

1989**Meeting between Saddam and unidentified ministers****Citation:**

"Meeting between Saddam and unidentified ministers", 1989, Wilson Center Digital Archive, Conflict Records Research Center, National Defense University, SH-SHTP-A-000-761. Contributed by Steve Coll.
<https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/301123>

Summary:

This undated file is a meeting between Saddam and a number of unidentified Iraqi ministers. The file goes back to the days of Francois Mitterrand. The main topic of discussion was European efforts to create a united economy. Tariq Aziz briefed Saddam on the internal relations in Europe, especially between East and West Germany before the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the weaknesses of Communism and Socialism.

Original Language:

Arabic

Contents:

Transcript - Arabic

TRANSLATION BEGINS HERE

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

In 1992, all of Europe, except England, will be required to do so. The conservatives in England do not want to turn the 12 nations of Western Europe into one open market. They also know that this could pose some coordination problems that will come to fruition in 1992.

Others think that it is impossible to stop these changes in the communist camp and that they are now facing two choices instead of three. The first is to continue to progress, and the second is to give themselves over to the real crisis, because the results and repercussions within the communist camp have not yet been determined. They think that they will launch one open market in 1992, characterized by an economic union and a common currency. We all know that this issue requires a bold look at the social situation and that many nationalities are involved. Europeans do not belong to a single nation; therefore, they should come up with flexible formats. However, they should also deal with the social situation, because the repercussions on the other side - communism - have many implications for them. They should study this situation and take the university system into consideration along with the details that may help them to avoid the repercussions of the process, which may lead to an explosion within the communist camp, if we can use that term.

The Italians and the French are thinking about Europe's status in 1992 if these repercussions in the communist camp continue. Are there any economic realities that will prevent them from turning into a closed fortress? In fact, this is the case, so which party will they have to coordinate with?

Mr. President, the majority bloc is calling for coordination with the three geographically-linked entities with which a political understanding is possible. The first consists of Italy, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Austria, and they all wish to coordinate with this entity.

[Saddam Hussein]

It seems that nowadays, Hungary's affairs are entrusted to Germany. Is that right?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Mr. President, they are first entrusted to Italy, but Germany provides the loans.

[Saddam Hussein]

It seems as though Germany is interested in the affairs of the GDR and Hungary more than those of any other country, right?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Mr. President, Germany is of course interested in them, but it is interested in East Germany and Poland as well. But this interest is no less than the interest it has in Hungary, as you mentioned.

[Saddam Hussein]

Are there any reasons for this?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Certainly, there are reasons. They think that such integration will possibly be part of the belt.

[Saddam Hussein]

Do you think that they agree on this because it is a matter that concerns their countries?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Mr. President, they have agreed to hold a meeting next month in Budapest.

[Iraqi Male Participant 1]

President Mitterrand invited the leaders of the Common Market to an emergency summit meeting on Saturday to discuss the changes in Eastern Europe. This meeting will be France's attempt to assign roles and promote certain policies concerning the changes in Eastern Europe and Budapest.

[Saddam Hussein]

Do you think the West has taken into account this series of explosions, as you called them?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Well, I doubt that. However, they are certainly considering them in part, especially regarding their connections and their current level.

[Saddam Hussein]

In part. Certainly they consider them to be a small part, smaller than what really happened.

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Surely, Mr. President, part of it.

[Saddam Hussein]

Let me describe an example. Someone comes and plays with a dam. He believes that he will be able to release water from this dam into a field for a certain purpose. Suddenly, an earthquake strikes the dam. So what happens? What are the consequences of this earthquake on him? Things have been arranged like this since World War II, and policies have been created in order to deal with them. Their people and regimes, and suddenly the situation, have all changed. So how do you see the

position of the West, and Europe's situation in particular, and then the U.S.' situation versus these changes, and how do you see the future of Europe?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Mr. President, I cannot say that I have a broad vision, but-

[Saddam Hussein]

It is an induction. It is like a person walking around without giving a full answer about anything. However, our meeting is being held only to exchange views that may paint a general picture.

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Mr. President, allow me to talk about Italy, as it has been somewhat surprised. The Italians once allowed me to attend parliamentary discussions, in the house of deputies but not the senate. At that time, I attended a session during which they were discussing trade relations with the Soviet Union, and apparently, Mr. President, a great number of deputies, mostly Italian communists, were surprised.

[Saddam Hussein]

The communists are surely those who were the most surprised. However, here we are talking about people who were working to create this earthquake, but they never expected that it would reach this level. They focused on human rights.

Take West Germany, for example, which was focusing on two main factors. Factor one was human rights in the GDR, where rights were being violated. Factor two was the difference in economic growth between the two Germanys. Suddenly, the president came and said, for one reason or another, "Germans of East Germany, this is Germany. Please take it in your hands, for I want to go." At that time, West Germany was ready to receive only one link from the East Germans, i.e., around five million people, but in general, it wasn't fully ready for this step. They were worried about social problems. When the East Germans started creating social, security, and administrative problems, how would the West Germans deal with these immigrants? In what spirit would these immigrants return to the GDR when the time came?

These problems are restricted to Europe, since the U.S. will never encounter such problems. Do the Americans intend to give Europe its chance to appear again as an axis when the Soviet Union is coming to its end and facing all kinds of explosions? In fact, this is part of our discussion today. In other words, will the Americans be impartial and leave Western Europe to face this new, unexpected situation alone, or will they step in to help? Please state the reasons for your yes or no answer.

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Mr. President, I believe that the United States will hesitate to lend Europe a hand in this matter.

[Saddam Hussein]

Amnesty is an urgent deal. The crisis of communism is intellectual. In other words, it is related to the theory and not to the process. And the first mistake in its philosophy is that it abounds the soul and God and denies the peoples' rituals for God.

Then there is the issue of democracy and their concept of the economy, which has failed as well. The question here is, have these issues led to the failure of communism?

They will be able to fix two out of the three issues in a short time. The third point will take a long time to resolve. They are dealing with these issues by giving the people the freedom to act toward God and their rights as human beings and everything else related to democracy. However, what will take time is the economic issue and all of the social issues related to it. These things are on the right track, and they will continue on their way, and our job is to watch them and decide when to stop them.

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Mr. President, as some Europeans see it, the United States of America is apparently not comfortable with the Europeans' 1992 plan to take a central position in the world.

[Saddam Hussein]

When someone encounters something unexpected and fears it, he will definitely help others to defeat enemies that may appear in the future.

Don't you think that Western Europe will help Eastern Europe, at least at this stage, to reduce the damage? But how much will they help? How will they strike a balance between the will to help defeat the risks and abstaining in order to benefit from the situation to achieve their old dreams?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Mr. President, as they say, "Your brother is obliged to help, but he is not a hero." This is the case of the Europeans, since explosions are happening in their arena that are directly affecting the European economy and society. The Americans are relatively far from these issues. The Americans have expressed in many different ways that they are not for a politically strong European Union. Therefore, it will be the end of the North Atlantic Treaty. When Europe is unified, it will be stronger, as will its opinion. And the Europeans are asking to continue with this breakthrough in order to diminish the military role of NATO and enhance its political role. This is an official Italian request.

Therefore, I believe that the United States will not pay any attention to the results of the communist explosions taking place in Europe, and the Europeans will have to help the communists economically. This analysis is not just mine; this is what they are writing.

[Saddam Hussein]

Have they started writing about these things?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

They have, Mr. President, and they are giving the example of Poland, where the economic crisis is a real dilemma. It has been published that so far, the United States has agreed to offer around \$160 million to help solve Poland's crisis, which amounts to more than \$1 billion.

[Saddam Hussein]

What will Poland do with \$200 million?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

Its crisis is worth several billions.

[Saddam Hussein]

Is Europe capable of multiplying this number by 10, or maybe even 20?

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

I doubt it, Mr. President. But it will assist Poland differently. Italy may not provide capital or offer loans, but it will give Poland technology.

[Saddam Hussein]

But technology takes money. No one could ever say that this is the final image of Eastern Europe from where it stands right now. Before Eastern Europe reaches a level of assurance, it is hard to believe that anyone would give it a technology loan or even continue to invest in it.

Do you think that this openness will export labor to Western Europe? Do you think that the Western European economy will be able to withstand and receive this wave of employment, which in terms of skills, will be competing with Western labor? We must not forget the severe reactions to the migration of the oppressed communist community to Western Europe.

[Mohammed al-Sahhaf]

This is the situation, Mr. President. But this comparison is just a small hint of things to come. For example, the Europeans' agreement with the Polish exceeds \$664 million, which means that it is three times more than what the United States has given.

[Saddam Hussein]

If only Poland was the issue here. Maybe this will help, but we are talking about four other nations as well.

Your turn is about to end, as others have the right to express their opinions as well.

[Male Participant 2]

Major General Sadiq Shaban.

[Major General Sadiq Shaban]

Thank you, Mr. President. Please, if you'll allow me, I have to discuss a certain issue.

[Saddam Hussein]

You are talking about this subject and forgetting about Japan, which has a good grasp of society, nationalism, traditions, ethics, ideas, technology, the economy, etc. America and Europe are complaining about Japan, which is sitting aside and waiting for its turn to resume its military role, as we discussed in 1975, in order to protect its transportation lines, since everything is imported. Now, this is the current situation, since Japan is enhancing its military power and its economy, which is now better known in the world and which should be discussed as well. What will happen to the world after these changes? Go ahead, Sadiq.

[Major General Sadiq Shaban]

Mr. President, if you'll allow me to go back to the issue of socialism before we discuss European integration. I will discuss socialism in Scandinavia, of course, being a former ambassador to Sweden. Socialism in Scandinavia was used to harness capitalism, and this is the secret behind its success. Capitalism can be pumped through the tax system in these countries under the umbrella of social services, and it is clear to us that it has been a complete success in these countries. And the system there is considered superior to socialism in the rest of Europe. However, socialism remains, for it is the only way to establish stability in the world.

The main reason behind the failure of communism is that it is characterized by rigid revolutionary exclusivity. The freedom of the individual is fully identified, and its results have been visible for a long time, for the collapse we have seen should have happened at the time of Khrushchev.

[Saddam Hussein]

If Khrushchev's era had witnessed such conditions, they would not have turned into a collapse. However, since it was delayed, it has led to an explosion. The revolution in Iran, if it had occurred earlier, would have been more balanced, but because it happened after the right time, it led to an explosion. Such an explosion can cause many things that are different from the usual policies.

[Major General Sadiq Shaban]

In fact, if we look at what is happening now in Iraq, especially in terms of the private sector and the encouragement of private industry, we see that it is a way to override capitalism with socialism. And I'm sure that it will be the case in many countries of Europe - even Eastern Europe - which will be the gray line. I do not believe that Eastern Europe will become part of Western Europe in the next merger, because it's radically different, and its issues need more time to resolve.

Let me go back to European integration and how it is seen from the Scandinavia point of view. Mr. al-Sahhaf spoke about the idea of Southern Europe. If we take the point of view of Scandinavians and the Swedish, who are the main engine for the Nordic countries, we see that the Scandinavian view of European integration is positive.

However, Sweden fears one thing, which is losing its impartiality. In other words, Sweden considers its impartiality an essential asset.

Despite these facts, two years ago, the ruling socialist party reconsidered all of the economic, financial, and tax laws that concern the future European integration. Sweden has two alternatives: one, the possibility that Europe accept Sweden as a member of the European market, or two, if it remains outside the European market, its economy will face significant damage. Accordingly, they have prepared laws so that in case Europe insists that only members have the right to benefit from group privileges, even Sweden, which considers the economy the basis of its relationship with other countries, will be obliged to join the European market. So in a way, it has given up on the concept of impartiality.

[Saddam Hussein]

Is this impartiality — Sweden's impartiality — based on problems between the European countries? Or is it based on international problems as a whole, including the relationship between the East and West?

[Major General Sadiq Shaban]

Sweden's impartiality is all about interests. It is an optional impartiality that Sweden has chosen for a long time, for around 170 years. It has enjoyed certain characteristics for all of this time, and it has held on to them, even through the European wars. I believe that it was only for its own interests at first, and then on the international level, especially in mediation issues and within the United Nations.

[Saddam Hussein]

So basically, Sweden's destiny is defined by the problems in Europe.

[Major General Sadiq Shaban]

Yes, Mr. President.

[Saddam Hussein]

When Europe was contradictory and antagonistic...

TRANSLATION ENDS HERE