

IRAN/IRAQ

21
~~22~~
~~23~~

ADVANCE COPIES

PS
PS/SIR I GILMOUR
PS/MR HURD
PS/PUS
SIR E YOUDE
SIR J GRAHAM
~~MR J C MOBERLY~~
MR BRAITHEWAITE
HD/MED
HD/NENAD
HD/UND
HD/CONS D
CONSULAR EMERGENCY UNIT
HD/ES & SD
HD/MAED
HD/DEF D
PUSD (2)
NEWS D

NO 10 DOWNING STREET
CABINET OFFICE DIO

~~RESIDENT CLERK~~

In a circle

ms

GPS620

CONFIDENTIAL

FROM UKMIS NEW YORK 072115Z OCT 80

TO PRIORITY F C O

TELEGRAM NUMBER 1456 OF 7 OCTOBER

INFO PRIORITY WASHINGTON

INFO MOSCOW BONN PARIS JEDDA BAGHDAD TEL AVIV

MY TELNO 1436 (NOT TO ALL) AND WASHINGTON TELNO 4202:

US INTENTIONS: IRAN/IRAQ

**~* Passage deleted
and closed, 40 years,
under FOI Exemption.*

*Wayland
13 September 2012*

1. THE UNITES STATES ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SECURITY COUNCIL IS
PUZZLING. APART FROM MUNOZ LEDO (MEXICO)*
~~~~~
* MCHENRY IS THE ONLY MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL WHO IS
ACTIVELY PRESSING FOR THE COUNCIL TO MOVE INTO PUBLIC SESSION
TO 'BEGIN DICUSSION OF THE SUBSTANCE'.

2. THE REST OF US IE THE FOUR WESTERN MEMBERS PLUS THE OTHER
NON-ALIGNED DO NOT BELIEVE THAT COUNCIL ACTION AT PRESENT CAN STOP
THE FIGHTING, NOR DO WE BELIEVE THAT THE TIME IS RIPE - ALTHOUGH
THIS TIME MAY WELL COME - FOR THE COUNCIL TO ACT EFFECTIVELY
IN ITS PEACE-KEEPING/MEDIATION ROLE. WE SEE NO PURPOSE IN ACTIVITY
FOR ACTIVITY'S SAKE. PUBLIC DEBATE ON THE SUBSTANCE WOULD ONLY
MEAN TAKING SIDES. FOR EXAMPLE, EVEN A STRAIGHT-FORWARD CALL FOR
A CEASEFIRE WOULD BE PRO-IRAQI WHILE CEASE-FIRE PLUS WITHDRAWAL
COULD BE PRO-IRANIAN A FORTIORI. FOR THE COUNCIL TO START

DISCUSSING WHO WAS THE MORE TO BLAME OVER BREACHES OF THE 1975 AGREEMENT OR WHERE THE BOUNDARY SHOULD RUN IN THE SHATT EL ARAB AND THE LAND FRONTIERS WOULD BE EXTREMELY AWKWARD. VERY FEW COUNCIL MEMBERS WOULD BE PREPARED TO SPEAK ON SUCH TOPICS AND, IN THE UNLIKELY EVENT OF THE COUNCIL ADOPTING A RESOLUTION GOING BEYOND SCR 479, IT WOULD EITHER CONTINUE TO ALIENATE THE IRANIANS OR ALIENATE THE IRAQIS, THUS DAMAGING ITS CHANCES OF BEING ABLE TO ACT EFFECTIVELY WHEN THE RIGHT MOMENT COMES.

3. WE AND THE OTHER WESTERN MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL PUT ALL THIS TO THE AMERICANS ON 6 OCTOBER AT A MEETING CALLED BY MCHENRY. HE ACCEPTED THE FORCE OF OUR ARGUMENTS BUT CONTINUED TO HANKER AFTER PUBLIC DEBATE.

4. IT MAY BE THAT MCHENRY'S ATTITUDE REFLECTS HIS OWN VIEWS ON THE NEED TO MAINTAIN THE AUTHORITY OF THE COUNCIL ETC, (HE SAID THAT WE WERE ALLOWING THE COUNCIL TO BE PUSHED INTO A POSITION WHERE IT COULD ONLY ACT IF THE COMBATANTS WANTED IT TO) BUT HIS MISSION TELL US THAT HE IS UNDER STRONG PRESSURE FROM THE WHITE HOUSE. IT OCCURS TO ME THAT A PARTIAL ANSWER MAY BE THAT THE ISRAELI LOBBY HAVE BEEN CRITICISING THE ADMINISTRATION ON THE GROUND THAT THEY DO NOTHING TO PREVENT THE ARABS FROM RUSHING INTO FORMAL SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL, EXCORIATING ISRAEL AND THE US AND ADOPTING OFFENSIVE RESOLUTIONS. HOW IS IT THEN THAT THEY ARE SITTING BACK AND ALLOWING UNSAVOURY COUNTRIES LIKE IRAQ AND IRAN TO CONDUCT A MAJOR WAR WITHOUT THE SECURITY COUNCIL EVEN MEETING? MCHENRY'S REMARKS AT LAST FRIDAY'S INFORMAL CONSULTATIONS LEND SOME CREDENCE TO THIS THEORY (MY TELNO 1444).

5. IT IS ALSO POSSIBLE THAT THE AMERICANS MAY SEE PUBLIC SESSIONS OF THE COUNCIL AS A MEANS TO BRING PRESSURE TO BEAR ON THE SOVIET UNION. HOWEVER, WHEN MY NORWEGIAN COLLEAGUE SAID AT THE MEETING ON 6 OCTOBER THAT A FIRM AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE US AND THE USSR WOULD BRING THE NON-ALIGNED BEHIND A SUPER-POWER CONSENSUS, SILENCE FELL ON THE US DELEGATION. IT IS IN FACT DIFFICULT TO SEE HOW PUBLIC DISCUSSION COULD BRING THIS ABOUT.

6. WHEN WE COMPARED NOTES AFTER THE MEETING BROKE UP, WE HAD A FEELING, ALTHOUGH DIFFICULT TO DEFINE, THAT THE AMERICANS WERE CASTING ABOUT TO FIND SOMETHING PRO-IRANIAN TO DO. IF SO, IT MAY BE THAT THEY SEE A COUNCIL MEETING AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO SAY SOMETHING IN PUBLIC WHICH THEY MIGHT HOPE WOULD HAVE A FAVOURABLE EFFECT ON THE HOSTAGES PROBLEM.