr and his sister. The prisons are full of honest Muslim prisoners. The position of the régime of Saddam Hussein *vis-à-vis* the Iranian revolution has been hostile right from the start and is aimed at preventing the achievements of the Islamic revolution. The entire world will recall that right at the very beginning of the revolution in Iran the Baghdad régime forced Imam Khomeini to leave Iraq. The friendly and fraternal relations of Saddam Hussein with the Shah's Iran changed right after the victory of the revolution, and its relations with Iran became imbued with a hostility that cannot ever be compared with the kind of hostility that that régime feels towards Israel. The publicity machine used by Saddam and his mercenaries was set in motion against the Islamic revolution. Iraq became the land of asylum and the centre of activities of the lackeys of the United States and the Pahlevi régime. Notorious torturers such as anti-revolutionaries from the right and the left in Iran enjoyed the material and moral support of the Baathists in Iraq. As I have said, radio broadcasting stations called "Iranian stations against the revolution" were set up in Iraq.

22. We call on the peoples of the world to ask why the Iraqi régime, which says that it is fighting against the United States, had friendly relations with the

Shah's régime, the valet of the United States, whereas its position is hostile to a régime that is truly fighting to destroy the vital and strategic interests of imperialism, and in particular those of the United States and international zionism, a régime that was even the victim of direct intervention by the United States when diplomatic relations were broken off and an economic embargo was put into effect. If Iraq is really hostile to the United States and if that hostility goes beyond mere declarations of intent, why did it never dare attack the Shah's army, which was entirely controlled by United States military advisers while today it is attacking an army that has only recently freed itself from the American yoke? Is this not, in fact, an American mission with an anti-American appearance? These tactics are not at all mysterious to the peoples of the world. Recently we saw another puppet régime—that of Ian Smith in Zimbabwe—using the same tactics and rising up against its masters.

23. The position of Iraq, which is hostile to Iran, is only a reflection of the hostility of the super-Powers, first and foremost the United States, towards the Islamic Republic of Iran. From this rostrum we declare to all the peoples of the world that Iraqi military aggression is construed by us as an integral part of the continual attempts at international aggression against our revolution. We wish to repeat that Iraq's aggression is in reality the aggression of the forces of evil and is the work of great Satan and the lesser Satans.

24. We ask the peoples of the world, and in particular the Arab Muslim peoples, to pause and ponder and we trust that they will find an answer to the questions which I am about to ask.

25. First, how is it that the Iraqi régime, even assuming that there was a territorial dispute with Iran, before having recourse to the good offices of Algeria, which presided over the reconciliation of the two countries, engaged in a wide-scale military attack on the land of the Islamic Republic of Iran?

26. Secondly, together with that attack, how is it that today Iraq's aggression goes beyond changes in borders and has as its object the invasion of our provinces, in particular the oil province of Khuzistan? And, together with that attack, how is it that all the counter-revolutionaries outside Iran went to Iraq where it was made possible for them to conduct their activities on Iraqi territory? How is it that the United States sees in that attack an opportunity for their hostages to be freed? How is it that Iraqi aggression coincides with the end of the separatist claims in Kurdistan and with the installation of the Government of the Islamic Republic?

27. Thirdly, how is it that in this war the puppet régimes *par excellence*, which are entirely dependent on the United States, such as those of Jordan, Egypt, Morocco and so on, are the primary suppliers of assistance to the so-called progressive régime in Iraq?

As I have already said, the Jordanian port of Aqaba is today the primary port of entry for Iraq, and the airports of Jordan today are accommodating Iraqi planes. The Egyptian pilots and crews are playing a particularly active role in Iraq, and units of the Jordanian army are at present stationed there.

28. In view of all those points, can we still consider the war of the Iraqi régime with Iran a war of claims that are exclusively territorial in nature? Are we not entitled to consider that this war is part of the fight of the super-Powers against the Islamic revolution? During these days of warfare, while blood is being shed, we are witnessing a buildup of the super-Powers' forces and fleets in the region, and we note with surprise that military agreements between European Governments and countries of the Middle East have been concluded. We are also greatly surprised these days to see that the United States, which had refused to take part in the Olympic Games in Moscow because of the Soviet Union's military aggression in Afghanistan, is today readily agreeing to engage in new SALT negotiations. Does that not explain why Soviet weapons are being shipped through American Jordan to Iraq and the régime of Saddam Hussein?

29. Let me now set forth our position on the war, and let me speak now about the outcome of the conflict.

30. The peoples of the world are well aware of the fact that the war between Iran and Iraq is a war that has been imposed upon us. The régime of the Islamic Republic never would have dared use its forces and its weapons against an Islamic country with an unpopular régime, at a time when the fight should have been against the invading régime in Jerusalem, which has subjected to international zionism our Palestinian Arab brothers who have been deprived of all their property and all their rights in the occupied territories and in southern Lebanon.

31. Unfortunately, Iraq's recent aggression has taken a very heavy economic and military toll on the Muslim peoples of both countries. Bullets which were intended to be used against the invaders of Islamic territories are today being used to kill our Muslim brothers, with the aim of satisfying the ambitions of a single individual to serve the interests of the forces of evil.

32. The Baath Government of Iraq, after occupying part of our territory, after killing innocent civilians, after destroying our facilities, our factories, our towns, asks for a cease-fire today in order to deceive international public opinion. Regrettably, some countries have wittingly or unwittingly supported that request. We wish to declare that a fair end to this war can be found only if the aggressor is vanquished and punished. That is our final position. For if a country that has been devastated, a country that has been the victim of aggression, accepts a cease-fire, that will only serve to consolidate the position of the aggressor; it will only serve to condone the act of aggression.

33. Our people are today in mourning for the thousands of schoolchildren killed during an Iraqi raid against the schools of Kermanshah. That is the best reason for condemning the Baath régime. We have seen that régime go so far as to bomb a hospital in Abadan. Eight wounded persons died, and more than 40 persons who had been working in the hospital were seriously wounded; today, they are in the very beds that had been occupied by most of the victims. That is but one reason, but we could cite so many more, for condemning the Baath régime of Iraq.

34. In conclusion, I should like to explain in a few words why we are here.

35. Islam and historical experience have taught us that we cannot overcome the difficulties unless we rely on God's will and the will of the peoples. In view of what I have just said, the members of the Council will readily understand that we are not here to ask the Council for anything at all; we are here to convey the facts, to expose what is actually happening in our country.

36. We are perfectly aware that the Council, in view of the veto of the major Powers, and in view of the existence of other difficulties, is not in a position truly to help the oppressed and disinherited peoples of the world. Moreover, history shows us that the Council, even if upon occasion it has adopted resolutions on matters of principle, under the pressure of world public opinion, has been unable to ensure their implementation owing to the opposition of one major Power or another. The failure to implement the resolutions of the Council concerning Israel or the racist régime of South Africa is particularly enlightening.

37. We are here for the sole purpose of making the voice of the Muslim and revolutionary people of Iran heard. We are here to warn the peoples of the entire world about the dangers that overthrowing the Iranian revolution would entail, about the impact that it would have on the struggles of other oppressed peoples. We are here to urge, once again, the great Powers and the forces of evil to put an end to their plots against the Islamic revolution, to realize that the noble, divine Iranian revolution, born of and nourished by the blood of thousands of martyrs, will never be vanquished.

38. The decision of the Council, whatever it may be, will not change anything for us. For our people, with the help of God, will fight Saddam and his oppressive régime with their own hands. Our people will win. With the help of God, the people of Iraq will in the near future be liberated once and for all from this cruel oppressor. Very soon the people will see the oppressors of the world disappear; they will see that, in the last analysis, it is those who have right on their side who will win.

39. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I now call on the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, Mr. Saadoon Hammadi.

40. Mr. HAMMADI (Iraq): I should like to begin by saying that I shall have a few comments to make on some of the statements which have been made by Mr. Rajai, the head of the Iranian delegation. However, I shall not use the improper language I have heard concerning Iraq, the Arab people and the leaders of my country. I do not think that improper language is in keeping with the dignity of this meeting or that it would serve the purpose of the meeting.

41. I should like to recall, however, that the President of Iraq rose from amongst the people, from the ranks of the very poor. He spent most of his life in revolutionary work against monarchy and dictatorship. He spent a good part of his life in gaol and in underground work. His ideas, and what he is doing for our country, for the Arab people, for the countries of the third world and the world at large, are well known and it is not my duty to comment.

42. I should, however, like to make the following points. Mr. Rajai spoke about the termination of the 1975 Algiers agreement.<sup>1</sup> As I made clear in my statements before the General Assembly<sup>3</sup> and the Security Council [2250th meeting], my Government decided to consider the aforesaid agreement and those following and based upon it as terminated on the part of Iraq after Iran had terminated them by word and deed. That was done in accordance with paragraph 4 of the Algiers agreement and article 4 of the Treaty concerning the State Frontier and Neighbourly Relations of 1975,<sup>1</sup> which was based on the aforesaid agreement.

43. The Algiers agreement represented a package deal, the spirit of which was to arrive at a final and permanent solution of the existing problems between the two countries, in the application of the principles of territorial integrity, the inviolability of frontiers and non-interference in internal affairs. The elements of the package deal were: first, definitive demarcation of land frontiers on the basis of the Constantinople Protocol of 1913 and the proceedings of the Frontier Delimitation Commission of 1914 established in accordance therewith; secondly, delimitation of the frontier in Shatt-Al-Arab according to the thalweg line; thirdly, the establishment of reciprocal security and confidence along the common frontiers and the exercise of strict and effective control with a view to putting a final end to all acts of infiltration of a subversive character, no matter where they originated. The parties assumed all the aforesaid obligations, under one condition, namely that of paragraph 4 of the agreement which provided that the parties had also agreed to consider those obligations as indivisible elements of a comprehensive solution and that any violation of any of them should naturally be considered contrary to the agreement. In that way the parties assumed their mutual obligations as a balance between

political and juridical considerations, and that is the cardinal provision of the agreement.

44. Turning now to the allegation regarding the settlement of disputes as contained in article 6 of the Treaty, it should be remembered that the Treaty represented the technical details of the Algiers agreement. I should like to point out at once that article 4 of the Treaty contained in a more categorical form the provisions of paragraph 4 of the Algiers agreement. Article 6 of the Treaty dealt with the resolution of differences of opinion regarding the interpretation and application of the Treaty provisions. Those two articles are mutually exclusive in the sense that the application of article 6 presupposes the existence of the Treaty through the non-violation of any of its indivisible elements. Article 6, in other words, only becomes operative when the Treaty is still in force and the parties disagree on the interpretation or application of the technical details thereof. When article 4 is violated, that means that the whole Treaty becomes non-existent. Any argument to the contrary makes the provisions of those two articles contradictory and impossible to apply. The continuous violations of the elements of the Treaty mentioned in article 4 left Iraq with no Treaty to implement. As a matter of fact, Iraq continued to remind Iran of the obligations under the Treaty until 17 September 1980. As I have shown in the General Assembly, the continuous reminders were not only met with continuous violations but also insistence upon them, which was made clear by the announcements of official Iranian circles that the agreement was suspect, that it did not meet Iran's interests and that Iran did not consider itself bound by it.

45. On 22 June 1976, upon the exchange in Tehran of the instruments of ratification of the Treaty of 1975, the Foreign Minister of Iran and I exchanged letters providing for the exchange, within six months of that date, of the immovable property—the buildings, the private and public establishments whose national identities had changed as a result of the redemarcation of the land frontiers. That was to be done by a mixed Iraqi-Iranian expert commission. The letters were designed to remove, once and for all, all the Iranian encroachments upon Iraq's sovereign territory, as delimited by the international agreement, binding upon the two parties. The deadline was set around the end of 1976. Now we are in 1980.

46. How long should a State wait for the return of its sovereign territory, at a time when that territory is being daily utilized in the shelling of towns and villages? If the Iranian Government had good faith, why did it not withdraw its military posts from those territories on 7 September? Why, when we delivered our first note requesting respect for the 1975 Treaty, did it not stop bombing us, even on that date? Why did it not even declare its intention to withdraw or say, "We shall discuss the matter", for instance? The Iranian response was shelling and claiming those very areas as Iranian territory.

47. The Prime Minister of Iran mentioned something about the national minorities in Iran. I should like to say that those national minorities expected, after the change of régime in Iran, that their national and cultural rights would be respected. Nothing of that sort happened. The régime in Iran took many steps to reformulate the State on a religious basis and specifically on the ideology of one sect of the population. That also, and very unfortunately, aroused the feelings of the other sects inside Iran. A considerable number of those minorities belong to our sects. We should be objective. We should look at things as they are. If the national minorities in Iran rise up and ask for national recognition, that their national and cultural rights be respected, that is not the fault of Iraq. We in Iraq have granted local autonomy and national and cultural rights to the Kurdish minority and to other minorities. We cannot be expected to accept this principle in our own country and be against it somewhere else. Apparently the Iranian Government would like us to oppose the principle of granting national rights to minorities in Iran. We do not do that, therefore we are accused of interfering in their internal affairs.

48. Something was mentioned about Khomeini leaving Iraq and the Iraqi Government having from the very beginning shown a hostile attitude to Khomeini. This is contrary to the facts. Khomeini, as I have mentioned, was a guest for 15 years in our country, and he was given material support in his struggle against the Shah for over seven years. But at the climax of the crisis, Khomeini was trying openly to carry out activities against the Shah. He wanted to have press conferences, he wanted to invite the world press and television to Iraq so as to speak to them. If we had allowed him to do that, that would have been considered by Iran as interference in their internal affairs, and the 1975 agreement strictly prohibits each side from interfering in the internal affairs of the other. We told Mr. Khomeini, "We cannot allow you to do that in such an open and large-scale manner. You are a political refugee, you have carried out covert activities against the Shah for a long period of time and we have tolerated that and helped you; but when it comes to open and large-scale interviews with the press and the other mass media, that cannot be allowed." Mr. Khomeini preferred to leave, and he left. Apparently he has kept that in his mind. Those are the real facts and the reason Mr. Khomeini left Iraq.

49. The Prime Minister of Iran spoke about the aggression on the side of Iraq. He did not mention anything about what the new régime in Iran did in order to stir up religious feelings inside Iraq, to form a Dawa Party, seated and led from Qum. He did not say anything about the subversive activities carried out by that group inside Iraq and by Iranians residing in Iraq. He did not mention anything about the attempt of the new régime to play again the card of the Kurdish rebellion in the north of our country. The régime



invited the Barzani leadership and gave them full moral and material support, including a broadcasting station in the north of Iran; and again, as with the Shah, this was directed towards our internal safety and the territorial integrity of our country.

50. The Dawa Party was organized by Iran and had its seat in Qum. I gave a detailed account of it in my previous statement [*ibid.*]. One of the prominent leaders of that Party volunteered; he came out of the place where he was hiding and made a long and detailed statement on our television on 24 April 1980. He gave full details of what the Dawa Party was doing in Iran, when it was formed, by whom it is led, where it is directed from and all the activities of that Party. The details of what he said were documented. We sent the document to the United Nations in a letter dated 21 May 1980 from our representative informing the Organization of this flagrant interference in our internal affairs.

51. Mr. Rajai tried to paint a picture showing us as the aggressors in Iran. Iraq did not start the war with Iran. The Iranian authorities started it with their subversive terrorist and military actions against us long before the present hostilities. I went through the facts which prompted our defensive action in my statement before the General Assembly on 3 October<sup>3</sup> and also before the Council [*ibid.*]. To put it briefly: when Khomeini's subversive sabotage and terrorism through the Dawa Party had failed to achieve their aim, military actions began.

52. The continuous shelling of our border towns, villages and roads became a daily routine in the conduct of the Iranian military forces. A dangerous turning-point was reached on 4 September 1980, when American-made heavy artillery of 175-mm. calibre was used to shell the towns of Khanaqin and Mandali, causing severe damage to both life and property. That shelling was carried out from the area of Zain Al-Qaws, which is one of the areas of Iraq's sovereign territory, illegally held by Iran.

53. We responded on 7 September by reminding Iran of its international obligations through a note delivered to the Iranian Chargé d'affaires in Baghdad. But the shelling continued, and we had to follow the same procedure the next day, 8 September, reminding Iran of its international obligations—only this time we stated our intention of exercising our legitimate right to self-defence in liberating our territory in Zain Al-Qaws, Saif Sa'ad, and other places. Our actions were again met by intensified Iranian military actions in the aforementioned areas against our liberating forces. In the face of that, we delivered to the Iranian Chargé d'affaires another note, setting out in detail Iraq's rights to those areas according to the Algiers agreement and the Treaty of 1975. All that fell on deaf ears. We were thus left with only one alternative, namely, to consider the Algiers agreement and what issued from it as terminated on the part of Iraq after it had been terminated by Iran in word and deed.

54. That decision on our part was adopted on 17 September 1980 and it was based, as I have mentioned, on paragraph 4 of the agreement. On that occasion, we called upon the Iranian authorities to act wisely and rationally, having exhausted all the peaceful means at our disposal to have Iran heed its obligations. Yet we failed and were thus left with only our right to self-defence to restore our sovereignty over the totality of our territory.

55. And despite our declaration that we did not wish to engage in any war with Iran, that we did not aim at widening the conflict, outside the limits of restoring Iraq's legitimate rights of territorial sovereignty, and that we did not have any territorial ambitions in Iran, the Iranian Government nevertheless escalated the conflict. It began as of 19 September to bombard by heavy artillery and bomber planes heavily populated areas in Iraq and vital economic establishments.

56. I should now like to mention as an example that the number of Iranian violations for the period of June to September 1980 has reached 187 violations and military actions across the Iraqi frontier against populated cities and villages, roads and border posts. Those armed violations have become a daily routine for the conduct of the Iranian military forces.

57. It is worth mentioning that concentrated bombardment was made from the area of Zain Al-Qaws, which is situated between frontier pillars 46 and 51 deep inside Iraq's territory. At noon on 7 September, the bombardment was carried out again in the same manner. In our turn, we summoned to the Foreign Ministry on that date the Chargé d'affaires of the Iranian Embassy in Baghdad, and we delivered a note to him. We stated that the Iranian military units had encroached upon numerous areas of Iraqi territory, as was the case in Zain Al-Qaws, and said that those violations had continued, contrary to the Treaty of 1975 between the two countries. We requested that he convey to his Government that it should immediately end those violations, but the Iranian forces continued with their bombardment that evening.

58. On the following day, 8 September, the Iranian Chargé d'affaires was again called in to the Foreign Ministry and we handed him another note. In that note, we stated that the Iraqi military forces, in the exercise of our legitimate right to self-defence, were forced to end the Iranian occupation of Zain Al-Qaws and to restore the occupied Iraqi territories. We also stated that the Government of the Republic of Iraq expressed its hope that the Iranians would benefit from that event and give back the Iraqi land which Iran had encroached upon in previous times, had been agreed upon in the 1975 Treaty, hence avoiding the possibility of a wider confrontation between the two countries. But the following days witnessed concentrated military activities by Iranian military forces inside the encroached-upon Iraqi territories. My Government again found it necessary to call in the Iranian Chargé

d'affaires to the Foreign Ministry on 11 September 1980. A detailed note was again delivered to him, this time stating the following points:

— First, from our observation of Iranian conduct and reactions, we had reached various conclusions, the main one being that owing to the confusion in Iran and the disorderly structure and information sources of the Iranian State, the Iranian leadership might not be aware of the fact that Iran had encroached upon Iraqi territories, contrary to international law and past agreements between the two countries, including the Algiers agreement of 1975. If that was so, the note said, we advised the Iranian leadership to ask the competent Iranian authorities responsible for matters of frontiers and agreements to make itself familiar with our point of view and henceforth base its action on knowledge rather than mistaken ideas.

— Secondly, the Iranian leadership should realize that striking at cities populated by civilians, as it did in bombarding Khanaqin and Mandali, is neither a simple matter nor a game of violence of the sort which the Iranian officials entertained themselves with at times inside Iran. Striking at Iraqi cities was considered a grave matter, which should be avoided by Iran if it wished not to have relations between the two countries deteriorate dangerously. The rulers of Iran alone would bear the responsibility for those aggressive actions before God, the Iranian people and world public opinion.

— Thirdly, Iraq had no ambition in Iranian territories.

59. All those diplomatic notes fell on deaf ears; we did not get any response to them. In view of the continual Iranian violations of the Algiers agreement of 1975, the insistence upon those violations which was made clear by the announcements of official Iranian circles, namely, that the aforesaid agreement was suspect, that it did not meet Iran's interests, and that Iran did not consider itself bound by it, it was established by my Government that the Iranian Government had violated the elements of the comprehensive settlement contained in the Algiers agreement and that it had terminated it. Consequently, the Government of the Republic of Iraq decided, in accordance with paragraph 4 of the Algiers agreement and article 4 of the Treaty of 1975, to consider the aforesaid agreement and those following and based upon it as terminated on the part of Iraq after Iran had terminated it by word and deed. Iraq then called upon the Iranian authorities to accept the new situation and to act rationally and wisely in the face of the exercise by Iraq of its legitimate rights and full sovereignty over all its land and water territories in Shatt-Al-Arab, as was the case before the Algiers agreement.

60. The Government of the Republic of Iraq was forced to take the measures I have just indicated after the ruling authorities in Iran continued to commit

grave violations of their international obligations. Having exhausted all peaceful means to have Iran heed its obligations, my Government was left with only one choice, namely, the exercise of self-defence for the purpose of restoring Iraq's sovereignty over the totality of its territory.

61. Iraq, as I have shown, did not act first, and when it acted it was absolutely in self-defence. Here is a list of the dates of Iranian armed attacks on Iraq from 19 to 22 September 1980: 18 September, machine-gun fire against Siba village in Shatt-Al-Arab; 19 September, artillery bombardment of Um Al-Risas in Shatt-Al-Arab; 20 September, artillery bombardment against navigation lanes at Um Al-Risas; the Iranian commercial vessel *Iran Bandar*, which was armed, fired at Iraqi military-naval patrols; 21 September, the British vessel *Oriental Star* was fired upon by an Iranian patrol boat at Ziyadiyah while en route to Basra; the Iraqi navigation control tower at Wasiliyah was fired upon by an Iranian patrol boat; the Kuwaiti vessel *Al-Ghardaniyah* was hit by fire from Abadan; Um Al-Risas tower number 2 was bombarded by medium and heavy artillery; Siba village was fired upon by a boat; medium and heavy artillery was opened on the Iraqi dredger *Sina'a* at Um Al-Risas; artillery shelling at the station at North Fakka, which was damaged; fire attack on *Muhammad* barge in Wasiliyah; the Singaporean vessel *Laucille* was hit by light fire while navigating towards Basra; an Iraqi crane vessel was fired on near Wasiliyah; heavy and medium artillery firing on the headquarters of an Iraqi naval lifeguard; heavy artillery shelling on the city of Mandali; concentrated aerial bombardment of the town of Mandali; heavy artillery shelling on the city of Khanaqin for 90 minutes; heavy artillery shelling on the town of Quratu; 22 September, concentrated artillery shelling on the suburbs of Mandali; harassment of navigation in Shatt-Al-Arab by intermittent firing.

62. Mr. Rajai spoke about the humanitarian aspects. He said something about his country's prisoners in Iraq. I should like to say this. It is clear from the statement of the International Committee of the Red Cross issued in press communiqué No. 1402, dated 13 October, that my Government has fulfilled its obligations under the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, of 12 August 1949<sup>a</sup>. My Government has been co-operating fully with the Committee. It would be interesting to ask whether the Government of Iran is acting in the same manner. This may not seem to be the case, as we saw on television the other day some Iraqi prisoners of war being exhibited inhumanely before a mass rally on the grounds of Tehran University. We hold the Iranian Government fully responsible for the fate and well-being of those prisoners. According to what we know, up to now, the Iranian Government has not allowed the Red Cross authorities to operate in Tehran.

63. Mr. Rajai also spoke about the bombardment of civilian targets in Iran. I should like to say, that from

the very beginning, our Government made it clear that we were not going to bomb civilian targets, and we called upon Iran to do the same. It is very clear that the overwhelming majority of attacks by the Iranian air force is carried out against civilian cities in Iraq, whereas the Iraqi air force has, on the contrary, always sought non-civilian targets in Iran. Mr. Rajai spoke about people being killed and wounded. This is most unfortunate. War is a very bad thing. It should not have been started. We should just like to say that somebody must have been responsible for this war. It is the side which did not listen to reason, which wanted to continue territorial expansionism, interference in the internal affairs of its neighbours and disregarded the call for reason. It is those who did these things who are responsible for the unfortunate events that are now taking place.

64. In conclusion, I should like to say this. Iraq is a small country and it is determined to preserve its independence. Its only way of achieving that is to be a non-aligned country. The principles of non-alignment are known to everybody. When a statement by the Iranian Foreign Minister, Mr. Yazdi, was made in which he expressed Iran's wish to be non-aligned, I sent a telegram to Minister Yazdi congratulating him and stating that Iraq would be glad to propose that to the non-aligned movement at its first meeting; and we did so. We did so having in mind the old Iranian policy of domination of the region and of territorial expansion. We had hopes that such long-standing policies would now be terminated and that we could live in peace. While this might have been the thinking of some Iranian leaders, like Mr. Bazargan, it was not the thinking of Khomeini. His idea was that of exporting the Islamic revolution, which is the expression coined for that purpose. What is the first step and how to do that? The first stage is Iraq and the Arabian Gulf countries, but Iraq is on the priority list for obvious reasons. Among those reasons is the ethnic and religious composition of its population. If Iraq falls, then the Arabian Gulf countries will fall. The method used was destabilization through terrorist and subversive activities coupled with an intensive media campaign to incite religious feelings, and then a mass uprising would follow, as they calculated it. As to the tool, it was militants sent from Iran and those recruited from among the Iranian residents and first-generation Iraqis of Iranian origin. Thus, the Al-Da'awa Party was established in Qum and its leadership was created there.

65. I described to the Council on Wednesday last [*ibid.*] the activities they had carried out and I gave some examples. This is the crucial point between us and Iran. Khomeini has waged an undeclared war against us, with intentions he does not hide. This easily explains the Iranian refusal to return the Iraqi lands. To them this would be giving lands to a Government they are working to overthrow. This explains their insistence on holding three Arab islands and keeping control of the Shatt-Al-Arab.

66. Khomeini has a different concept of the world's political structure. To him it is not a world made up of independent States, where one should not interfere in the internal affairs of another and every country should be free to choose its own political and social system. His ideology is religion. To him what happened in Iran has not been the outcome of the social, economic and political developments in Iran but rather a manifestation of the rise of Islam's fundamental principles. The rise of the Islamic Republic of Iran is only considered the starting point. That is exactly the road to territorial expansion, regardless of the ideological dressing. It is the justification for open interference in the internal affairs of the neighbouring countries. That is why the new régime has developed tense relations with practically all its neighbour countries. Unfortunately, Iraq was the first open case of conflict. That has happened because Iraq, in Khomeini's view, is vulnerable and because Iraq insists on resisting.

67. As Iraq is a small and developing country, there is nothing we want more than peace. We want peace with independence and non-interference in our internal affairs. We tried hard to achieve that. We did our best, and nothing was spared to avoid conflict; but Khomeini had fixed ideas in his mind. His success in overthrowing the Shah made him over-confident, and holding diplomats of a super-Power as hostages made him more so. He became more rigid. He thought that overrunning Iraq and then the region was possible.

68. We hope that reason will eventually dominate and that an understanding can be reached with Iran. Despite the military situation that we are now in, we reaffirm again that we have no territorial ambitions in Iran, but we insist on the territorial integrity of Iraq in land and water and non-interference in our internal affairs.

69. Mr. McHENRY (United States of America): The purpose of this meeting is to carry out the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the preservation and maintenance of peace. United States Government officials have already spoken in regard to the conflict between Iran and Iraq, and at an appropriate time I will have an opportunity to state with candour and frankness the principles that all nations must respect in resolving this and any other dispute. We shall do so on the basis of principle. Despite the unfounded and untrue charges just made against the United States by the representative of Iran, at no time has the United States passed information to either party regarding the military actions of the other.

70. The subject of this meeting is the situation between Iran and Iraq, but no one could come to this meeting without sharing the burden of the concern for the 52 Americans who for almost a year have been held in Iran against their will. We all recall the unanimous decisions of the Security Council, the eloquent pleas by the former President of the General Assembly and even the order of the International Court of jus-

tice,<sup>5</sup> which spoke without dissent in reaffirming the status of the hostages and their right to be free under international law.

71. The mothers, fathers, wives, sons and daughters whose loved ones remain separated from them are part of the audience of this meeting and our special thoughts for them today should remind all of us that we are a family of nations and that our faith and aspirations are interdependent and perhaps even indivisible. The voices of all nations have spoken. The universal tenets of all religions, including the precepts of Islam, echo what must be done. The hostages must be freed, and in their freedom the community of nations, I believe, will find new strength.

72. I believe it unfortunate that in the speech of the Prime Minister of Iran the only reference to the hostages was a rhetorical question on how the Iran-Iraq conflict would lead the United States to expect that the hostages would be freed. Of course, we do not believe that the conflict in and of itself should lead to anything except a search for peace, but the basic answer to the question posed by the representative of Iran is simple. We expect the hostages to be freed on the basis of the same principles of law, justice and human dignity on which the Prime Minister based his own appeal to the Council. Indeed, on the basis of those principles, the hostages should not have been taken captive in the first place.

73. I should like to make one final point. The Prime Minister of Iran referred to the inability of the Council to implement its resolutions and suggested that the Council's actions are blocked by the super-Powers. Indeed, the Council is sometimes prevented from implementing its resolutions. But is it not ironic that this complaint about the Council's inability to implement its resolutions should come from Iran, which stands in defiance of numerous resolutions of the Council?

74. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Iran has requested to be allowed to speak in exercise of the right of reply, and I call on him.

75. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran): My purpose in asking for the floor is to dissipate a false impression that may have been created, not in the minds of the members of the Council but in the mind of the Foreign Minister of Iraq as a result of his second intervention in the debate—the false impression that he has perhaps been able to deceive international public opinion in his futile attempt to justify the aggression that Iraq has unleashed against my country.

76. It is not my intention to make a long statement because a few minutes ago my Prime Minister in his statement unmasked the true nature of Iraq's pretensions regarding the war it has imposed on my country. But I can say that the Foreign Minister of Iraq said

absolutely nothing new to this Council in his second statement. Once more he repeated the same arguments that he used when addressing the General Assembly.<sup>3</sup>

77. When Iraq launched its aggression against my country, it launched at the same time a campaign of lies and distortions designed to deceive international public opinion about the true nature of its action, which is a blatant aggression according to all the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, according to the Charter of the Islamic Conference, and according to the principles of the non-aligned movement.

78. How does the Foreign Minister of Iraq dare to come to the Security Council and tell the international community how his country respects international law and the principles of the non-aligned movement, when at this precise moment the forces of aggression are present in my country? They have occupied parts of my country. From the very beginning of their aggression they have been destroying oil installations, economic resources, centres of civilian population, towns and cities, and the lives of innocent people.

79. Their instruments of propaganda have constantly been boasting of how they have invaded my country, how in Abadan, in Khorramshahr, in Dezful and in other cities of Khuzistan they have attacked and killed innocent people and destroyed huge economic installations and raw resources of my country. I think that the members of the Council will agree that nothing that has been said by the Foreign Minister of Iraq can justify an unjustifiable action: the aggression Iraq has launched against my country.

80. I think that what the representative of the United States has said regarding the crisis between our two countries does not reflect the realities of the situation. I wish that we had time enough here in the Council to study and examine all the aspects and dimensions of the problem. What has happened between our two countries is an eloquent expression of more than three decades of intervention and interference in the affairs of my country.

81. The representative of the United States has spoken of respect for humanitarian principles of international law, but he is fully cognizant of the reality that perhaps no country in the world has violated principles of international law and disregarded respect for humanitarian principles more than the United States. I do not think that I need mention examples here. Everybody knows what the United States did in Viet Nam. Shall I give more examples? I do not think that it is necessary.

82. Millions of people were massacred there as a result of the deliberate policy pursued by the United States Government. And not only in Viet Nam, but in Cambodia, in Laos, and in some other parts of the world. But what happened with regard to my own country is something on which I am sure the United

States representative himself will agree. If he examines his conscience, he will agree with me that his country committed many, many crimes during the 35 years of the dark history of relations between our two countries. Who toppled a constitutionally established Government in Iran in 1953? Nobody in the Council raised a finger then. Was that not against the principles of international law? Was that not a violation of all the elementary principles of the Charter of the United Nations? Everybody kept silent.

83. I do not think that even for a moment an official representative of the United States would deny that reality, which has been admitted by Presidents and high dignitaries of the United States. Exactly like the aggression of Iraq, it is undeniable.

84. Therefore it is not my intention to go into details about the history of the relationship between Iran and the United States, but I thought that, in order to set the record straight, it was necessary for me to mention just a few examples of what the United States has done in other parts of the world and what the United States has done in the case of my own country.

85. I reserve my right to speak again if that is necessary.

86. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): The representative of Iraq has asked to be allowed to exercise the right of reply, and I now call on him.

87. Mr. AL-QAYSI (Iraq): The representative of Iran said that his Prime Minister "unmasked the true nature of Iraq's pretensions" regarding what he called "the war it has imposed on my country". I think it is evident to the minds of all that if there is anything that the Prime Minister of Iran has unmasked this afternoon it is the mentality of Khomeini and his strange outlook on international relations. I need only refer to the concluding remarks which were made by the Prime Minister of Iran as to how supposedly the forces of good will prevail over those of evil. He was talking in terms of right and wrong, basing himself on Islam. Islam does not yield him any support in the ideas he pretends to carry with him in his ideology on more than one score and least of all regarding the sanctity of diplomatic representatives.

88. The Prime Minister of Iran said with all the determination that a human being can muster that Iran is determined to interfere and, it seems, to interfere in the affairs of the whole world. Why? Because, he says, their revolution is leading mankind to true human values.

89. The representative of Iran who has just spoken is a seasoned diplomat. He knows the Charter. He knows this organ of the United Nations. He knows the

rule of procedure. He knows the ethics of statesmanship. Can he profess now before the Council that the language of the Iranian revolutionary so-called statements in the General Assembly and the Council conform to the basic norms of ethical conduct in this Organization? Or has he perhaps become convinced of the new logic of Khomeini's revolution? I do not know. He talks about the principles of the Charter and says that the Foreign Minister of my country did not say anything new in the Council, because he repeated the same arguments all over again. It seems that we have to repeat arguments and continue repeating them because we appear to be running up against a concrete wall. The world is on one side—that is, the world of evil—and Khomeini's world—the world of right, goodness, justice, equity and so on—is on the other.

90. The Prime Minister of Iran and the representative of Iran who followed him came here to the Council talking about the humanitarian conduct of the hostilities. They started off in their statements by touching upon the chord of humanity or human feeling. How many persons were condemned to death in Iran and executed during the month of Ramadan, for instance? Did the Iranians or did they not bomb civilian targets in Iraq long before 4 September? Have they or have they not murdered unarmed sailors in cold blood in the waters of the Shatt-Al-Arab? Those are facts that cannot be denied by rhetoric. They talk about legalities and they appeal to law, yet they violate the law, only to come when they find themselves in a corner and say "Give us some time to study the situation in depth". Certainly my delegation is not prepared to see more than two years of the disruption of its internal security.

91. The PRESIDENT (*interpretation from Russian*): I call on the representative of Iran who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

92. Mr. SHEMIRANI (Iran): I am reluctant to reply to rhetoric. I shall never accept lectures on human rights from the representative of a country that is the last one to speak of respect for human rights.

*The meeting rose at 8.30 p.m.*

---

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1017, No. 14903.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Nos. 14904 to 14907.

<sup>3</sup> *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Plenary Meetings*, 22nd meeting.

<sup>4</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 75, No. 972, p. 135.

<sup>5</sup> *United States Diplomatic and Consular Staff in Tehran. Provisional Measures, Order of 15 December 1979, I.C.J. Reports 1979, p. 7.*





---

**كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة**  
يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم - استلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها  
أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة ، قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

**如何购取联合国出版物**

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经营处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

**HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS**

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

**COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES**

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

**КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ**

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

**COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS**

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

---