

December 3, 1989

**Dialogues between Saddam Hussein, Iraqi
ambassadors and journalists in foreign countries**

Citation:

"Dialogues between Saddam Hussein, Iraqi ambassadors and journalists in foreign countries", December 3, 1989, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Conflict Records Research Center, National Defense University, SH-SHTP-A-000-930. Contributed by Steve Coll. <https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/301033>

Summary:

This file contains dialogues between Saddam Hussein and Iraqi ambassadors in foreign countries. This period contains an Iraqi ambassador comment on the Zionist influence in the United States. He stated that the American brains were conducting the Zionism in the United States. He added that the Jewish immigration whether to Israel or to the United States would create a threat on the Arab Countries. Saddam commented that the Soviet Jewish immigration to these states would decrease because the regime has changed in the Soviet Union. He said that Israel wished the Berlin wall would move to the States of the Middle East. Their target was to eliminate the wall separating them from the Arab States. He added that the democratic changes were continuously occurring. He gave an example about a protest in Czechoslovakia. It leads to the resignation of 11 Ministers of the Czechoslovakian government. Saddam answered that when a protest occurred in the Yarmuk City, Iraq, the Revolutionary Command Council considered carefully how to deal with the protest. . Israel was afraid from the Iraqi evolution to a technologically developed country. Saddam stated that every new power appearing in the world might threaten the two existent enormous poles. That was the reason Iraq fought. This period contains the Saddam declaration on the ambassadors' freedom to express their opinions. He also noticed that they were well prepared for the discussion. He added that the good preparation for the conferences was the key of their success.

Original Language:

Arabic

Contents:

Transcript - Arabic

TRANSLATION BEGINS HERE

[Male Participant 1]

Many from the Jewish community will be allowed to emigrate or will have the choice between emigrating and staying. It will be a new case concerning the issue of emigration.

[Saddam Hussein]

After the events in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, it is clear that immigration to the Zionist entity will be very limited because of what led the West to raise this issue, which is a political issue being used to embarrass the former communist countries. One of the things that was and still is pushing Zionism is that they have access to a number of third world countries. Why would a person who can go and see Israel and then come back want to immigrate? There is no need for that.

Due to the influence of the Zionist lobby in the West, America and the West have not helped immigrants from communist countries go to the West, but are instead leading them to Israel. Now this accounts for all of the cases of immigration. Israel will depend on people coming from third world countries to increase its population. So the makeup of the Israeli society is expected to be disrupted in the future, and it will be affected by diseases coming from third world countries, such as laziness, underdevelopment, etc.

This is the case, although there will be a Zionist lobby in the Soviet Union, Poland, Romania, etc. It will happen in Romania later, because even if Ceausescu holds on, he will only hold on for the remnants of his life, and he will not hold on as the prophet Noah did. He is not a lion; his end is near.

After Ceausescu, the experience in the communist countries will take hold. In this regard, things are positive, and emigration will not take place. On the other hand, Zionism will continue with the Zionist lobby, as we said before. Global development in general has not given Israel the same prestige in the Zionist lobby as before. I mean that the Zionist ideological influence has been lost.

Israel has always worn a halo by calling itself "the Jewish state, which extends from the Euphrates to the Nile." It has become clear to every Jew in the world that this slogan is a mirage. When the halo falls in the eyes of Jews abroad, the enthusiasm for such a slogan will decline. However, if Jews consider the state of Israel as only a state, then the state of Israel will not enjoy the same favor as if Jews considered it to be the representative of Jews throughout the world.

Yes, Sadiq Shaban?

[Major General Sadiq Shaban]

Mr. President, the importance of this subject makes us ask this question: who is leading? I mean, is Zionism leading the United States, or is the United States leading Zionism?

If Zionism is leading, emigration will certainly have a greater impact in the region, but I would agree that the emigration will not be very large. However, this emigration will help to accommodate a specific area in Palestine and to accommodate the most recently acquired area of the occupied territory in Gaza on the other side.

Mr. President, I believe that the answer is that the United States is leading. In order to keep the Jewish state from becoming too strong, the best solution is to control the region and its oil fields. So the United States is hesitant to allow emigration. Sometimes it issues strict laws, and sometimes it tolerates it. However, I imagine that this process is a kind of game, in both cases. Mr. President, this will have a negative effect on us, so if the emigration turns to Palestine or the United States, the negative effects will be the same. Thank you.

[Saddam Hussein]

I think that the rate of emigration will be less than before, than the desire for migration or asylum, whether to America, the West or occupied Palestine. The number of Soviets who want to emigrate to all of these places will be less than before, because one of the reasons that led them to emigrate was the difference between the two societies: the society they are seeking and the community they are dealing with; bridging the gap means that this factor will become a form of psychological pressure that will encourage the desire to emigrate.

Who is leading? In this case, in the past, there were many factors that played a role in the Zionist lobby's influence. Now, the Zionist lobby makes everyone more reliable, and it has a high level of impact when its rhetoric and slogans match the wishes and interests of major companies in the United States, and this can affect the possibility of it getting what it wishes.

In any case, the U.S. has an interest in the survival of Israel. Here is the point, which has two sides related to the U.S.' national interests and not the Zionist influence. It has an interest in the survival of the Zionist entity in the same way that I have described. It is expressed by the political perception that "it is not strong with the U.S. strategy in place, nor is it weak with the possibility of implementing the U.S. policy," and it is a fundamental pillar of the implementation of the United States' policy and its ambitions in the region and with the Zionist entity.

From here, we can broach the subject of those who think that the solution is coming soon. I mean that these people and others don't have an appreciation. As we say, they are not realistic, and they are affected by a factor of weakness, not force, and they are

filling themselves with false hopes. In the short term, there is no solution to the issue, but that does not mean that there is no solution at all. However, the solution is mainly in the Arabs' ability to influence things, and the Arabs are now able to influence things if they want to. But even this "wanting to" has been the subject of a long and well known discussion. Radio and television, yes?

[Participating Journalist]

Concerning the support of the socialist-communist countries and the Palestinian issue this year, two events occurred in 1989. The first event was at the beginning of the year, at the World Health Organization. The Palestine Liberation Organization wanted to become a full member of the World Health Organization. It had a good justification for this request, since it had health institutions and the Palestinian Red Crescent Foundation, and it provided health assistance to some countries in Africa. It also provided medical missions. The United States said, "If the World Health Organization accepts it as a full member, we will stop our aid and financial contributions to the organization."

The first group who came to the organization and asked it to refuse the request claimed that it was not the right time for the socialist bloc. However, it is clear that the socialist bloc -- the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe -- came to the organization and asked it to postpone the request. The General Assembly of the Palestine Liberation Organization submitted a request to raise its level of representation from a control organization to a state of control. There is no doubt that the PLO had support from some Arab, third world and non-aligned countries, but ultimately, the Soviet group was saying, "Please do not accept this request because the U.S. has threatened to stop its financial contributions to the organization."

[Saddam Hussein]

This was Gorbachev's idea, to solve problems by peaceful means. In other words, the concessions on both sides were being made at whose expense? At the expense of others who were unable to control them. This requires compromise.

[Participating Journalist]

The Soviet Union and the communist and socialist countries have no objection to providing free support to the Palestinian cause, because this support will not cost them anything. They have no problem giving them support if the support is not expensive, as it was in 1967 when the leaders met and broke off relations with Israel and mobilized their armies. That is what happened.

[Saddam Hussein]

That is over now. It is part of the past. Mr. Saad al-Bazzaz?

[Saad al-Bazzaz]

Thank you, Mr. President. The question that we can ask after this discussion is the following: did the strategic value of the Arab nation deteriorate in a potential conflict between the two giants, since the value of the Arab world was formed in light of the changes that followed World War II, as an Arab world based on its dynamic location?

[Saddam Hussein]

The value of the Arab world has many constants. In other words, when organized human beings appeared in addition to states and conflict — that is, in the Arab world -- it had a historical value. This value is stable. You are assuming that its value will decline if there is a conflict between the giants, but could it become less important in the framework of bargaining between the giants? The answer is yes.

[Saad al-Bazzaz]

Mr. President, we asked this question after the Malta Summit declaration, which said that the Soviets were once again proposing easing the military presence of the superpowers in the Mediterranean. This arose from the reduced level of conflict between the Americans and the Soviets in Europe. When Europe's attention decreased, the Mediterranean's attention decreased immediately. If the attention and military presence decrease in the Mediterranean, we expect a decline in the level of interest in the Arab region concerning the solution.

In the 1960s, McNamara's theory was that the Arab world was the last line of defense for Europe. It was important and vital to Europe's security. The level of conflict over Europe has been reduced to some degree, and this is reflected in the Soviet and American discussion about reducing the military presence in the Mediterranean. This question should be reflected in the superpowers' interest in the Arab world.

If the sources of power in the Arab nations stems from the wealth and cash flow that emerged after World War II, there is no doubt that the interest in their location is an issue to be discussed. The Arab world no longer has a big cash flow to run large-scale investments because of the considerable absorption of this cash flow.

The value that is still important and that has an impact on international relations is oil. Oil makes us believe that the level of interest will fluctuate between the Arab-Israeli conflict and the situation in the Gulf. The attention will still be focused on the Gulf region as long as large oil reserves exist in Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Kuwait rather than other parts of the world.

The concern over oil will continue to have an impact on international relations. However, with the conflict in the Arab-Israeli region, which is adjacent to the Mediterranean, there is a lower level of interest. The impact of the two superpowers will be reduced, and the regional factor, or what we call the "internal factor," will rise. This means that the regional players will have a greater chance of fighting and creating a future conflict between them. This is what causes concern. The Arab internal factor at this stage is

very important, because the future could bring many surprises. Israeli officials have begun talking about many of these things. They have said that the Soviets will not arm the Arab countries now as they did in the past, and therefore, the Arabs will not receive the same quantity of weapons that it was possible to receive from the Soviet Union in the past. Peres also said two days ago that now that the Soviet Union has abandoned its strategic allies in Eastern Europe, what would keep it from abandoning its Arab allies in the area?

The Israelis will now promote what I call a "crisis by suggestion." I mean that they will say, "You should now move the experience of the Berlin wall — the collapse of the war -- to the Middle East." The goal is not to keep the wall between them and the Arabs, and they want to move the crisis to the region by suggestion. This crisis has several dimensions, including poor discipline. The legitimate institutions in many countries of the world have declined, and not just in Eastern Europe. People are moving.

In Czechoslovakia, a demonstration brought down the ministry yesterday, with 11 out of 18 ministers resigning because the demonstration in Prague opposed their ministry. Events have happened in China, the Soviet Union and other countries outside the socialist or Eastern European countries. It is important to observe how much they want to--

[Saddam Hussein]

If you want to listen, sit down, but if you want to show by appearance, then that is not consistent with democracy.

[Saad al-Bazzaz]

Mr. President, there are several concerns. This concern is about the extent to which the enemy will work on transferring the crisis by suggesting it to the Arab region, the crisis of throngs of people coming out of legitimacy and out of their current status. People are protesting against the existing systems in their countries and are moving according to the suggestions of others.

[Saddam Hussein]

This issue was raised more than once by our brothers in 1977. In Iraq, an armed demonstration began in Najaf, and the demonstrators walked along the road from Najaf to Karbala. Witnesses are still alive today. We met in the leadership and continued the debate. The demonstration continued. The police seized their weapons, and they continued, and we were discussing in the leadership if we should end this armed demonstration. Should we use the party, the police, or the army? What would be the reason? The leadership was not united around one idea, and there were some people called "Baramika" who had a different plan, which did not appear to us. We were discussing the fact that if some factors did not exist, it would be possible to cause a crisis in the country, and we had no idea what the political status would be.

Part of what is happening in Eastern Europe is related to the political-administrative topic. I mean, we should not neglect the analysis, as each group has a point of view. No one comes out and says, "Stop there. You talked about slogans, and we have achieved all of them." After that, you should not step on the government. Each of them has something in mind and hopes to achieve it. We do not know how long they will keep flailing and trying to stand up again. That is my opinion.

[Saad al-Bazzaz]

Yes, Mr. President. Will Iran's strategic value in the relationship between the Americans and the Soviets remain the same, and will Iran have the same ability to maneuver between the Soviet Union and the United States in light of the new international climate?

Mr. President, I think that Iran's ability to maneuver will diminish in the coming stage because the Soviet Union's view of safe limits will change, based on what happened in Eastern Europe and the new perspective of their relations. Thank you very much.

[Saddam Hussein]

Who has a view that strengthens or contradicts al-Bazzaz's ideas? Yes?

[Al-Mokhtar]

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to comment on the Zionist power concerning the events happening in Eastern Europe and their impact on the future of Iraqi-Iranian relations. My logic is based purely on a practical point indicating the Israeli vision of its future.

[Saddam Hussein]

The speaker is al-Mokhtar, who writes articles in Iraq.

[Al-Mokhtar]

Thank you, Mr. President. Israel's view of its future could give us the key to upcoming events in the Arab-Israeli conflict and to Iraqi-Iranian relations and the future of the Gulf region in general.

In Eastern Europe, events are now taking place under the guise of openness. One result, as agreed by the ambassadors, is to remove the official cover of Zionist power and Zionist activity in the former communist and current socialist countries. This has led to an increase in Zionist activity in the countries of Eastern Europe, so the reflection of the first Israeli conflict will be increased support for the Israeli position.

[Saddam Hussein]

I want to mention that our ambassadors in the socialist countries, in light of the new trend called human rights, are looking to encourage associations that may help all of the Arab ambassadors and friends of the Arabs with regard to prisoners of war. Those mentioned might now be preoccupied with the internal situation -- that is clear -- but

now, everyone is starting to think about how to deal with this subject, including Arab students, who are very engaged. They classify this subject as a part of human rights.

[Al-Mokhtar]

The signs of this Zionist influence started early with the praise announced by President George W. Bush for the new Soviet attitude toward the Arab-Israeli conflict. I consider the position of the Soviet Union to be positive for the first time, and this is very clear. The important issue for us is how that will affect the future of Iraqi-Iranian relations.

If we look at the Israeli composition and internal structure, we can see that it is a state lacking the components of a state that exists by itself and relies on its own resources. For this reason, throughout history, it has relied on a stream of external transfers, whether they be financial transfers or transfers of human beings from the outside.

Israel's plan for 2000 is based on turning Israel into a center to attract industrial technology in the Middle East, surrounded by a backward Arab countryside that provides the raw materials and labor. For this reason, electronics and technology have developed in Israel over the past several years. Israel has continued to assume that the next century will see its transformation into a center of gravity in the Middle East.

The following dangerous event has taken place. In the past few years, Iraq has emerged as a technological, industrial, scientific and cultural center of gravity in the Middle East by virtue of its human and physical potential. This has confused the Israeli vision and put it in a certain situation, facing a new challenge that was not taken into consideration accurately and in detail. The Israeli policy, as it has been noted, from the mid-1970s onward was based on following the events in Iraq in order to monitor the possibility of Iraq's transition to a natural alternative to the Israeli center in the region. The hitting of the nuclear reactor and Iran's support in the Gulf War was due not only to Iraq's national position but also to the fear that Iraq would turn into a technological, industrial and scientific center of gravity in the Middle East. This would lead to a total cancellation of the Israeli project, and therefore the Zionist entity, in the Middle East.

This Israeli obsession still exists, and even if the Israeli conflict is resolved peacefully in the coming years, another obsession will always control Israel's regional policy and will always directly affect American-Israeli relations. That is, how will Iraq evolve in the future? How will Iraq's development affect the future of Israel as the technological and industrial center in the Middle East?

So it is possible, as we are assuming, that Israel and global Zionism will carry out events and activities and will put numerous plans in place to attract a wide audience from Eastern Europe and other places in the world. This will be done in order to surround and isolate Iraq, to cooperate with Iran regionally, and to pave the way for it to move elsewhere in the world, including Eastern Europe. Iran is an oil country that has a

large quantity of resources, so in the next century, it will try to join up with the Zionist entity in an attempt to surround Iraq.

The study of this phenomenon and the Israeli project must be our top concern in the near future, because even though the world is heading toward a bilateral center of the Soviet Union and the United States, it is still impossible for two or three superpowers to control the world. The two superpowers will play the major role, but there is a second and a third role to play, and the regional powers will be able to affect their surrounding regions.

[Saddam Hussein]

It is regrettable that the world did not tell us about the existence of more than two powers at the same time that have an equal ability to influence others. No one told us about this. I mean that there were always two religions that won the conflict at the global level. It was not expected that three equal forces with the same power of influence and weight would show up. One of the reasons is that that would lead to the emergence of other forces. When a third force starts to take hold, it must take power from the two existing powers. So due to the theory of evolution and influential and physical interventions, the Americans and the Soviets have had to search for a new route in order not to be overcome by development and lose their influence. Yes?

[Al-Mokhtar]

Yes, Israel's margin of maneuver -- even if it is reduced -- will remain important because it is related to its existence and future and not only to its extension capacity. It is also reflected in its impact on the United States and its attitude toward the region and the countries of the region, since the presence of structural disorder in Israel will keep this entity in severe disruption. Some perceptions were put into place in order to overcome the future structural crisis in Israel. One of these perceptions consists of establishing an alliance or a common market in the Middle East after the peace process with Israel in which they will divide the roles and benefits. Thank you, Mr. President.

[Saddam Hussein]

Arms companies are some of the large companies that affect their countries. They will always have an impact on decisions. We see that the U.S. arms companies are not bothered by events being led by the United States. What is the reason for this? First, is this observation true? My opinion is based on findings more than on field monitoring. I have not yet read or seen anything interesting concerning the position of U.S. arms companies. Yes?

[Male Participant 2]

We heard yesterday that the U.S. Secretary of Defense requested a five percent reduction in the defense budget next year. Certainly, it is a situation that might continue, and it will have negative consequences for the arms companies. However, the arms companies have not reacted yet.

[Saddam Hussein]

There has not been anything serious yet? I expect that when the agreement is reached between the two parties, both will inevitably reduce their budgets. Nevertheless, this issue is important to us, since this means that the wars have not ended yet. The issues that may be provided by the White House are promises made to American arms companies. It is true that it will reduce the budget concerning the Soviet Union, but this does not mean that its production of weapons in other fields will be reduced. In other words, the other fields will remain potentially explosive. And the states that are able to push back are concerned by this, particularly in the Middle East, which means that the Arab-Israeli conflict will continue.

There are many factors involved, including the impossibility of reaching a clear conclusion. In fact, since these arms factories are not angry, it means that conflict will always be present in our region and in third world countries, where conflicts may arise to the great satisfaction of arms factories.

[Male Participant 3]

[Inaudible]

[Saddam Hussein]

The government's contributions to them are large, especially for arming their own armies.

[Male Participant 3]

[Inaudible]

[Saddam Hussein]

All the military industries can be converted through development or by adding lines.

[Male Participant 3]

[Inaudible]

[Saddam Hussein]

Did we convert travel companies into companies that produce bombs? I mean, we organized trips for local governments to Abu Ghraib prison.

Yes, before going on with this subject, there is a small point that is ineffective but important. How do you see the future of the two Koreas in light of this event? The point that concerns us is that its position was very bad in the war. The arming of ground forces with medium and light weapons depends largely on North Korea. Yes?

[Male Participant 4]

I have a question concerning the conflict of strategies. I have a question, and then I will give my opinion about Korea. Is it possible that arms companies have realized that the role of states fighting on behalf of other states had ended?

[Saddam Hussein]

Give me the answer and don't ask me a question. I am here to ask you.

[Male Participant 4]

Within the policy of reconciliation, Mr. President?

[Saddam Hussein]

States could not fight on behalf of other states. The Soviet Union's impact will not remain the same in the long term. So the Soviet Union's progress may have a greater impact than its existing impact. This is surely in its interest. This old principle has ended now, and a new phase has started.

What about Korea?

[Male Participant 4]

In fact, our field work is far from Korea, but it is possible to give an idea of the Vietnamese reactions to the events and changes that have occurred in Eastern Europe. Actually, Vietnam's first reaction emerged directly after the events in China, which troubled the leadership and the party in Hanoi. This concern appeared clearly with the reinforcement of the Vietnamese people with capabilities of heavily armed military forces. This situation is occurring for the first time in Vietnam after the events in China.

In addition, the Vietnamese Communist Party and the Vietnamese leadership are following a policy of threat and inducement at the same time. In fact, members of the Politburo and the Central Committee went to Vietnamese colleges and universities to meet with students and made a declaration [inaudible] in which they said that any situation that may threaten security would be strictly dealt with. In response to this declaration, the Vietnamese media started to publish reactions to the official government view, saying that it was against all attempts at reform. The party's leadership announced that the error was not in Marxist theory but in its application. On this basis, the Vietnamese experience is-

[Saddam Hussein]

The error is not in the theory of Marxism?

[Al-Mokhtar]

Yes, that is what they are saying. Mr. President, what we can conclude from the considerations is the following: Vietnam did not arise because of the Soviet Union's victory in World War II. It was the result of an indirect effect owing to the defeat of the

Axis powers and the Japanese withdrawal from Vietnam, China, and the countries of Indochina. The symbol of struggle, Ho Chi Minh, used Japan's defeat and withdrawal to declare Vietnam's independence on February 9, 1945. This situation gave Vietnam a unique characteristic, which is different from other strategic nations, although it is still locked firmly to the theory of Marxism and its role in the party.

On this basis, a week before Mr. President's arrival, the Doi Moi prime minister met with the leaders of the armed forces and officially told them, "Any movement within the country to cause instability or disturbances must be confronted by force." In addition, the leader of the diplomatic corps in the capital, Hanoi, announced in one of the leadership meetings that the Vietnamese minister of health had expressed sympathy for Chinese students. The leadership answered him sharply in saying that they would take stronger actions than China if students carried out any action that would disturb security and the ruling system.

It is an indicator of the desire among the group of strategic countries, as the ambassador to Romania mentioned. Romania is now leading a cluster including China, Vietnam, Cuba, and North Korea that opposes reforms. The main reason is the difference in economic growth levels. For example, Vietnam, as you know, is among the 10 poorest countries in the world. Therefore, this process cannot change anything, since it is plagued by Cambodia and by poverty. What can be changed? It has no foundation of an economic infrastructure to be changed, and there is no advanced technology to be changed. The Vietnamese are asking now for an increase in rice rations for food and clothing.

On this basis, change and economic growth in Vietnam is different from the situation in Western Europe, particularly since the Western media against it in Europe is far from Vietnam, which is overwhelmed by a major issue concerning regional security: Cambodia. This issue may also be a direct cause of the lack of support in the state for democracy reform. The reform process should start with economic and democratic reform without violence, demonstrations, or other movements. It can be compared somewhat to the situation in Korea, especially since those countries and their government systems are the result of force, since they are military countries.

[Unidentified Male Participant]
[Inaudible from 46:69 to 47:45]

[Saddam Hussein]

We want to make it clear that the changes taking place in those countries started with the Soviet Union, which is not a leader in the communist revolution or even the second, third, fourth or fifth leader. It is the sixth leader. It is normal that the Soviet Union is exasperated by another generation. Vietnam does not have a generation that is exasperated by the other generations, except the young students, some of whose fighter parents are still alive. The points you mentioned are deep and correct, but we

could add a few things. Did you notice that the outer group started the discussions, I mean the Baghdad crew--

[Unidentified Male Participant]
[Inaudible]

[Saddam Hussein]
I want al-Bazzaz and al-Mokhtar to coordinate and hold an open discussion on television to host our ambassadors before they leave. They can divide them into two groups. Then they could host the audience after the ambassadors. I mean you will discuss, comment, ask questions, and give answers about the general topics covered in this meeting or the meetings held before in the Western countries, Japan, and the Soviet Union.

You have to send the questions before the discussion without specifying any limits. Each of them could speak and discuss freely, so they can prepare themselves for the debate. Do not restrict the discussion to the ambassadors, but host some audience members and university professors from other fields. Each group should have five, six, or seven members. The discussion should move in the same way that it sometimes does in Western countries. I know that we are not familiar with that, but let's get used to it.

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]
I'm anxious about you having this discussion while I'm not here. I have a recommendation for my brothers. The transition followed in the states, of course...

[Saddam Hussein]
You should take into consideration that the ambassador is in the state that he represents, and others could express their views.

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]
They should not speak directly about the state, though. For example, what if our ambassador to Bulgaria is asked, "Why did Zhivkov resign?" If he wanted to be honest, he would say that he was forced to leave his post. Yes, that is the truth.

[Saddam Hussein]
It is my personal opinion that—

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]
But if he said so, this would undermine his position, because he is still representing a policy, right?

[Saddam Hussein]
They are saying it in the Bulgarian streets.

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Yes, the ambassador has a special position. Let them talk about general issues.

[Saddam Hussein]

Let them talk freely and say anything they want, but they should pay attention to their words as ambassadors in the country that they represent or in other countries. Let them say anything they want, and if they don't respond, we will take them to another location. Whoever wants to move should start from his own country.

Thank you, my brothers. This discussion was very helpful. It is clear that this time, the ambassadors were mentally prepared. That is the benefit of these meetings, because they knew that some discussions have been held between other ambassadors. Good evening.

There is a dinner to attend. It is not mandatory, because some of you may have other dinners to attend.

TRANSLATION ENDS HERE