GRS 500 CONFIDENTIAL

FM FCO 111830Z JUNE 81

TO IMMEDIATE BAGHDAD

TELEGRAM NUMBER 298 OF 11 JUNE 1981.
REPEATED TO (FOR INFO) IMMEDIATE UKMIS NEW YORK, WASHINGTON,
TEL AVIV, BEIRUT, DAMASCUS, AMMAN, JEDDAH, KUWAIT, ALGIERS, TUNIS
ABU DHABI, PRIORITY ADEN BAHRAIN CAIRO DOHA DUBAI JERUSALEM
KHARTOUM MUSCAT RABAT SNAAA TRIPOLI AND EC POSTS.

ISRAELI ATTACK ON IRAQ

- 1. THE AMBASSADORS OF THE UAE, IRAQ, JORDAN, LEBANON, ALGERIA AND KUWAIT CALLED ON THE LORD PRIVY SEAL ON 11 JUNE (NOT ON INSTRUCTIONS).
- 2. THEY HANDED OVER A STATEMENT BY THE ARAB AMBASSADORS IN LONDON (COPIES BY BAG) CONDEMNING THE ISRAELI ATTACK, JUSTIFYING IRAQ'S PEACEFUL NUCLEAR PROGRAMME AND CONDEMNING ISRAELI POLICIES IN LEBANON. IT CALLED FOR MEASURES, INCLUDING SANCTIONS, TO PREVENT REPETITION OF ISRAELI AGRESSION. IT ALSO CALLED ON BRITAIN TO USE HER INFLUENCE WITH THE UNITED STATES AND OTHER GOVERNMENTS TO SUSPEND ALL MILITARY AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL.
- 3. THE AMBASSADORS ALL SPOKE IN SIMILAR TERMS (ALTHOUGH TOUCHING LITTLE UPON LEBANON). THEY WELCOMED OUR CONDEMNATION OF THE ISRAELI ATTACK BUT STRESSED REPEATEDLY THE INADEQUACY OF SUCCESSIVE SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS MERELY CONDEMNING ISRAEL. THIS WAS NO LONGER ENOUGH AND EFFECTIVE ACTION WOULD HAVE TO BE TAKEN BOTH BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL AND BY THE US BILATERALLY. THE UAE AMBASSADOR

SPOKE OF PRESSURE ON THE STREETS FOR ACTION WHICH COULD AFFECT
THE STABILITY OF ARAB REGIMES IF NOTHING EFFECTIVE WERE DONE. AND
THE PEOPLE WOULD QUESTION WHY OIL SUPPLIES SHOULD CONTINUE TO GO
TO THE WEST IF THE WEST FAILED EFFECTIVELY TO SUPPORT THE ARABS.

4. THE LORD PRIVY SEAL SAID THAT BOTH THE FCO AND THE PRIME MINISTER IN PARLIAMENT HAD FORTHRIGHTLY CONDEMNED THE ATTACK. IT

/WAS

WAS UNJUSTIFIED AND UNLAWFUL AGRESSION. BUT IF THE ARABS WANTED A UNANIMOUS CONDEMNATION OF ISRAEL THEIR SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION WOULD HAVE TO BE CAREFULLY WORDED AND NOT INCLUDE SANCTIONS. THE US WOULD VETO ANY REQUEST FOR SANCTIONS AND OTHER COUNTRIES WOULD ALSO HAVE DIFFICULTY WITH IT. ASKED ABOUT THE UK ATTITUDE TO THE SECURITY COUNCIL DEBATE HE SAID THAT WE WOULD HAVE TO SEE WHAT SORT OF RESOLUTION WE WOULD BE ASKED TO SUPPORT. BUT OUR POSITION ON SANCTIONS GENERALLY WAS THAT WE WERE OPPOSED ON THE GROUNDS THAT, OTHER CONSIDERATIONS APART, THEY WERE UNLIKELY TO ACHIEVE THEIR OBJECTIVES.

- 5. THE LORD PRIVY SEAL URGED THE MERITS OF A UNANIMOUS RESOLUTION CONDEMNING ISRAEL. IF THE NEW US ADMINISTRATION, WHICH WAS PRO-ISRAELI, SUBSCRIBED TO THIS IT WOULD BE A SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENT. AND IT WOULD ENABLE THE ARABS TO BUILD ON THIS IN THEIR PRIVATE PRESSURE TO PERSUADE THE US TO REDUCE HER SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL (FAR BETTER TO PRESS THEM PRIVATELY THAN CONFRONT THEM PUBLICLY). IT WOULD ALSO SPLIT THE US ADMINISTRATION FROM ISRAEL TO BEGIN'S ELECTORAL DISADVANTAGE. BUT IF THE ARABS PRESSED FOR SANCTIONS WHICH WOULD BE VETOED THEY WOULD LOSE ALL THIS AND BEGIN WOULD GAIN.
- AS FOR PRESSURE BY OURSELVES ON THE AMERICANS, THE US ADMINISTRATION KNEW OUR VIEWS. BUT WHEN WE SPOKE PRIVATELY TO THE AMERICANS OUR HAND WOULD BE IMMEASURABLY STRENGTHENED BY A UNANIMOUS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION AND BY THE ARABS PUTTING THEIR OWN CASE FOR EFFECTIVE PRESSURE ON ISRAEL DIRECT TO THE US ADMINISTRATION.

CARRINGTON

MIDDLE EAST STANDARD

NENAD MAED
MED SO ES & SD
NAD ERD
UND ESID
EESD CONS DEPT
ECD CONS EM UNIT
WED CABINET OFFICE
RID

ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION
ARAB/ISRAEL DISPUTE