

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

PLEADINGS, ORAL ARGUMENTS, DOCUMENTS

CASE CONCERNING UNITED STATES
DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR STAFF
IN TEHRAN

(UNITED STATES OF AMERICA v. IRAN)



COUR INTERNATIONALE DE JUSTICE

MÉMOIRES, PLAIDOIRIES ET DOCUMENTS

AFFAIRE RELATIVE AU PERSONNEL
DIPLOMATIQUE ET CONSULAIRE
DES ÉTATS-UNIS À TÉHÉРАН

(ÉTATS-UNIS D'AMÉRIQUE c. IRAN)



**DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE COURT
AFTER THE FILING OF THE REQUEST FOR
THE INDICATION OF PROVISIONAL
MEASURES**

**DOCUMENTS PRÉSENTÉS À LA COUR
APRÈS LE DÉPÔT
DE LA DEMANDE EN INDICATION
DE MESURES CONSERVATOIRES**



SELECTED DOCUMENT 1¹DECLARATION OF DAVID D. NEWSOM, UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE, OF
6 DECEMBER 1979, WITH APPENDICES

I, David D. Newsom, certify and declare the following:

1. I am Under Secretary for Political Affairs of the United States Department of State. I have been vested by the Secretary of State with overall responsibility within the Department for matters relating to the crisis in Iran, and I am thoroughly familiar with the actions taken by the United States in the course of that crisis.

2. I understand that the President of the International Court of Justice has asked the Agent of the United States to answer certain specific questions and supply copies of specified documents. In the succeeding paragraphs of this statement I set forth each of the specific inquiries and the response of the United States thereto.

3. The President of the Court has asked "*What, if any, exchanges have taken place between the Governments of the United States and Iran regarding recourse to arbitration, conciliation or any other pacific means for the settlement of the present differences?*" The answer is as follows:

On 7 November 1979, the Secretary of State instructed Ramsey Clark, Esquire, former Attorney-General of the United States, to travel to Iran to deliver a message from the President of the United States to the Ayatollah Khomeini and to seek the immediate release of the hostages. The Iranian Government initially agreed to receive Mr. Clark in Tehran. Shortly after Mr. Clark landed in Istanbul, where he was to change planes, Iranian authorities reversed themselves and stated that Mr. Clark should not come to Iran. Tehran radio that same day broadcast a message from Ayatollah Khomeini stating that it was "not possible under any circumstances for the special representatives to meet with him", that "the members of the Islamic Revolutionary Council under no circumstances should meet with them", that "none of the responsible officials has the right to meet with them", and that, should the United States meet specified Iranian demands, "the way to talks would be opened". Since that time, Iranian authorities indicated that they would have no direct contact with representatives of the United States Government concerning the holding of the hostages.

The United States Government has persisted in its efforts to open communications with the Government of Iran and has taken the following steps: The United States has communicated positions on various matters relating to the crisis to the Iranian Chargé d'Affaires in Washington. We have asked him for Iran's comments. At other times, we have put specific questions to the Chargé d'Affaires. He has not been able to respond to questions relating to the release of the hostages.

The United States Government has also attempted to establish communications with the Iranian representative at the United Nations. He and the staff of the Iranian Mission have refused to have contact with our representatives. While there had been some hope that Iran would follow through on its pledge to send a representative from Tehran to participate in Security Council meetings, and thus provide an opportunity for dialogue, Iran did not do so.

¹ See p. 499, *infra*.

The American Chargé d'Affaires, L. Bruce Laing, is held in protective custody in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Tehran. He has regular contact with the Ministry's Chief of Protocol but has been denied access to any senior officers of the Ministry and has not been able to engage in any conversations of substance regarding the release of the hostages.

In addition to these efforts at direct communication, there have been a number of efforts made by leaders of other governments and by the Secretary-General of the United Nations to intercede with the authorities in Iran to secure the release of the hostages and the resolution of the crisis. In his statement to the Security Council on 27 November Secretary-General Waldheim recalled to the members that he had, within the three preceding weeks, been continuously involved in efforts to find means of resolving the problem, as had the President of the Security Council and many governments. He reported to the Council that "in the prevailing circumstances it became clear to me that the efforts I have mentioned, which were conducted with good faith and determination, could not for the time being overcome the very difficult obstacles with which we were faced. Although, at times in the past few days agreement seemed close, in the end the gap appeared too wide to be bridged at this stage." It was for this reason that the Secretary-General exercised his prerogative to call for the urgent convening of the Security Council. The United States supported his initiative and the resulting Security Council resolution calling for the immediate release of the hostages and the pacific settlement of the other remaining issues between the United States and Iran.

It is clear from the foregoing that the Government of Iran has flatly refused to engage in discussions, still less negotiations with the Government of the United States. We continue to strive to resolve this conflict through diplomacy, recourse to the machinery of the United Nations system, and all pacific means available to us. The policies and attitudes of the Iranian authorities, as well as the circumstances and nature of the crisis have precluded recourse to formal measures of arbitration or conciliation.

Documents relating to the foregoing, in so far as there are any, are contained in Appendix A. Apart from these, there are at present no public documents in point.

4. The President of the Court has asked: "*Whether the Government of either the United States or Iran has formally broken off diplomatic relations between the two Governments since the matters which are the subject of their present differences arose?*" The answer is that neither Government has yet broken off diplomatic relations *de jure*, although the seizure of the American Embassy in Tehran, the endorsement of that seizure by the Government of Iran, and its refusal to discuss the crisis with the Government of the United States, have brought about a severe impairment of our ability to conduct relations between the two Governments through diplomatic channels. There are no documents relating to the foregoing.

5. The President of the Court has requested copies of any statements made by the United States representatives in the Security Council in regard to the matters alleged in the United States Application of 29 November 1979. Copies of the statements are appended hereto as Appendix A.

6. The President of the Court has requested copies of any official statements of the President of the United States, the Secretary of State or of other United States authorities relating to the matters alleged in the United States Application of 29 November 1979. Copies of all of the official statements by senior United States officials are appended hereto as Appendix B. In order to avoid burdening the Court with a large volume of documents of lesser importance, Appendix B does not include copies of every informal statement made by every United States official (e.g., at press briefings). The volume of such documents, were they to be collected completely, would be very large.

7. The President of the Court has requested copies of any statement by Iranian

authorities evidencing the matters alleged in the United States Application of 29 November 1979. As indicated in paragraph 3, above, the United States Government has received no such communication directly from Iranian authorities. On the other hand, in the period since 4 November 1979, when the United States Embassy in Tehran was seized, the Iranian and world press have carried many reports of statements by the Ayatollah Khomeini, persons identified as members of the Revolutionary Council, and persons identified as holding specific senior governmental positions. In addition, the governmentally controlled Iranian broadcast media have carried statements issued in the name of the group holding the embassy, described as "followers of the Imam", and extensive commentary. During this period, it has been difficult for the Government of the United States to evaluate the accuracy, authority and status of the various reported statements. Further, there has been a very large volume of such reported statements. Appendix C contains a collection of some of the statements involved, but I cannot represent to the Court that we have been informed of all such statements, or that this collection is complete.

8. The President of the Court has requested details of the number of persons included respectively in the diplomatic, administrative, technical, consular and service staff who are the subject of the United States application and request of 29 November 1979. At least 51 persons are in these categories. To the best of my knowledge, at least 28 of the United States nationals currently held hostage in the embassy are diplomatic staff and at least 20 are members of the administrative and technical staff¹. The 3 United States embassy officials in custody at the Iranian Foreign Ministry are members of the diplomatic staff. I wish to draw the Court's attention to the fact that, in addition, there are currently hostage in the Embassy in Tehran, to the best of my knowledge, 2 United States nationals who, although they do not qualify as "diplomatic, administrative, technical, consular or service staff", are nonetheless, like all other United States nationals in Iran, nationals of one of the High Contracting Parties within the meaning of Article II of the Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations and Consular Rights between the United States and Iran. All United States nationals in Iran are equally entitled to protection, including in the present circumstances, the right to depart.

David D. NEWSOM.

Washington, D.C.
6 December 1979.

¹ See pp. 503-504, *infra*.

Appendix A

LETTER DATED 9 NOVEMBER 1979 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On 4 November 1979, the American Embassy in Tehran was occupied and the American diplomatic personnel on its premises were taken and held by a group of Iranians. All efforts to secure their release, including an offer of discussions with emissaries, have so far been unavailing.

This action and the support it has received strike at the fundamental norms by which States maintain communication and violate the very basis for the maintenance of international peace and security and of comity between States. We consequently request that the Security Council urgently consider what might be done to secure the release of the diplomatic personnel being held and to restore the sanctity of diplomatic personnel and establishments.

(Signed) Donald F. McHENRY.

* * *

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR DONALD F. McHENRY, UNITED STATES PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL, ON THE SITUATION IN IRAN, 1 DECEMBER 1979.

Mr. President:

Twenty-seven days ago, 63 Americans as well as personnel of other nationalities were seized when an armed, disciplined group of demonstrators invaded the United States Embassy in Tehran. Eighteen of those captured have been released. At least 50 Americans remain captive.

As with diplomats everywhere, the individuals who were taken hostage are entitled to the protection of the Government of Iran by the most solemn commitment nations can give—the sovereign pledge of governments by treaty and international obligation.

Governments retain the right to require that foreign diplomatic personnel leave their soil. But every standard of international behaviour, where established by practice, by ethics, by treaty or by common humanity supports the principle that the personnel of a diplomatic mission and diplomatic property are inviolate. Even in the darkest moments of relationships between countries, the security and well-being of diplomatic personnel have been respected.

Iran asks that its grievances be heard and acted upon. Yet Iran, and the authorities who speak for it, are violating the most basic obligation of nations. They hold hostage the very people who facilitate those communications that can resolve differences and lead to understanding and agreement among nations.

None of us, whatever our differences on other issues, can ignore the implications for all of us of this event.

Nor can the world ignore that these diplomatic representatives are being held under degrading conditions. They are threatened, kept bound, isolated, not allowed to speak, denied mail. Even their whereabouts are uncertain. All of us at this table are also diplomatic representatives of our countries, charged with the same duties and protected by the same laws and rules of conduct as those now held captive in Tehran. It is for all of us to speak up to demand their release and

to insist upon basic conditions of humanity for their care pending that release, including daily visitation by impartial observers.

Many Members of the United Nations, including some members of this Council, have had Ambassadors murdered, diplomatic personnel injured, embassy facilities destroyed. On each occasion the delicate framework of our international community has been harmed, but efforts were made to repair the wounds. The situation in Tehran has a feature unlike other assaults on the diplomatic ties that bind our world. In Iran, the Government itself defends the violence which holds diplomats hostage. Such a position is intolerable.

The United States insists that its diplomatic personnel be released and its diplomatic premises restored. These are not negotiable matters. The United States will hold the authorities in Iran fully responsible for the safety of the Americans held captive.

I speak today for hostages who are endangered by the frenzy and uncertainty of events; by the inhumane conditions under which they are held; and by the threat of the authorities in Iran to compound unjust acts through trials.

Around the world, nations of east and west, north and south, in individual and collective statements, have expressed their opposition to this violation of international law and called for the immediate release of the hostages. We express our appreciation for this overwhelming expression of international concern and support in behalf of principles that lie at the heart of civilized international behaviour.

In this spirit, the President of the Security Council, speaking for the members of this body, has twice urgently appealed for the release of the hostages.

The President of the General Assembly has twice spoken eloquently in support of this plea.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations has worked unceasingly to resolve this crisis.

There has not been a satisfactory response and the hostages are still not free.

We gather here to determine what more can be done.

None of us is deaf to the passionate voices that speak of injustice, that cry out against past wrongs and that ask for understanding. There is not a single grievance alleged or spoken in this situation that could not be heard in an appropriate forum.

In addition, as we have said from the beginning, the United States remains ready, upon the release of the hostages, to discuss with the Iranian authorities the differences which exist between us and to seek their resolution.

But no country can call for justice while at the same time denying it to the defenceless. No country can breach the most fundamental rules of the community of nations and at the same time expect that community to be helpful in the problems which it perceives for itself.

In the simplest terms, no country can break and ignore the law while seeking its benefits.

What is it that the world can agree upon if not the protection and respect for those whom we appoint to represent our sovereignty and resolve our differences?

How tragic for Iran, how tragic for the world that threats to peace are being driven to a new crescendo. The most powerful voices in Iran are encouraging violence in neighbouring countries and condoning bloodshed rather than condemning it. In addition, totally unfounded charges which can only inflame the situation are being made against the United States with respect to the current crisis.

The United States in all the years of its history has had as a fundamental principle the freedom of all people to worship as they choose. Out of this history and long association, we honour and respect the leaders and the nation of Islam.

The principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations is both a tenet of the United Nations and of the foreign policy of the United States, and

that includes, of course, respect for the territorial integrity, political independence and sovereignty of Iran. We respect the right of the people of Iran to determine their own future through institutions of their own choosing. All of us must accept their decisions.

The President of the United States, speaking for a unified and determined nation, has made it clear that we are seeking a peaceful resolution to this conflict so that the wounds of the past can be healed. In this spirit, the United States has turned to the Security Council and the Secretary-General in the search for a peaceful solution. In this spirit, the United States has begun proceedings in the International Court of Justice.

There is in the United States a unity of purpose, a disciplined sensitivity to the needs of peace, a determination to search out all peaceful means to bring this dispute to a just conclusion, and also a determination to do what must be done to protect our fellow citizens and the rule of law. That unity of purpose is shared by all Americans. But make no mistake. Beneath that discipline is a seething anger which Americans properly feel as they witness on daily television new threats and outrages against their fellow citizens.

The hostages must be freed.

* * *

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR DONALD F. MCHENRY, UNITED STATES
PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, IN THE SECURITY
COUNCIL ON THE SITUATION IN IRAN, 4 DECEMBER 1979

Mr. President,

The 15 members of the Security Council in their action today have given unanimous expression once more to their urgent call on the Government of Iran for the immediate and unconditional release of the hostages of our Embassy being held in Tehran. They have called on the Government of Iran to provide the hostages protection and to allow them to leave the country. It is clear from this vote and from the debate of the last four days, in which representatives from all parts of the world have participated, that the family of nations speaks with one voice in calling for the immediate release of the hostages. We are deeply appreciative.

We hope that this call of the Security Council will be heeded and carried out by the Government of Iran in a matter of hours. Whatever the time required, we urge the Secretary-General, in the exercise of his good offices, to provide all humanitarian support possible to those being detained against their will. We remain deeply concerned for their safety, their well being and their health on this, their thirtieth day of suffering and isolation.

The United States wishes to place on the record that the adoption of this resolution by the Security Council clearly is not intended to displace peaceful efforts in other organs of the United Nations. Neither the United States nor any other Member intends that the adoption of this resolution should have any prejudicial impact whatever on the request of the United States for the indication of provisional measures of protection by the International Court of Justice.

With the hostages released, the resolution calls on the Governments of Iran and the United States to take urgent steps to resolve peacefully the remaining issues between them in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations. The United States is fully prepared to co-operate with this call.

Many speakers in this debate have also referred to the grievances of the people of Iran—I myself did so when I remarked that: "None of us is deaf to the passionate voices that speak of injustice, that cry out against past wrongs and

that ask for understanding. There is not a single grievance alleged or spoken in this situation that could not be heard in an appropriate forum." The Security Council has now also noted those grievances in its acknowledgement of the Iranian letter of 13 November 1979.

Neither the United States nor the other members of the community of nations has a desire to isolate Iran. We are all Members of the United Nations. Let us then, all of us, be true to the purposes and principles of the Charter which we have pledged ourselves to honour.

Appendix B

THE WHITE HOUSE, STATEMENT ON IRAN, 6 NOVEMBER 1979

The President met with senior foreign policy advisers this morning to discuss the situation in Iran.

The US has been given assurances by the authorities in Iran that the safety and well-being of Americans will be protected.

The US expects that these assurances will be honoured.

In the meantime, we are doing everything possible to secure the release of our embassy staff. We do not consider public comment on these efforts to be appropriate or helpful while they are in progress.

* * *

STATEMENT AT SPECIAL BRIEFING—WEDNESDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 1979—5.02 P.M. ON THE RECORD UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTED

Mr. Carter: As I said earlier today, Iranian authorities agreed to receive our emissaries. However, we were informed this afternoon by the authorities in Iran that Mr. Clark and Mr. Miller should not proceed to Tehran at this time. They will remain in Istanbul pending clarification of the position of the Government of Iran. It is our hope that they will be able to proceed with their mission at the earliest opportunity.

* * *

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE CYRUS R. VANCE—THURSDAY, 7 NOVEMBER 1979, 3.29 P.M.

Secretary *Vance:* Good afternoon, I'm sorry to have kept you waiting.

Since the first word that our embassy had been taken over in Tehran, the President aided by his senior advisers, has been directing the efforts of our Government to secure the safe release of our people. We have been assured repeatedly that those being held have not been physically harmed. We expect those assurances to be observed.

The situation is extremely difficult and delicate. I am sure that all Americans understand the efforts we are pursuing cannot take place in the glare of publicity. Let me assure you, however, that we are pursuing every avenue open to us to secure the safe and early release of our people. Our actions will continue to be guided by this overriding objective.

Let me say in particular to the families of those being held in Tehran that we understand fully your anguish and we will continue to work around the clock to achieve their release.

We have announced our readiness to have personal representatives of the President go to Iran to discuss with the Iranian authorities the release of our embassy people. Many governments and others have been helping. We appreciate those efforts.

We need the continued support of the American people as we pursue these efforts. It is a time not for rhetoric but for quiet, careful and firm diplomacy.

In this situation, the United States has no higher obligation than to do all that it can to protect the lives of American citizens. We will honour that obligation.

Thank you.

* * *

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE CYRUS R. VANCE, SECRETARY OF STATE,
CONCERNING THE SITUATION IN IRAN, 8 NOVEMBER 1979

Since the first word that our Embassy had been taken over in Tehran, the President, aided by his senior advisers, has been directing the efforts of our Government to secure the safe release of our people.

We have been assured repeatedly that those being held have not been physically harmed. We expect those assurances to be observed.

The situation is extremely difficult and delicate. I am sure that all Americans understand that the efforts we are pursuing cannot take place in the glare of publicity. Let me assure you, however, that we are pursuing every avenue open to us to secure their safe and early release. Our actions will continue to be guided by that overriding objective.

Let me say, in particular, to the families of those being held in Tehran that we understand fully your anguish and we will continue to work around the clock to achieve their release.

We have announced our readiness to have the personal representatives of the President go to Iran to discuss with the Iranian authorities the release of our embassy people.

Many governments and others have been helping. We appreciate those efforts.

We need the continued support of the American people as we pursue these efforts. It is a time, not for rhetoric, but for quiet, careful, and firm diplomacy.

In this situation, the United States has no higher obligation than to do all that it can to protect the lives of the American citizens. We will honour that obligation.

* * *

THE WHITE HOUSE, 9 NOVEMBER 1979

The seizure of more than 60 Americans in our embassy in Tehran has provoked strong feelings here at home. There is outrage. There is frustration. And there is deep anger.

There is also pride in the courage of those who are in danger and sympathy for them and for their families. But the most important concern for all Americans at this moment is safety of our fellow citizens held in Tehran.

The President shares these feelings. He is pursuing every possible avenue in a situation that is extremely volatile and difficult. His efforts involve many countries and individuals. Many of these efforts must of necessity be conducted without publicity, and all require the calmest possible atmosphere.

The President knows that no matter how deeply we may feel, none of us would want to do anything that would worsen the danger in which our fellow Americans have been placed.

He calls on all Americans, public officials and private citizens alike, to exercise restraint, and to keep the safety of their countrymen uppermost in their minds and hearts. Members of the families of the American hostages with whom the President met this morning have asked to join with him in this appeal. The President expects every American to refrain from any action that might increase the danger to the American hostages in Tehran.

* * *

THE WHITE HOUSE, 10 NOVEMBER 1979

The President has directed the Attorney-General to identify any Iranian students in the United States who are not in compliance with the terms of their entry visas, and to take the necessary steps to commence deportation proceedings against those who have violated applicable immigration laws and regulations.

As an initial measure, the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice will issue a notice requiring all Iranian students to report their present location and status immediately to the nearest INS office, and will take additional steps to locate and identify such students to determine legal status. For students found to be in illegal status, deportation proceedings will be conducted in accordance with constitutional due process requirements.

* * *

THE WHITE HOUSE, ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT,
THE BRIEFING ROOM, 12 NOVEMBER 1979

The *President*: Thank you very much. We continue to face a grave situation in Iran, where our embassy has been seized, and more than 60 American citizens continue to be held as hostages in an attempt to force unacceptable demands on our country. We are using every available channel to protect the safety of the hostages, and to secure their release.

Along with the families of the hostages, I have welcomed and I appreciate the restraint that has been shown by Americans during this crisis. We must continue to exhibit such constraint, despite the intensity of our emotions. The lives of our people in Iran are at stake.

I must emphasize the gravity of the situation. It is vital to the United States and to every other nation that the lives of diplomatic personnel and other citizens abroad be protected, and that we refuse to permit the use of terrorism and the seizure and the holding of hostages to impose political demands.

No one should underestimate the resolve of the American Government and the American people in this matter. It is necessary to eliminate any suggestion that economic pressures can weaken our stand on basic issues of principle. Our position must be clear. I am ordering that we discontinue purchasing of any oil from Iran for delivery to this country.

These events obviously demonstrate the extreme importance of reducing oil consumption here in the United States. I urge every American citizen and every American business to redouble efforts to curtail the use of petroleum products. This action will pose a real challenge to our country. It will be a test of our strength and of our determination.

I have directed Secretary Duncan to work with the Congress and with other federal, state and local officials, and with leaders of industry to develop additional measures to conserve oil and to cope with this new situation. We will strive to insure equitable and fair distribution of petroleum products and to insure a minimum of disruption of our nation's economy.

These American measures must be part of an effective international effort and we will consult with our allies and with other oil-consuming nations about further actions to reduce oil consumption and oil imports.

America does face a difficult task and a test. Our response will measure our character and our courage. I know that we Americans shall not fail.

Thank you very much.

* * *

THE WHITE HOUSE, 12 NOVEMBER 1979

IMPORTS OF PETROLEUM AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A PROCLAMATION

The Secretary of the Treasury in a memorandum dated 12 November 1979, and the Secretary of Energy in consultation with the Secretaries of State and

Defense, have informed me that recent developments in Iran have exacerbated the threat to the national security posed by imports of petroleum and petroleum products. Those developments underscore the threat to our national security which results from our reliance on Iran as a source of crude oil. The Secretaries have recommended that I take steps immediately to eliminate the dependence of the United States on Iran as a source of crude oil.

I agree with these recommendations and that the changes proposed are consistent with the purposes of Proclamation 3279, as amended.

Now, therefore, I, Jimmy Carter, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by the Constitution and the laws of the United States, including Section 232 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, as amended (19 USC 1862) do hereby proclaim that:

Section 1. Section 1 of Proclamation 3279, as amended, is further amended by the addition of a new paragraph (e) to read as follows:

Sec. 1 (e). Notwithstanding any other provision of this Proclamation, no crude oil produced in Iran (except crude oil loaded aboard maritime vessels prior to 13 November 1979) or unfinished oil or finished products refined in possessions or free trade zones of the United States from such crude oil, may be entered into the customs territory of the United States.

Section 2. Section 11 of Proclamation No. 3279, as amended, is further amended in paragraph (1) to read as follows:

(1) The term "imports", when applied to crude oil other than that produced in Iran, includes both entry for consumption and withdrawal from warehouse for consumption, but excludes unfinished oil and finished products processed in the United States territories and foreign trade zones from crude oil produced in the United States.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twelfth day of November, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and seventy-nine and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and fourth.

Jimmy CARTER.

* * *

THE WHITE HOUSE, 14 NOVEMBER 1979

The President has today acted to block all official Iranian assets in the United States, including deposits in United States banks and their foreign branches and subsidiaries. This order is in response to reports that the Government of Iran is about to withdraw its funds. The purpose of this order is to insure that claims on Iran by the United States and its citizens are provided for in an orderly manner.

The order does not affect accounts of persons other than the Government of Iran, the Central Bank of Iran and other controlled entities. The precise amounts involved cannot be ascertained at this time, but there is no reason for disturbance in the foreign exchange or other markets.

The President is taking this action pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, which grants the President authority "to deal with any unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States".

* * *

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, WASHINGTON, 14 NOVEMBER 1979

The President today has issued an order blocking all official Iranian assets in the United States, including deposits in United States banks, their foreign

branches, and subsidiaries in response to reported instructions that the Government of Iran is about to withdraw its funds. The purpose of this order is to insure that claims of the United States and its citizens in Iran are settled in an orderly manner. The order does not affect accounts of persons other than the Government of Iran, the Central Bank of Iran, and other controlled entities. The precise amounts involved cannot be ascertained at this time, but there is no reason for disturbance in the foreign exchange or other markets. The President is taking this action pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act which grants the President authority "to deal with any unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States".

IRAN AND ENERGY

Following is an excerpt relating to foreign policy from President Carter's address before the AFL-CIO in Washington, DC, on 15 November 1979.

For a brief time this afternoon I want to speak with you and all Americans about some fundamental principles upon which our nation was founded and which we must never forget. To some, these ideals may seem at times to be old fashioned or outmoded. But we've been clearly reminded in recent days that these principles mean just as much to us now as they have ever meant during any time of critical decision in the history of our nation.

These fundamentals have old names to which we must continually give new meaning—names like strength, courage, patriotism, independence, the love of freedom, human rights, justice, concern for the common good.

This is the 12th day that more than 100 innocent human beings, some 60 of whom are members of the US diplomatic mission, have been held hostage in our embassy in Iran. For a rare time in human history, a host government has condoned and even encouraged this kind of illegal action against the sovereign territory and official diplomatic relations of another nation. This is an act of terrorism—totally outside the bounds of international law and diplomatic tradition.

In this time of trial, our deep concern is for the lives of these brave hostages—our nation's loyal citizens and faithful representatives. Every American feels anger and outrage at what is happening to them—just as every American feels concern for their safety and pride in their great courage. This crisis calls for firmness and it calls for restraint. And I'm proud that this situation has brought forth calm leadership by officials and private citizens throughout this country.

Firmness does require patience and it requires perseverance. Firmness also means measured action—deliberate actions that clarify the real issues, reduce the likelihood of violence, protect our interests and insure justice.

The United States has done nothing and will do nothing that could be used to justify violent or imprudent action by anyone. While we are pursuing all avenues of diplomatic resolution, we're also acting unilaterally as appropriate—with restraint, yes, but without hesitation.

First, in order to discourage violence and possible bloodshed here, which when televised and transmitted back to Iran might threaten the safety of the hostages, I've discouraged the issuing of permits for demonstrations on federal properties here in Washington, consistent with our laws and pursuant to my own powers and responsibilities. I have also encouraged local and state officials to take similar legal action.

Second, I've directed our immigration authorities to review the visas of some 50,000 Iranian students who are guests here in our country. Our nation is fully committed to the protection of legal rights, and the enhancement of civil justice. All provisions of the US Constitution will be honoured. All foreign nationals

who are here lawfully may continue here with their work or their studies. But those who are here illegally will be processed promptly and lawfully for deportation back to their own country.

Third, I want to remove any question that our principles might be compromised by our supposed need for Iranian oil. Early this week, therefore, I ordered an immediate halt to any purchases or shipments of Iranian oil to the United States of America.

I'm determined to make clear that we will never allow any foreign country to dictate any American policy.

Fourth, in order to protect our economic interests and to insure that claims on Iran by the United States or by US citizens are settled in an orderly manner, we've legally frozen official Iranian property and financial assets. The order does not affect any accounts other than those of the Government of Iran, the Central Bank of Iran, or other government-controlled entities.

And yesterday I further instructed Secretary of State Vance and Ambassador [to the United Nations] McHenry to oppose any discussion of Iran's problems in the UN Security Council as long as American hostages are being held. Only after the hostages are released will we be willing to address Iran's concerns and then under the provisions of international law and under the charter of the United Nations. The members of the United Nations Security Council, I am pleased to announce to you, have agreed unanimously with our own proposal.

It's important for all of us to remember that we will not compromise our fundamental principles of justice no matter how grave the provocation nor how righteous our indignation. At the same time, we will continue to use our influence around the world to obtain the same kinds of human rights for people everywhere.

In this instance, we are upholding an important principle on behalf of the entire world community. It's a clear tenet of international law and diplomatic tradition that the host government is fully responsible for the safety and well-being of the property and the legal representatives of another country. Less than a year ago—and this is a fact not generally known or recognized—less than a year ago, 70,000 American citizens were in Iran. As you know, thousands of people were killed during the upheavals there but almost miraculously, and because of the good work of Cyrus Vance and others, our people were brought home safely, and I thank God for it. Despite the turmoil, each succeeding Iranian Government—and they were being changed, as you know, quite rapidly—protected the citizens of other countries.

Foreign visitors are often vulnerable to abuse. An embassy is not a fortress. There are no embassies anywhere in the world that can long withstand the attack of a mob, if the mob has the support of the host government itself. We had received repeated assurances of protection from the highest officials in the Iranian Government, even a day or two before the mob was incited to attack and before that protection was withdrawn at the last minute. The principle of inviolability of embassies is understood and accepted by nations everywhere, and it's particularly important to smaller nations which have no recourse to economic or military power. This is why the United Nations Security Council has also unanimously supported our demand for the release of the American hostages.

In accordance with this principle as recognized and observed by all civilized countries, the Iranian Government and its leaders are fully responsible for the safety and well-being of our representatives in Iran, in Tehran, and they will be held accountable for that responsibility. It is unthinkable that any responsible government in today's modern world could regard the seizure and the holding of the diplomatic officials of another nation as a realistic means to advance any cause whatsoever. Terrorism is not an acceptable means to resolve disputes between individuals or between nations.

No act has so galvanized the American public toward unity in the last decade as has the holding of our people as hostages in Tehran. We stand today as one people. We are dedicated to the principles and the honour of our nation. We've taken no action which would justify concern among the people or among the Government of Iran. We have done nothing for which any American need apologize.

The actions of Iranian leaders and the radicals who invaded our embassy were completely unjustified. They and all others must know that the United States of America will not yield to international terrorism or to blackmail.

These difficult days have reminded us of basic facts and principles which are fundamental to the existence of us as a people. We will honour all Constitutional protections and international law and custom, and we will not let our freedom and our security be jeopardized.

US DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

The developments in Iran have made it starkly clear to all of us that our excessive dependence on foreign oil is a direct, physical threat to our freedom and security as Americans.

That is why we must all join together in the battle for an energy-secure America. This struggle demands the deliberate and the conscientious participation of every single citizen. Unfortunately, our dependence on foreign oil has been growing for the last five or six years, especially, when it should have been diminishing. As a nation we have become dependent on the undependable and addicted to the unaffordable. At Camp David this summer, one man summed up the significance of our energy problems better than any other person. It was Lane Kirkland. He said to me, "Mr. President, the issue is freedom".

That is exactly the issue today. That is why I have been calling on the Congress and encouraging the American people for the last two-and-a-half years to recognize the danger of excessive dependence on foreign oil. That is why I have ordered phased decontrol of oil prices to make conservation pay and to stimulate domestic energy sources.

This is an extremely important, vital issue. Do not be misled by political demagoguery. I and every other public official in this country have an obligation to speak the truth and to deal responsibly with the hard facts, and they are hard facts. We cannot close down all nuclear power plants, burn less coal, refuse to build oil refineries, refuse to explore for new oil sources, oppose the production of synthetic fuels, and at the same time encourage the waste of energy by artificially holding down its price in order to encourage more consumption. This is a ridiculous combination of proposals which could only be put forward in an election campaign. America knows better.

I am very pleased that our national energy programme is now moving steadily through the Congress, after enormous difficulty there and sharp debate. Now more than ever before it is essential that we have an energy security corporation and a windfall profits tax in order to take care of the poor, encourage production, build a better transportation system. Armed with these new programmes, our technology, our creativity, our abundance, our vision, and our firm will, America can finally control its own resources and we can continue to control our own destiny.

Our love of freedom will not be auctioned off for foreign oil. Hundreds of thousands of our forebears gave their very lives for our freedom. Our freedom is not for sale—now or ever in the future.

Every important victory that this nation has ever won—with Americans struggling together—has made us stronger as a nation. So will it be with the energy problem. There is a clear choice for Americans to make. We can either keep pouring out billions and billions and billions of dollars to foreign countries

to import oil—which also buys us inflation, unemployment, and national dependency and insecurity—or we can take some of that money and invest it in America to hire American workers, to unleash American ingenuity, to develop American resources, to promote American energy that Americans own and control. That is the way to approach the energy problem and that is what we must do together.

There are millions and millions of people who can help directly with this challenge and there are hundreds of thousands of jobs involved. Next year we anticipate that we will send overseas \$70 billion to pay for foreign oil. Just think of how many fine things we could do in America with that much money.

So in the last few days we have been reminded once again of our essential need of energy security so that we can continue to protect the basic principles of our country, and together that is what we must achieve, both for ourselves and even more importantly, for our children and grandchildren. America must always be militarily strong and economically strong, and that America will always be.

US COMPASSION AND GENEROSITY

One final comment I would like to make. America must also maintain its moral and its ethical strength. We are not a selfish people. History has recorded many times America's great generosity, as it does today in Thailand and Kampuchea, formerly known as Cambodia. Even as we face problems of great economic concern in our own country, we are sparing no effort to help those who are suffering and starving in every way we can.

Compassion enhances American strength. It is one of our deepest values, one to which we will always cling and remain true. Concern for human life and justice is as vital as military power to our special place in the family of nations. Human rights is a compelling idea of our lifetime. Our hearts and our aid will continue to go to those who are suffering, who are starving, or who are deprived of freedom. In this time of tension and turmoil I am proud that our commitment to American strength and to American principles is unshakable.

November 1979.

Bureau of Public Affairs,
Office of Public Communication,
Editorial Division.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 17 NOVEMBER 1979

We welcome this announcement that some of the Americans held in the Embassy in Tehran will be released. We are thankful the ordeal may be over for them and that they may be soon reunited with their families.

We strongly urge that the authorities in Iran now move to secure the safe release of all those still being held. Their ordeal is not over. The United States Government will continue to work in every channel open to it to achieve that end.

* * *

THE WHITE HOUSE, STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, 17 NOVEMBER 1979

As we approach our traditional day of national Thanksgiving, the hearts of all Americans are heavy with concern for the safety of those held hostage in Iran.

We join with people of all faiths throughout the world who adhere to fundamental principles of human rights and international law. We are united with them in seeking an end to acts of terrorism against innocent people.

On Thanksgiving Day and during the holiday weekend, I ask all Americans to make a special prayer at churches and synagogues and places of public meeting.

Let us seek God's guidance in our search for peace and human brotherhood, and pray for the safe return of those whose lives are threatened. May we come with gratitude for our abundant blessings, and humility before the heavy burden of world responsibility that our blessings and power have brought.

* * *

THE WHITE HOUSE, 19 NOVEMBER 1979

Three of our hostages in Tehran have been released and have left Iran. After a brief period of rest and care they will be reunited with their families here in the United States.

The remaining hostages must also be released. Their detention is without justification. The Government of Iran is responsible for achieving their immediate and safe release and the United States has the right to expect that Iran will do so.

The spectre has been raised of other American diplomatic hostages being placed on trial. Such a step would be a further flagrant violation of elementary human rights, religious precepts and international law and practice.

Worldwide outrage at the detention of these hostages would be greatly heightened by any attempt to put these diplomatic personnel on trial.

* * *

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT PRESS CONFERENCE IN BLOOMINGTON, MINNESOTA, AT MINNESOTA FARMERS' UNION CONVENTION: 19 NOVEMBER 1979

"As you all know, the President and I and the senior foreign policy advisers of our Government have been working literally around the clock to secure the release of our people being held hostage tonight in Iran—some 62 people less a few that have been released.

We're especially proud that the chargé d'affaires, the leading official there is a Minnesotan—Bruce Laingen—who is discharging his responsibilities with courage and with great ability.

The support and understanding that Americans have given to our efforts have been truly magnificent. Our country has stood together in these last days almost like a family—united in our concern for fellow Americans in danger and united in our determination to stand firm. And we've been joined by scores of other nations and millions of other people throughout the world.

Thankfully, the first hostages released will soon be reunited with their families. We are thankful that some are free. But all of us recognize that we cannot rest until every one of the hostages has returned home—safe and unharmed. Our efforts to secure their release must be continued and intensified.

We hold the Iranian Government fully responsible for the safety and well-being of the remaining hostages. We and the rest of the world have every right to expect the Iranian Government to honour its clear obligations under international law to secure the release—and safe return—of all hostages. The last hostage is as important as the first hostage.

The Iranian people must understand the firmness and resolve of our people and our nation, and that we stand as one.

America will continue to act as a great nation acts—with a sober sense of responsibility, with determination and with unity."

* * *

THE WHITE HOUSE, 20 NOVEMBER 1979

There are reports that the American citizens being illegally held as hostages in Tehran with the support of the Iranian Government might soon be put through

some sort of "trial". This would be a flagrant violation of international law and basic religious principles, and the Government of Iran would bear full responsibility for any ensuing consequences. The United States is seeking a peaceful solution to this problem through the United Nations and every other available channel. This is far preferable to the other remedies available to the United States. Such remedies are explicitly recognized in the Charter of the United Nations. The Government of Iran must recognize the gravity of the situation it has created.

* * *

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE CYRUS VANCE, 21 NOVEMBER 1979

On the eve of the return to America of the first group of released hostages, I would like to share with all Americans a message to us from Bruce Laingen, our chargé d'affaires in Tehran:

"In our prayers of thanks for the safe return of the first of the hostages, of hope for the early release of those who remain, and for strength in standing firm for what we believe is right, let us also pray that a process can begin that will ultimately permit the restoration of the traditional friendship between the American and the Iranian peoples. Let us ask God's guidance that the two countries, in all they do and say, will act on that basis and from a posture of humanity and restraint, so that both our peoples and Governments can again look to a future of restored understanding and co-operation.

Let the Nation's church bells ring with that message and that hope."

* * *

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, 27 NOVEMBER 1979

Attorney-General Benjamin R. Civiletti today issued the following statement on the rights of Iranian students in the United States:

Americans and the people of other civilized countries condemn the taking of hostages in Iran. This action violates basic principles of international law. That fundamental illegality points up, however, the restraints we must observe in the United States. Here constitutional liberties and due process protect everyone, even sometimes intemperate guests and visitors who have overstayed their legal right to remain in this country.

Despite our justifiable anger at the students and others who make prisoners of our citizens, we all must restrain our actions and behave with a considered regard for our rule of law. Crises test our adherence to our basic protections; in these protections we find the preservation and promotion of our better instincts and collective values.

Recent news accounts have reported that some few American citizens have taken their own action against Iranians in this country. According to the news reports, some Iranians have been fired from their jobs, expelled from universities, and denied public accommodations. This conduct is not proper. A variety of federal laws prohibit discrimination based on national origin. These laws forbid treating people differently in such areas as employment, public education, housing, credit, and public accommodations like restaurants and hotels. These laws—which do not involve the immigration laws—generally protect both citizens and non-citizens.

It is the role of the Justice Department to go to court, when necessary, to prevent and to remedy illegal discrimination. In the current situation, we must do no less. The Department will continue to enforce these laws both here in Washington and through the US Attorneys' offices around the country.

Americans who want to tell Iran of their concern in a potentially constructive way can send letters and telegrams to The Permanent Mission of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations, 622 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

I urge everyone in this country to honour and respect our laws which protect the rights of persons of Iranian origin as they protect us all.

* * *

NEWS CONFERENCE ON IRAN

Following is a news conference by President Carter broadcast live on television and radio from the East Room of the White House on 28 November 1979.

For the last 24 days our nation's concern has been focused on our fellow Americans being held hostage in Iran. We have welcomed some of them home to their families and their friends. But we will not rest nor deviate from our efforts until all have been freed from their imprisonment and their abuse. We hold the Government of Iran fully responsible for the well-being and the safe return of every single person.

I want the American people to understand the situation as much as possible, but there may be some questions tonight which I cannot answer fully because of my concern for the well-being of the hostages.

First of all, I would like to say that I am proud of this great nation, and I want to thank all Americans for their prayers, their courage, their persistence, their strong support and patience. During these past days our national will, our courage, and our maturity have all been severely tested and history will show that the people of the United States have met every test.

In the days to come our determination may be even more sorely tried but we will continue to defend the security, the honour, and the freedom of Americans everywhere. This nation will never yield to blackmail.

For all Americans our constant concern is the well-being and the safety of our fellow citizens who are being held illegally and irresponsibly hostage in Iran. The actions of Iran have shocked the civilized world. For a government to applaud mob violence and terrorism, for a government actually to support and in effect participate in the taking and the holding of hostages is unprecedented in human history.

This violates not only the most fundamental precepts of international law but the common ethical and religious heritage of humanity. There is no recognized religious faith on earth which condones kidnapping. There is no recognized religious faith on earth which condones blackmail. There is certainly no religious faith on earth which condones the sustained abuse of innocent people.

We are deeply concerned about the inhuman and degrading conditions imposed on the hostages. From every corner of the world nations and people have voiced their strong revulsion and condemnation of Iran, and have joined us in calling for the release of the hostages.

Last night a statement of support was released and was issued by the President of the United Nations General Assembly, the Security Council, and on behalf of all of its members. We expect a further Security Council meeting on Saturday night, at which more firm and official action may be taken to help in obtaining the release of the American hostages.

Any claims raised by government officials of Iran will ring hollow while they keep innocent people bound and abused and threatened. We hope that this exercise of diplomacy and international law will bring a peaceful solution, because a peaceful solution is preferable to the other remedies available to the United States.

At the same time, we pursue such a solution with grim determination. The

Government of Iran must recognize the gravity of the situation which it has itself created, and the grave consequences which will result if harm comes to any of the hostages.

I want the American people to know, and I want the world to know, that we will persist in our efforts, through every means available, until every single American has been freed. We must also recognize now, as we never have before, that it is our entire nation which is vulnerable, because of our overwhelming and excessive dependence on oil from foreign countries. We have got to accept the fact that this dependence is a direct, physical threat to our national security. And we must join together to fight for our nation's energy freedom.

We know the ways to win this war: more American energy and the more efficient use of what we have. The US Congress is now struggling with this extremely important decision. The way to victory is long and difficult, but we have the will, and we have the human and the natural resources of our great nation. However hard it might be to see into the future, one thing tonight is clear: we stand together.

We stand as a nation unified, a people determined to protect the life and the honour of every American. And we are determined to make America an energy secure nation once again. It is unthinkable that we will allow ourselves to be dominated by any form of overdependence at home or any brand of terrorism abroad. We are determined that the freest nation on earth shall protect and enhance its freedom.

I will be glad to answer questions.

[Question] The Ayatollah Khomeini said the other day, and I am using his words, that he doesn't believe you have the guts to use military force. He puts no credibility in our military deterrent. I am wondering how do we get out of this mess in Iran and still retain credibility with our allies and with our adversaries overseas?

[Answer] We have the full support of our allies, and in this particular instance we have no adversaries overseas. There is no civilized country on earth which has not condemned the seizure and holding of hostages by Iran. It would not be advisable for me to explode publicly all of the options open to our country.

As I said earlier, I am determined to do the best I can through diplomatic means and through peaceful means to insure the safety of our hostages and their release. Other actions which I might decide to take would come in the future after those peaceful means have been exhausted. But I believe that the growing condemnation of the world community on Iran will have a beneficial effect.

[Question] Why did you reverse your policy and permit the Shah to come into this country when, 1, medical treatment was available elsewhere; 2, you had been warned by our Chargé that the Americans might be endangered in Tehran; and 3, the Bazargan government was so shaky that it was questionable whether he could deliver on the promise to protect our embassy, and, last of all, in view of the consequences do you regret the decision?

[Answer] No, the decision that I made personally and without pressure from anyone to carry out the principles of our country, to provide for the means of giving the Shah necessary medical assistance to save his life, was proper. At the same time we notified the Government of Iran. We were assured by the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister that our embassy would be protected, and it was protected for several days in spite of threats from outside.

Then peremptorily, after Khomeini made an aggravating speech to the crowds in the street and withdrew protection from the embassy, it was attacked successfully. The embassy was protected by our people for the length of time possible without help from the host government. No embassy on earth is a fortress that can withstand constant attacks by a mob unless a host government comes to the rescue of the people within the embassy.

But I took the right decision. I have no regrets about it nor apologies to make because it did help to save a man's life and it was compatible with the principles of our country.

[Question] We appear to be in a rather dangerous period of international tension and volatility, especially in the Islamic world, and it comes at a time when we are about to embark on our quadrennial election campaign, with all that that will bring. Have you given any thought to whether following examples of other national emergencies it may be wise to try to mute the political fallout of this by trying to bring opponents in and outside of your party into some kind of emergency coalition for this purpose?

[Answer] We have attempted to keep the political leaders in our nation informed, both publicly and through other channels. We have given frequent briefings, for instance, on the Hill, both to the members of the Senate and to the House. We have encouraged all of those who have become announced candidates for president to restrain their comments which might be misconstrued overseas and to have a maximum degree of harmony among those who might be spokesmen for our country.

I myself, in order to stay close to the scene here where constantly changing events could be handled by me as President, have eliminated the major portion of political oriented activities.

I don't think the identity of the Islamic world is a factor. We have the deepest respect and reverence for Islam and for all those who share the Moslem faith. I might say that so far as I know, all of the Islamic nations have joined us in condemning the activities and the actions of the Government of Iran. So I don't think religious divisions are a factor here at all.

But I will have to continue to restrict my own political activities and call on those who might be opposing me in the future for president to support my position as President and to provide unity for our country and for our nation in the eyes of those who might be looking for some sign of weakness or division in order to perpetuate their abuse of our hostages.

[Question] What can the United States do now, what can it do to prevent future incidents of the nature of Iran? How can you satisfy the public demand to end such embarrassment?

[Answer] This is an unprecedented and unique occurrence. Down through history, we have had times when some of our people were captured by terrorists or who were abused, and there have obviously been instances of international kidnaping which occurred for the discomfiture of a people or a government.

So far as I know, this is the first time that such an activity has been encouraged by and supported by the government itself. And I don't anticipate this kind of thing recurring.

We have taken steps already in view of the disturbances in the Middle East and the Persian Gulf regions to guard our people more closely, to provide them with a higher degree of security, and to make arrangements with the host government to provide assistance if it is needed in the fastest possible way.

Many other nations have reduced severely the number of people overseas. I think that one of the points that should be made is that a year ago, we had 70,000 Americans in Iran—seventy thousand. There were literally thousands of people who were killed in the Iranian revolution, from all nations.

We were able to extract Americans from Iran safely. It was a superb demonstration of co-operation and good conduct on the part of the State Department and other American officials. So, there will be disturbances in the future, but I think we are as well protected as we possibly can be without withdrawing into a shell from protecting American interests in nations overseas.

My own experience, so far has been that the leaders of nations have recommitted themselves to provide security for embassies of all countries. I think we have learned a lesson from this instance. But because it is so unique, in

the high degree of irresponsibility of the Iranian Government leaders, I don't believe that we will see another reoccurrence of it any time soon.

[Question] Former Secretary Kissinger has criticized your Administration in handling the situation in Iran. He has suggested that it came about because, partly because of the perceived weakness in American policy and that you have further damaged America's image as a result. How do you respond?

[Answer] I would rather not respond. There is no reason for me to get into a public debate at this time with former Secretary Kissinger about who is or who is not responsible for the events that took place in Iran. Obviously what has occurred cannot have been predicted.

And, for 30 years, our country has had a relationship with a fairly stable government there. The changes took place very rapidly. So far as I know, no one on this earth predicted them.

And, I think it is not becoming at this moment, and not conducive to better American understanding to get involved in answering allegations that I or someone else may have been culpable and may have caused a further aggravation of a very difficult situation.

[Question] What role did the former Secretary play in your decision to permit the Shah to enter the country?

[Answer] None. I did not hear at all from the Secretary, former Secretary Kissinger, nor did he contact Secretary Vance at any time during the days when we were deciding that the Shah should come into the United States for medical care to save his life. In previous weeks and months, since the Shah was deposed, Secretary Kissinger and many others let it be known that they thought that we should provide a haven for the Shah. But Secretary Kissinger played no role in my decision to permit the Shah to come in for medical treatment.

[Question] Speaking of the Shah, if he is well enough to travel, would you like him to leave the country?

[Answer] That is a decision to be made by the Shah, and by his medical advisers. When he decided to come to our country, with my permission, I was informed then, and I have been informed since, that as soon as his medical treatment was successfully completed, that his intention was to leave. I have not encouraged him to leave. He was free to come here for medical treatment, and he will leave on his own volition.

[Question] The consequences of the crisis in Iran are drifting the United States into almost a cold war with the Islamic countries. Watching TV news for 25 days, Americans soon will believe the whole Moslem world is hating him. Moreover, they are not told that the Shiites are very minor minority among the population of the Islamic world, because the majority is Sunni. Don't you think you get any help from any Islamic countries, and what will your policy be toward Islamic countries under these circumstances?

[Answer] The premise of your question is completely wrong. We are not approaching any sort of cold war with the Islamic countries. So far as I know, every Islamic country has condemned Iran for its capture of our hostages, and has been very supportive.

This includes Moslem nations which, in the past, have not been close friends of ours: Iraq, Libya, and others. So I don't see this as a confrontation at all between our nation and the Islamic world. It is certainly not part of the Islamic faith to condone, as I said earlier, blackmail or the persecution or harm of innocent people or kidnapping or terrorism.

So I think that we have a very good relationship with the people and the governments of the Islamic world, and I don't think it has deteriorated in this instance. In some ways we have been drawn closer to these people, because they see what has occurred in Iran as something of a disgrace for their own religious faith, and they don't see this as typical of what Moslems believe.

I might add also, that this is not typical of the Shiite faith either. It

is the misguided actions of a few people in Iran who are burning with hatred and a desire for revenge, completely contrary to the teachings of the Moslem faith.

[Question] There is a feeling of hostility throughout the country toward Iran, because of the hostages. Senator Long said that the taking of our embassy in Iran, in his words, is an act of war. There are rumours, since denied, that our Navy has been called up for service. I ask you, as our Commander in Chief, is war possible, is war thinkable?

[Answer] It would be a mistake for the people of our country to have aroused within them hatred toward anyone; not against the people of Iran and certainly not against Iranians who may be in our country as our guests. We certainly do not want to be guilty of the same violation of human decency and basic human principles that have proven so embarrassing to many of the Iranian citizens themselves.

We obviously prefer to see our hostages protected and released completely through peaceful means. That is my deepest commitment, and that will be my goal. The United States has other options available to it which will be considered, depending upon the circumstances. But I think it would not be well-advised for me to speak to those specifically tonight.

[Question] We have had 55,000 Iranian students in this country. We have been very good to them, very hospitable. Even the new Finance Minister of Saudi Arabia was a student who once demonstrated in Washington against law and order. Shouldn't we be very careful in letting any of these students come in here? Shouldn't we screen them in the future, and make them agree that they will not demonstrate?

[Answer] It is very difficult for an Iranian citizen or a student to get a visa at the American Embassy in Iran at this time. *[Laughter]* And I think the influx of Iranians to our country now would be minimal.

I am determined to enforce the law in regard to Iranian students. Some of them have violated the law; they are now being screened, they are being assessed in their commitment and the legality of their presence here. We have already finished this procedure with more than 22,000. About 17,000 have proven to be here completely legally and are indeed full-time students. Among the other 5,000, about several hundred have already departed. Others are now having to prove that, contrary to the earliest evidence, they do indeed have a right to be in our country. If they are here illegally, they will be expelled. There is one exception to that rule: If a citizen of Iran can prove that if he or she returned to Iran that they would be executed or abused because of their political beliefs, they can seek asylum here. And if that asylum in our judgment is justified, we will provide it for them. But this procedure is going forward in accordance with American law, in accordance with American fairness, in accordance with the full principles of the US Constitution.

[Question] Can this crisis go on indefinitely or ought the Ayatollah Khomeini to understand that at some point the American people may demand and other nations may expect that you move forward to resolve it by whatever means you find necessary?

[Answer] It would not be possible or even advisable for me to set a deadline about when or if I would take certain action in the future. This is an ever-present consideration on my mind. I am carrying out all the duties that normally fall on a President's shoulder, which are adequate, but I never forget one moment that I am awake about the hostages whose lives and whose safety depend on me, and I am pursuing every possible avenue to have the hostages released.

Any excessive threats or any excessive belief among the Iranians that they will be severely damaged by military action as long as these negotiations are proceeding and as long as legalities can be followed, might cause the death of the hostages which we are committed to avoid. So that is one of the questions that I

cannot answer, to set down a certain deadline beyond which we would take extra action that might result in the harm or the death of the hostages.

We are proceeding, I guarantee you, in every possible way, every possible moment, to get the hostages freed and at the same time protect the honour and the integrity and the basic principles of our country. That is all I can do. But I am doing it to the best of my ability and I believe we will be successful.

[Question] Many Americans view the Iranian situation as one in a succession of events that proves that this country's power is declining. How can you assure Americans tonight that our power is not declining abroad and how are you reassessing priorities for the 1980s in terms of foreign policy?

[Answer] The United States has neither the ability nor the will to dominate the world, to interfere in the internal affairs of other nations, to impose our will on other people whom we desire to be free, to make their own decisions. This is not part of the commitment of the United States.

Our country is the strongest on earth. We are the strongest militarily, politically, economically, and I think we are the strongest morally and ethically. Our country has made great strides, even since I have been in office. I have tried to correct some of the defects that did exist. We have strengthened the military alliances of our country, for instance. NATO now has a new spirit, a new confidence, a new cohesion, improving its military capabilities, much more able to withstand any threat from the East, from the Soviet Union or the Warsaw Pact, than it was before.

We have espoused again the principles that unite Americans and make us admired throughout the world, raising the banner of human rights. We are going to keep it high. We have opened up avenues of communication, understanding, trade with people that formerly were our enemies or excluded us—several nations in Africa, the vast people and the vast country of the People's Republic of China. In doing so we have not alienated any of our previous friends.

I think our country is strong within itself. There is not an embarrassment now about our Government which did exist in a few instances in years gone by. So I don't see at all that our country has become weak. We are strong and we are getting stronger, not weaker. But if anybody thinks that we can dominate other people with our strength—military or political strength or economic strength—they are wrong. That is not the purpose of our country.

Our inner strength, our confidence in ourselves, I think, is completely adequate. I believe that the unity that the American people have shown in this instance, their patience, is not at all a sign of weakness. It is a sign of sure strength.

[Question] Serious charges have been placed against the Shah concerning the repression of his own people and the misappropriation of his nation's funds. Is there an appropriate vehicle to investigate those charges and do you foresee a time when you would direct your Administration to assist in that investigation?

[Answer] I don't know of any international forum within which charges have ever been brought against a deposed leader who has left his country. There have been instances of changing governments down through the centuries in history, and I don't know of any instance where such a leader who left his country after his government fell has been tried in an international court or in an international forum.

This is a matter that can be pursued. It should be pursued under international law, and if there is a claim against the Shah's financial holdings there is nothing to prevent other parties from going into the courts in accordance with a law of a nation or internationally and seeking a redress of grievances which they claim.

But as I said earlier, I don't think there is any forum that will listen to the Iranians make any sort of claim, justified or not, as long as they hold

against their will and abuse the hostages in complete contravention to every international law and every precept or every commitment or principle of human-kind.

December 1979.

Bureau of Public Affairs,
Office of Public Communication,
Editorial Division.

* * *

THE WHITE HOUSE, STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT, 5 DECEMBER 1979, THE BRIEFING ROOM

Vice President *Mondale*: Over the past several weeks we have been hearing a drumfire of propaganda out of Tehran, some of it from people calling themselves students, some of it from the government-controlled radio and television in Iran, and some of it from various officials or people in authority. The message is very clear. It says over and over that the world and the American people should ignore the hostages, forget about the innocent people bound hand and foot, overlook the continued outrage to law and standards of human behaviour. We are told to forget all that and focus on the hatred of one man.

We are not going to forget and the American people are not going to get their priorities confused. How are our hostages being treated? The facts are there for all to see, and the simple fact is that 50 human beings are being held in inhuman conditions, contrary to all civilized standards, in order to prove a political point. They are not permitted regular visitors. They are isolated and not allowed to speak except to their captors. As far as we know, the hostages have not been allowed to receive mail or messages. There has never been a systematic accounting of the numbers and welfare of the hostages.

The so-called "students" have not permitted any outside observers even to see these people for ten days. They are refusing to let international organizations such as the Red Cross into the compound. They refuse visits by religious organizations. They refuse representatives of neutral States. Even prisoners of war are guaranteed certain standards of human treatment. But these standards are being dragged in the dirt every day by a group of kidnapers with the acquiescence of the government.

We are hearing daily propaganda about the alleged crimes of our people in Tehran, most of whom volunteered to serve their country at a difficult and dangerous time. We are not and will not respond to that propaganda. I would note that one of those being held as a so-called "spy" in Tehran is in fact a private American citizen who simply happened to be visiting the embassy on business at the time of the attack on 4 November. It was many days before we even learned, indirectly, that he was being held. That man, like the rest, has now been held for 31 days, tied up, denied contact with his family, denied exercise, denied access even to the comfort of religion.

We hear a great deal about the crimes of the Shah, but that is not the issue. The issue which disturbs the American people is that 50 of our fellow citizens are being abused in violation of international law. These are our brothers and sisters.

Yesterday the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution which called as the first most important priority, as it should, for the release of the American hostages. That is the issue. It is the only issue, and we are not going to forget they must be set free.

Appendix C¹

1. Khomeini Telephone Call

NC041745 Paris AFP in English, 1736 GMT, 4 Nov. 79 NC.

[Text] Tehran, 4 Nov. (AFP)—Pro-Khomeini students holding at least 49 people hostage here in the American Embassy today said they would not be released until the country's former ruler, the Shah, was returned to Iran.

At a press conference held in the embassy, a spokesman for the "occupation coordination council" added that Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini, acting as "guide of the Iranian revolution", had telephoned the embassy to express his agreement with the students' action. The Shah, who was ousted by the Khomeini-led revolution in Iran last February, is currently in the United States undergoing treatment for cancer.

A band of 100 students took the embassy by storm here today, and have claimed to have taken 100 American hostages.

We express our support for this brave and decisive act by our student brothers and sisters.

US imperialism, the biggest enemy of the Muslim people of Iran, is daily engaged in plots against our Islamic revolution. It has given refuge to the deposed and criminal Shah—one of the greatest criminals in history—thus helping the Iranian counter-revolutionaries.

While expressing our hatred for the actions of US imperialism against the Muslim people we call on the Carter administration to take immediate action to return the deposed criminal Shah and his collaborators to Iran, so that they can be put on trial in Islamic revolution courts.

Long live the Iranian Islamic revolution, led by Imam Khomeini. Long live the solidarity of the oppressed peoples of the world. Down with US imperialism.

2. Council of Experts President's Speech

LD041830 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1630 GMT, 4 Nov. 79 LD.

[Report on speech by Dr. Mohammad Beheshti, president of the Council of Experts, at a meeting of the Council of Experts on 4 November—read by announcer.]

[Text] While referring to the occupation of the US Embassy in Tehran by a number of youths, Dr. Beheshti said:

A number of faithful and devoted youths who consider the admission of the criminal Shah by the United States as a great humiliation to our revolution and our Muslim nation, no longer could tolerate this and as a protest have occupied the US Embassy and taken several of its staff as hostages. As people who have a feeling of responsibility, we have told America and the colonialist world: You not only take sides against right; you not only take sides against the person of the Imam and against the Revolution Council and the provisional government of the Islamic revolution; you are taking sides against a nation. Therefore, you must understand our position and realize that the Iranian nation has recognized the line of its revolution. And now, too, we must say: You should not expect anyone to be able to harness our nation, which is awakened against your unbecoming deeds.

¹ The contents of this appendix are taken from the Foreign Broadcast Information Service *Daily Report*, a United States Government publication.

Dr. Beheshti continued his remarks by adding: It is as if America and other world powers only know the language of diplomacy and have not yet become acquainted with the language of revolution. But our nation has become familiar with this language thanks to the revolution and understands the meaning of every word in the context of this revolution.

While we accept that a country's embassy and nationals should enjoy security, and while the law of Islam guarantees such security, we see that the language of the revolution is an upright, clear and expressive language. (It ought to) be added: If America has not yet learned the language of the Iranian revolution and cannot understand it, then it would be well for it to come to its senses and understand it.

America should have known at the time it admitted the deposed Shah as a patient that doing so would be followed by difficult consequences. Dr. Beheshti addressed America and said: Are you still unable to understand that the deposed Shah is the bloodthirsty enemy of the people and should be handed over to the Revolution Court? Hence, the country's youths are forced to talk to you in this way; I hope that you will learn to listen as a result of this issue, so that our youths no longer will use this method to speak to you.

Dr. Beheshti added: The humanitarian duty of America, if it recognizes this, is to hand over this enemy of the people to the Islamic Revolution Court and create no more headaches for itself.

3. Qom Seminary Statement

LD041902 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1630 GMT, 4 Nov. 79 LD.

[Statement issued 4 November by the Qom religious seminary—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God the compassionate, the merciful: America, death to your intrigue, the blood of our martyrs drips through your claws. Death to the corrupt trio—Carter, As-Sadat and Begin and hundreds of other slogans against America, the leaders of America and its associates. This is the thundering cry of the nation against America. This has been and continues to be the anti-imperialist roar of the oppressed people of Iran in all its marches. This is the anger of the mothers, fathers, brothers and sisters who have been the target of the hail of bullets coming from the Shah and Carter. This is the political position of the nation. This is the line that the Imam has set out. When the idol-smashing Khomeini cries out decisively and fearlessly that it is the duty of the valiant nation to prevent US and Israeli interests being pursued in Iran, and to attack them, even if this action leads to their destruction. Again the Imam cries out: The world must know that whatever problems the Iranian nation and Muslim nations face emanate from foreigners, particularly from America. Again the Imam roars that yesterday, the Muslim nations were in the grip of Britain and its agents, and that today they are in the grip of America and its associates.

And he cries: All our problems stem from America which strengthen Zionism, enabling it to massacre our brothers in their multitudes. Again the Imam warns: It is America that regards Islam and the glorious Koran as harmful to it and is trying to eliminate it. The Imam has also said: What do we want with relations with America. On yet another occasion, he said painfully: Relations between Iran and America are akin to relations between a lamb and a wolf. On yet another occasion, he said: Our nation has tested the bitter experience of domination by foreigners and oil-plundering free-loaders, particularly those of America. On yet another occasion, the Imam cried: let us unite and cut off the leftist and rightist hands, led by America. Again he cries that the Iranian nation should fearlessly stand against its enemies, particularly America and international Zionism. Yet another cry: Iranian nation, do not submit to injustice and expose with awareness the evil plots of international world-devourers, led by

America. Yet another cry is that today Muslim African countries are suffering under the yoke of America and other foreigners and their lackeys.

The Imam again roars that, generally, today the world of Islam is in the grip of America. And yet again he cries that it is the duty of the students and those seeking religious knowledge to increase their attacks against America and Israel with the utmost strength and to force America to extradite this criminal and ousted Shah. And there are hundreds upon hundreds of other such attacks, and yet thousands more attacks which in themselves constitute a huge volume of writing. This is the position of the nation and that of the leader of the nation in the face of the nation's unquestionable enemy. Suddenly one hears out of the blue that there has been a meeting with Brzezinski, Carter's assistant for national security affairs. Then we discover that this meeting took place without the Imam's permission and that two policies have emerged: The policy of America and the policy of relentless enmity toward America, which clarifies the perspective of the Imam's foreign policy and which prompts the sincere allies of the Imam to take over the spy nest of America and make all its occupants surrender, and prove that such meetings can in no way diminish, even by an iota, the nation's revolutionary rancor and anger and that of the leader toward America.

The Qom religious seminary expresses disapproval of this meeting and, with all its force, strongly supports the Muslim brothers and sisters following the Imam's policy, who declared to the whole world, by their occupation of this (?CIA), the protest of all those who support the Imam's policy.

[Signed] The religious seminary of Qom.

4. Revolution Council Assumes Government Functions

LD062314 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 0030 GMT, 4 Nov. 79 LD.

[7 November statement by the Revolution Council of the Islamic Republic of Iran—read by announcer.]

[Text] Dear struggling nation of Iran: The Revolution Council of the Islamic Republic of Iran, dictated by the necessity of this phase in your great revolution, O heroic nation, and at the behest of the Imam, has shouldered a heavier task in the continuation of the revolution and in administering the country's affairs.

The council, with divine support and with the backing, confidence and trust of the overwhelming majority of the Iranian nation, has accepted this heavy burden and, in step with the nation, has accepted the Imam's command.

During the limited time it has been given to take over the administration of affairs, the council is determined to carry out the following measures:

1. To carry out a referendum on the constitution, the election of the members of the National Consultative Assembly and the presidency.

2. To make increasing use of elements faithful to the revolution, and particularly of the vast force of the younger generation, who by their revolutionary sincerity and their bloody jihad and self-sacrifice in bringing the struggle to fruition have played their worthy role, so that they may co-operate in administering the country's affairs, turning the wheels of the realm and bringing about fundamental economic and social changes.

3. To purge establishments and ministries of rotten and subservient elements until stability is reached, in order to set up an administrative system suitable to the revolution.

4. To work and carry out the appropriate crash programmes for the improvement of the life of the deprived with the assistance of the people.

5. Khomeini's Son Arrives

LD050842 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 0830 GMT, 5 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] Following the invitation extended by the student followers of the Imam to Seyyed Ahmad Khomeini [Khomeini's son] to investigate the situation in the

US Embassy in Tehran, he has just arrived in Tehran in order to go to the US Embassy.

Tabriz students occupy consulate, demand break with US.

LD051142 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1030 GMT, 5 Nov. 79 LD.

[Excerpt] The central news bureau reports that the US Consulate building in Shiraz was occupied this morning by the young people, according to the Imam's policy. The Revolution Guards Corps of Fars Province expressed its support for the action and announced that they would always strive to carry out the commands of his eminence, the Imam Khomeini. Similarly the US Consulate in Tabriz was occupied by Student Followers of the Imam's Policy. Here is a report from our correspondent:

Following the occupation of the US Embassy in Iran by Student Followers of the Imam's Policy, at 10.30 this morning the US Consulate building in Tabriz was occupied by Muslim students. The same group [as heard] then marched from the consulate building to Tabriz University. A statement issued by the Muslim Student Association of the University of Tabriz says in part: While supporting the revolutionary move to occupy the US Embassy—this nest of spics and criminals—and in compliance with Imam Khomeini's revolutionary demand, we shall, having occupied the US Consulate, march to the University of Tabriz. The statement continues: We call upon Imam Khomeini, in the implementation of his demand and that of the Iranian people relating to the destruction and elimination of imperialism, to continue to remain decisive and uncompromising. We call upon the heroic people of Iran to support and assist us in this matter. We demand:

1. Abrogation of all military and oil agreements with imperialists;
2. Confiscation of assets and capital associated with imperialists in Iran in the interest of the oppressed people of Iran;
3. Expulsion of all CIA officers in Iran and [words indistinct] and all its documents;
4. A complete break in relations between Iran and the United States until the delivery of the treacherous Shah to Iran.

6. Student Interviewed

LD030612 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 0015 GMT, 5 Nov. 79 LD.

[Unidentified correspondent's interview with unidentified student who participated in occupation of US Embassy in Tehran—recorded.]

[Excerpt] *[Question]* Dear listeners, now it is 01.30 on 3 November and I am here with one of the students who attempted this revolutionary act and occupied the US Embassy.

In connection with this issue, we thought it useful to discuss some points with him about the time when first they thought of this action, what was the cause and how have they executed their plans up to now and what is their general aim in this operation?

[Answer] Basically, in connection with this plan it should be explained that recent events in our society have caused us to feel that the main direction of the revolution is being lost and the movement is being diverted to other channels, especially in connection with recent events in a society which shows traces of US interference. Documents discovered after we took over the embassy, which our friends have studied, confirm this fact, the most important point being the Shah's trip to the United States and America's disregard for the crimes committed by the Shah in Iran, not taking any notice of the revolution in Iran and accepting the Shah. The need to do something was felt more than ever, which is quite evident in the speeches of the Imam in the past week or couple of weeks. The Imam during this period has talked to all those received by him

about the problem of America. In his last message on the occasion of 4 November he addressed a message to students and all the strata of the people, especially pupils, students and theological students, and asked them to extend and strengthen their attacks against the United States. That was why the Muslim student believers in the way of the Imam decided, with regard to all the above, to take a revolutionary step in the right channel, that is to say against America and its interests and in the interests of the oppressed masses of society. Thus the need to do something was felt simultaneously in two universities, and students from several faculties agreed on the plan to occupy the US Embassy and take the staff of the embassy as hostage. They worked on this plan for about ten days and decided that the best and most appropriate day for it was 4 November on the occasion of the Imam's exile from Iran and the mass slaughter of 4 November last year which marked the beginning of the military rule of the Shah.

This was how the plan was made. At about 10.30 the demonstrators started to march along the east wing of the embassy and about 10.45 entered the embassy. After some resistance from inside the embassy by persons not willing to surrender—mainly because they wanted to destroy documents and they even threw several tear gas bombs—at about 12.30 to 13.00 the embassy was completely occupied by my friends. The persons who had been arrested were taken to a safe place and are being kept there. What is important at this juncture is that in the embassy's building No. 1, which is in the south wing of the embassy, my friends found a door, a vaulted door, which they could not open. About 90 minutes later, the door was opened and several people surrendered. The door led to four or five rooms where computer documents and tapes were bundled. The staff had destroyed as many of the documents as possible. We were very interested in having these documents because we might have been able to disclose some of the crimes committed by America in Iran and other countries in the region. Then they took all the hostages to a safe place in the embassy, and they are all safe. About nine to ten statements have been issued which have been given to the radio. All matters pertaining to persons taken hostage and the reasons for the action have been explained. You can obtain them from the news unit and broadcast it for the listeners outside the country.

[Question] Would you tell us how many people you have taken hostage and how many of you attempted this action?

[Answer] The number of my friends who started the attack—I should mention that my friends entered the embassy as demonstrators and not for a military takeover, it was a political matter from the beginning. Of course, at the beginning they had the idea that they should stage it as a military operation, but then they thought it better to enter in a political fashion and then go on from there.

This needed a large force and in theory they had mobilized about 500 to 600 university students. The hostages number about 100, some are Iranians who are being interrogated [words indistinct] and about 70 to 80 of them are foreigners with 60 to 65 being Americans. The important personnel are all there except for the chargé d'affaires. It is probable that the chargé d'affaires will be asked to join the others as well.

[Question] Have you decided what to do during the next few days, because obviously you have foreseen what their reactions will be and what your reactions will be to that, and how far are you prepared to go? Has your aim been as a whole a sort of exposition, and do you intend to achieve a result from your action?

[Answer] In addition to an exposition, we await a result as well. With regard to our next steps, it is not we who will decide, this is a decision to be taken by the people and the most important reason for this is that now, about 13 to 14 hours after the occupation of the embassy, we see that more than one-third of the country has announced support for us, from different parties and even different

little villages and towns. We have received telegrams from them, and we have given these to the radio as well. That is why this is a matter for the people to decide. It is not us who will decide, it is the people who will decide. We do not impose any limitations on this; it will continue and we have already prepared plans for any eventuality. But wherever the action leads to, the final decision will be with the people. People should decide what to do with them, whether to keep them until the Shah returns or whether to let them go, or whatever they like, whether there should be an embassy or not will depend on them.

7. Guards Commander on Takeover

LD050251 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 0030 GMT, 5 Nov. 79 LD.

[Message from the commander of the corps of Islamic Revolution Guards, Hojjat ol-Eslam Lahuti, to Muslim students who have occupied the US Embassy—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful, His Eminence Hojjat ol-Eslam Musavi (Khoie), our Muslim student brothers: At this point when you have bravely taken a strong and God-loving step and have occupied the US Embassy, that enemy of the oppressed nations of the world and especially the brave people of Iran, I am very sorry not to be able to take part in your gathering because of illness and having to receive treatment in the hospital. Therefore, I wish to announce hereby to you dear ones, who have the hearty support of the nation of Iran who assist you in your revolutionary movement, that the corps of the Revolution Guards are ready to serve you with all their force and might and, holding their lives in their hands, are prepared to shed the last drop of their blood and to undertake your protection to the last state of victory.

Dear brothers, all the Revolution Guards, one by one, regret and severely condemn the meeting between some of the officials and Brzezinski. In order to clarify to the public opinion, we announce that this meeting was conducted without the knowledge or consent of the Imam. All discussions carried out at this meeting are condemned by our nation. The corps of Revolution Guards generally, only support revolutionary movements following the Imam and condemn any counter-revolutionary movements inside or outside the country, and will crush them.

8. Public Prosecutor Statement

LD050255 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 0030 GMT, 5 Nov. 79 LD.

[Statement by the central office of the public prosecutor—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. Greetings to the fighting and brave Muslim nation of Iran. Greetings to the students and students of theology and congratulations to the religious students who have announced their solidarity with other university students. The staff of the central office of the public prosecutor of the Islamic revolution, the research staff and the judiciary announce their support for the Muslim fighting students who have occupied the US Embassy in order to make the United States extradite the deposed, traitorous Shah to bring him to the Islamic court of justice.

9. Praise for Embassy Seizure

LD050708 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 0645 GMT, 5 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] Dear listeners, you know that America, this enemy of all the oppressed people of the world, every day and every minute hatches plots and conspiracies in different corners of the world, and especially in our dear country, Iran. Our bloody revolution, which blessed by the blood-stained bodies of 60,000 martyrs is blossoming, has dealt the biggest blow to this world domineering superpower.

The act of the dear students, followers of the Imam's way, has lighted new sparks of hope in the hearts of our oppressed and revolutionary nation.

From this hour, in order to air the reflections on this revolutionary act, which is about to root out the domination of imperialism from this dear soil, we will inform you of messages and reports about this act. Meanwhile, we will bring the voice of our nation's Imam Khomeini to your ears, greetings to the Imam, greetings to the dear students and greetings to you Muslim people of Iran.

10. Khomeini Representative's Remarks

LD050806 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 0730 GMT, 5 Nov. 79 LD.

[“Text” of message from His Great Eminence Ayatollah Haj Seyyed Abolfazl Khansari, Imam Khomeini's representative, to the US Embassy—read by announcer.]

[Text] The Soviet Union is worse than America, America is worse than the Soviet Union and Britain is worse than both, all are more evil than the others. However, at present we are trapped by evil America. This was Khomeini's remark in 1963. The direction taken by the student followers of the Imam is extremely praiseworthy. The harbouring of the deposed Shah and the plots hatched against Iran, especially carried out in dear Kordestan, prove the point that we must uproot the rotten roots of this world imperialist and throw them in history's garbage can.

I, on my own as well as on behalf of the people of Arak, praise this act and express my support for this revolutionary act.

11. Yazdi Comments

LD052255 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 2030 GMT, 5 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] Dr. Ebrahim Yazdi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran, today in a press interview attended by a number of local correspondents explained the view of the Government and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerning the occupation of the US Embassy in Tehran. Concerning the Shah's visit to America, Dr. Yazdi said:

The US chargé d'affaires had informed Iran's prime minister that the Shah had decided to travel to America due to serious illness, and that America had agreed to this trip on humanitarian grounds. In the same meeting, the US chargé d'affaires had confessed that this action may not pass without having some effect on relations between Iran and America. Yazdi added: From the beginning, the Iranian Government expressed its serious opposition to the Shah's trip to America.

The Foreign Minister of Iran then referred to the subsequent events, and said: Twenty-four hours after the first meeting of the US chargé d'affaires and Mr. Bazargan, the US Embassy delivered a report concerning the arrival of the Shah to America, and once again the Iranian Government strongly protested. Following this, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs requested that two Iranian physicians be allowed to go to investigate the truth concerning the Shah's illness, a request which was initially accepted. However, these two doctors were prevented from visiting the Shah to carry out a medical examination.

On 30 October the Ministry of Foreign Affairs sent another protest to the US Government, rejecting its excuses for admitting the Shah and for failing to return him and his wife to Iran.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs added: During the trip I made to the States in order to take part in the United Nations General Assembly session, I met Cyrus Vance and talked to him concerning the extradition of the guilty individuals who had taken refuge in America. The US Foreign Secretary promised that if he received a list of the guilty individuals with the verdicts by

American courts, he would take steps to extradite the guilty individuals. The Minister for Foreign Affairs said: For instance, if we formally requested from America the extradition of Brigadier General (Razmi) who was responsible for the fire in the Rex Cinema in Abadan, who travelled to the United States under a false name and forged passport, and whose address we have obtained. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs has also acted through the international police, INTERPOL, for the arrest and extradition of Brigadier General (Razmi).

Mr. Yazdi said: On the same date, 30 October, that we submitted a request to the US Government for the extradition of the Shah and his wife and all his property, we also sent a note to Spain requesting them to return the property of the former Shah in those countries. Mr. Yazdi emphasized: Despite all these steps by the Iranian Government, the United States did not give a positive response, and now whatever is being said about the neglectfulness of the government is very unjust and unfair.

Concerning the occupation of the US Embassy, Mr. Yazdi said: Although according to international regulations the Iranian Government is duty bound to safeguard the life and property of foreign nationals, and although we as a government express regrets and will try to solve the problem in a peaceful way, nevertheless, the responsibility for this incident lies with the US Government, because it did not pay any attention to the notes concerning the extradition of the Shah and his wife and the returning of his property and, consequently, the people showed such a reaction. Yazdi added: The action of the students enjoys the endorsement and the support of the government, because America herself is responsible for this incident.

In response to another question, Mr. Yazdi said that he has received assurances from the students who have occupied the US Embassy that the lives of the hostages are not in danger.

12. Khomeini on Occupation

LD051232 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1030 GMT, 5 Nov. 79 LD.

[Excerpts] Today the employees of the Iran Central Insurance Company were received by Imam Khomeini in Qom. The Imam made some remarks and then said: [read by announcer]

In this revolution, the big Satan is America, which is clamouring to gather other Satans around it; this includes both the Satans inside and outside Iran. You know that during the rule of these two devils [presumably the Shah and his father], whose rule was in contravention of the law, Iran was in turn enslaved by Britain and then America. This great Satan—America—is clamouring and gathering around it other Satans because its hand has been cut off from our resources. It is afraid this amputation may become permanent. Therefore, it is plotting.

As for that centre [the US Embassy] occupied by our young men, I have been informed that it has been a lair of espionage and plotting. America expects to take the Shah there, engage in plots, create a base in Iran for these plots, and our young people are expected simply to remain idle and witness all these things.

The rotten roots have become active, hoping we would mediate and tell the young people to leave this place. Our young people resorted to this action because they saw that the Shah was allowed in America.

America expects our nation, our young people, our university and our young religious people to sit idle and see the blood of the nearly 100,000 martyrs shed in vain. Obviously, had it not been for the plots, sabotage and all these corrupt acts, everyone could have remained here in freedom. However, when we face plots, our young people cannot wait and see their country return to the past and everything go with the wind. Our young people must foil all these plots with all their might. Today we cannot simply remain idle and watch things; today we are

facing underground treason, treason devised in these same embassies, mainly by the great Satan, America. They must bear in mind that Iran is still in a state of revolution; a revolution greater than the first one. They must be put in their place and return this criminal to us as soon as possible.

As for that criminal Bakhtiar, Britain must return him. Britain cannot continue to keep Bakhtiar in order to devise plots: The British Government should not arrest our young people because they have staged demonstrations against the deposed Shah or the criminal Bakhtiar. If they do not give up these criminals, if they do not return them to us or, at least expel them from their countries, then we shall do whatever is necessary.

13. Letter of Resignation

LD061020 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 0930 GMT, 6 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text of letter of resignation from Prime Minister Mehdi Bazargan—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful: to the esteemed person of His Great Eminence Ayatollah, Imam, Ruhollah Mosavi Khomeini, may your blessings continue: With the greatest of respect, this is to state humbly that in pursuance of frequent explanations offered in the past and in view of the fact that interferences, instances of creating obstacles, instances of opposition and instances of differences of views have for some time now made it impossible for me and my colleagues to carry out the duties assigned and to continue to shoulder responsibility, and in view of the fact that in crucial and historic conditions the salvation of the country and bringing the revolution to fruition cannot be achieved without unity of expression and unity of management, I hereby tender my resignation so that all the affairs may be brought under the command of the leadership in any manner deemed appropriate or that volunteers, among whom there is co-ordination, may be assigned to form a government. With humble expressions of greetings and prayers for success. [Signed] Mehdi Bazargan. [Dated] 5 November 1979.

14. Khomeini Accepts Bazargan Resignation, Delegates Power

LD061003 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 0930 GMT, 6 Nov. 79 LD.

[“Command” issued by Imam Khomeini to the Revolution Council—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. To the Council of the Revolution of the Islamic Republic of Iran: Since His Excellency Mehdi Bazargan, having given his reasons, resigned the post of prime minister on 5 November 1979, while expressing appreciation for his exhaustive efforts and services during the period of transition and having confidence in his religious devotion, trustworthiness and good will, I have accepted the resignation. I assign the Revolution Council to consider and manage the affairs of the country in a period of transition, and to carry out the following without delay:

1. to prepare the preliminaries for a referendum for the constitution;
2. to prepare the preliminaries for the elections for a National Consultative Assembly; and
3. to prepare the preliminaries for choosing a president.

It should be noted that, with reliance upon almighty God and confidence in the power of the exalted nation, it is essential that the affairs assigned, particularly those which concern the purging of the administrative apparatus and welfare of the lowly classes of our people, be carried out in a decisive and revolutionary manner.

[Dated] 6 November 1979. [Signed] Ruhollah Mosavi Khomeini.

15. Students Threaten To Kill US Embassy Hostages

LD061742 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1710 GMT, 6 Nov. 79 LD.

[Statement No. 15 of the Student Followers of the Imam's Policy—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful: O Muslim nation of Iran, until a final outcome is reached, the US centre of plots and espionage will remain under our occupation, and we will strongly and solidly hold our positions. The US mercenaries and spies, who are hostages, are being watched most closely.

With you as witness, O nation, we sharply warn the criminal United States and its domestic agents to give up their futile attempts. And should the United States and its hateful agents in Iran resort to the least conspiratorial movement, military or otherwise, to release the hostages, all the hostages will be destroyed and the responsibility for this will lie directly with the US Government.

[Signed] The Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Policy.

16. Clergy Support for Takeover

GF070516 Shiraz Domestic Service in Persian, 1500 GMT, 6 Nov. 79 GF.

[Text] Following the declaration of affinity with, support for, and approval of the revolutionary action by Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Policy regarding the occupation of the US Embassy, once again messages and announcements were received today at Shiraz Radio from various groups.

Also, His Excellency Haj Seyyed Abdolhosein Dastgheyb has issued an announcement with regard to the admirable and courageous act of the Student Followers of the Imam's Policy. The text of his announcement follows:

In the name of God the merciful and compassionate: It has become known to all brave and struggling people of Iran that the only way for the country to be rescued and salvaged from the evils of imperialism and Zionism and the only way toward the liberation and happiness of the nation is through obedience to his exalted eminence His Excellency Imam Khomeini. The Imam has repeatedly declared the United States to be Iran's most stubborn and hardheaded enemy, and has been asking for continuous struggle against US plots and conspiracies. But the United States has not given up its conspiracies against our revolution, and it has, in fact, recently provided shelter for the deposed Shah. It is acting as his host by completely ignoring the Iranian nation's demand for his extradition to Iran.

Apparently, it does not consider the Iranians to be human beings. Otherwise, out of its so-called sense of humanity—which it claims to have—it could provide relief to thousands of bereaved fathers and mothers by delivering to them the murderer Shah—the bloodthirsty criminal. The United States considers only Mohammad Reza, its hireling, to be a human being and shelters him for humanitarian reasons!

Inasmuch as our beloved students and brave Muslims exhausted their tolerance and patience, following the policies of the Imam, they took over the centres of plots and espionage—the US Embassy in Tehran and US Consulates in Shiraz and Tabriz—and are holding its employees as hostages. This courageous and God-loving action by you, the beloved youth, is appreciated and supported by the entire nation.

I pray and wish for your success and for solidarity of the entire nation with the Imam and for the abjectness and perdition of imperialism. Greetings upon all of you and upon all decent subjects of God.

[Dated] 6 November 1979.

[Signed] Seyyed Abdolhosein Dastgheyb.

17. "Announcement" from Shiraz

GF070526 Shiraz Domestic Service in Persian, 1500 GMT, 6 Nov. 79 GF.

["Announcement" issued by the Corps of Revolution Guards and students in control of the US Consulate in Shiraz on the "Takeover of the US espionage nest in Shiraz"—read by announcer.]

[Text] Following the takeover of the US Consulate in Shiraz and the announcement of this action by various news media, we have been so overwhelmed and touched by expressions of affinity and co-operation from students, office workers, various institutions and all the noble and brave people of Shiraz who, as in the past, did not hesitate to give their lives, that we decided to express our gratitude and appreciation. We hereby announce that giving our lives and property for the noble and united people is an unworthy contribution which we nonetheless hope will be accepted. We hope to God for speedy destruction and perdition of criminal superpowers, especially world-eating imperialists.

[Signed] Corps of guardsmen and students stationed at the US Consulate.

18. Khomeini Tells Youths to Leave Iraqi Consulate

LD061856 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1630 GMT, 6 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] According to reports received from Kermanshah the young people who occupied the Iraqi Consulate this morning left the consulate building at 1700. On the basis of the same report, at 1600 today Hojjat ol-Eslam Hajj Shaykh Baha'eddin 'Iraqi, together with Hojjat ol-Eslam Zarandi had talks with the young people who had occupied the Iraqi Consulate, and the young people announced: We will follow instructions from the office of the Imam.

On the basis of this, the office of the Imam Khomeini, the leader of the Islamic revolution of Iran, was requested by telephone to decide on the matter and the office of the leader of Islamic revolution of Iran replied that despite the fact that one day after the occupation of the US Embassy the Iranian Consulate in Al-Basrah was occupied by agents of the Iraqi Ba'th, nevertheless, the Imam Khomeini emphasized that the young people should leave the consulate building as soon as possible. The report says that with the agreement of the negotiators and the Iraqi Consul a procès-verbal, in Persian and Arabic, to the effect that no document had been touched and that everything had remained intact, was drawn up and signed and then, after handing this procès-verbal to the operational group of the guards of the Islamic revolution in Kermanshah, the young people who had occupied the Iraqi Consulate left the building at 17.00 today.

19. Beheshti Interviewed on New Tasks of Revolution Council

LD062222 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 2030 GMT, 6 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] In an interview with correspondents tonight Ayatollah Dr. Beheshti, member of the Revolution Council of the Islamic Revolution of Iran, said regarding the new tasks of the Revolution Council: The Government's overall executive task will be entrusted to and carried out by the Revolution Council, like all other revolution councils the world over. Up to now we preferred to work (?in a new way), namely, to have a revolution council and a revolution government.

However, since that necessary degree of coordination and unity of thought was not forthcoming, as mentioned by Engineer Bazargan himself in his resignation, either the revolution government or the Revolution Council would have to take over in accordance with its defined position and conclusions. And the choice was the nation's and the Imam's. That is, both the nation and the Imam have chosen to adopt the course to face up to the problems counselled by the Revolution Council.

In reply to the question as to whether the cabinet ministers who are members of the Revolution Council would remain, Ayatollah Dr. Beheshti said: The necessary decision has not yet been taken on this, and you will be informed in time.

Dr. Beheshti added: All my friends and I are confident that thanks to the succour of the nation and the powerful solidarity between the nation, the Imam and the Revolution Council, which is part and parcel of the nation and is a companion of the Imam, we will be able to pass through the next one or two months and to bring our nation as soon as possible to the state of affairs envisaged by the constitution.

Dr. Beheshti added: For the time being we will not have a prime minister until the elections.

20. Khomeini Forbids Officials To Meet US Representatives

LD071750 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1630 GMT, 7 Nov. 79 LD.
[Message from Imam Khomeini, leader of the Islamic revolution of Iran—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful:

According to our information, Carter's special representatives are on their way to Iran and they intend to come to Qom in order to meet me. Therefore, I deem it necessary to recall that as the US Government, by keeping the Shah, has declared its open opposition to Iran, and on the other hand—as is being said—the US Embassy in Iran is our enemies' centre of espionage against our sacred Islamic movement, it is therefore not possible under any circumstances for the special representatives to meet us.

Furthermore:

1. The members of the Islamic Revolution Council under no circumstances should meet them.
2. None of the responsible officials has the right to meet them.
3. Should the United States hand over to Iran the deposed Shah—this enemy number one of our dear nation—and give up espionage against our movement, the way to talks would be opened on the issue of certain relations which are in the interest of the nation. [*Signed*] Ruhollah Nosavi Khomeini, 7 November 1979.

21. Students Reaffirm Demand

LD071913 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1630 GMT, 7 Nov. 79 LD.
[Statement No. 19 of the Muslim student followers of the Imam "occupying the US Embassy in Tehran"—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful: Peace be unto all the Muslim sisters and brethren throughout Iran and the world who, with their unstinting acts of support, are strengthening our faith in the action which we have taken. Peace and a salute, which emanates from our very existence, to the leader of the revolution, the Imam of the nation, the great Khomeini, who with his messianic breath is every moment breathing a new life into the body of the nation so that it might rise in battle against the biggest infernal power of the arch-Satan of the era, the criminal United States, through reliance on and faith in God and through the unity of word.

The world-devouring United States imagines that it could resist the great nation of Islam. As the Imam has graciously said, the United States has the temerity to think that it could resist the entire world. O Iranian nation, from this nidus of espionage and the centre of US plots your sons have proclaimed your demand, O heroic people, to this barbarous beast of prey and have often said that the United States should return to Iran the deposed and traitorous Shah. This is quite clear and does not need any negotiation whatsoever.

Today, however, we have learned from the official agencies that the archcriminal Carter is feverishly striving in order to extricate himself from this political impasse which has come about following the great Iranian nation's revolutionary wrath for the extradition of the deposed Shah and following the occupation of the US spies' plotting centre. Toward this end, the two US Senators, [as heard] Ramsey Clark and William Miller, are to negotiate officially with the Iranian authorities and the religious leaders about the condition of the hostages and Iranian-US relations. It is incredible that Carter and his hateful agents are still planning to find out about the hostages and Iran's relations through negotiations. Have not Carter and the world-devouring US big shots learned a lesson from the Iranian revolution and the fall of the 2,500-year-old Shah's empire at the hands of the Iranian nation, led by the Imam Khomeini? And have our resolute demand is for the extradition of the traitorous Shah? Are we forgetting that all the US agents are among the worst anti-God and anti-people criminals and that their solutions whatever they may be, will ultimately culminate in blood-sucking and cannibalism, let alone the fact that this mission has been entrusted to the filthiest individuals, that is, William Miller, the high-ranking member of the US Zionist senate's counterintelligence [as heard] committee, and Ramsey Clark, the former US attorney-general? Moreover, with whom do they wish to enter into negotiations? Is it to be with the great leader of the revolution, the Imam Khomeini? How strange and what a shallow thought. Do they not know what the spirit of God [Ruhollah, part of Khomeini's name, means spirit of God] means? Do they not know that the Imam is the universal conscience of the nation who, inspired by the monotheistic school of the apostles, is not prepared to have talks with any traitorous big shot?

Then who else is left? Could they possibly wish to have talks with the chairman of the Revolution Council? How will the chairman of the Revolution Council then answer the nation? This is the nation that did not forgive the former prime minister for his meeting with one of these very criminals. How then could it forgive the chairman of the Revolution Council for such a scandalous meeting? Never. What need is there for such negotiations? Is not the Iranian nation's demand clear to Carter? How preposterous to expect such from evil thoughts and malevolence.

You criminals, we sharply warn you to give up plotting and political games. Our nation's demand is very clear. That is, the extradition of the traitorous Shah.

[Signed] The Muslim student followers of the course of the Imam.

22. Khomeini's Refusal To Deal With US Commended

LD091242 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1030 GMT, 9 Nov. 79 LD.

[Station commentary.]

[Text] The Iranian nation has once again seen his word proceeding from the mouth of the Imam. The Imam rejected the possibility of any kind of negotiations with Carter's envoys and firmly in a command, in which no ambiguity or forgiveness [eghmaz] could be discerned, banned all meetings or talks between Iranian officials and US envoys. A man who, relying on the Muslim Iranian nation and after 16 years of relentless struggle, has brought down one of the greatest despots of world history from the throne of a reign of execution—a man who has always been and continues to be conscious of the oppressed people of the world, a man who derives his strength from millions of faithful and committed Iranians, a man who is one of the descendants of the most noble and the most modest men of history [the prophet] has once again, by his decisive word, rendered null and void all the plans of the mercenary politicians of the world. The Imam, who only yesterday in his simple room in Qom told a group of Iranian youngsters with sincerity: I am your servant, has declared that he would never receive the envoys of the US President.

Here is a man standing fast who does not give a dime for the political games, a man who wrested the most important bastion of this superpower from the claws of the most bloodthirsty character of history and entrusted it to the Iranian people. The restoration of the Iranian people's sovereignty over their destiny is the Imam's gift to Iran's sons, and it is for this reason that when the Imam speaks it is the people's word which proceeds from the mouth of the Imam.

America's blind and wild diplomacy has once again resorted to a ludicrous game which only proves the giddiness and the panic of American politicians. Carter has dispatched two envoys to Iran to resolve with the Imam the issue of the occupation of the US Embassy. American diplomacy is blind because it cannot see that the Imam is a manifestation of the deep-rooted and profound hatred of the people who have suffered the severest blows from bloodthirsty America. American diplomacy is wild because it does not realize that the word of the Imam is the word of 36 million Iranians. America's diplomacy is panic-stricken because it has yet to realize that the Imam is absolutely firm in the message that until the deposed Shah of Iran has been extradited he will not negotiate with American envoys.

23. Ayatollah Beheshti Interview

LD111401 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1030 GMT, 11 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] According to AFP, Ayatollah Beheshti, a member of the Iranian Revolution Council, revealed in an interview with *Newsweek*, which is published in New York: We will try to avoid killing the staff of the US Embassy in Tehran. Ayatollah Beheshti then stressed that talks concerning the release of the American hostages will start only when the deposed Shah is returned to Iran. He pointed out that the United States has become Iran's biggest enemy by accepting the Shah and therefore should have expected such a reaction from Tehran.

In the interview, Ayatollah Beheshti warned the United States against any form of resorting to force for the release of the American hostages and added: In such a case, all relations would be severed for a long time, perhaps forever.

Ayatollah Beheshti said in conclusion: The Revolution Council has issued no orders to the Iranian students concerning the occupation of the US Embassy. He then stressed that the possibility of cutting oil supplies to the United States still exists.

24. Bani-Sadr Letter to Waldheim

LD131518 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1030 GMT, 13 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] Mr. Abolhasan Bani-Sadr, supervisor of our country's Foreign Ministry, has described in an open letter addressed to Mr. Kurt Waldheim, United Nations Secretary-General, the causes and factors leading to the current crisis between Iran and the United States. In his letter addressed to the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Bani-Sadr says:

Dear Secretary-General, your proposal to come to Iran gives me an opportunity, through you, to draw the attention of the representatives of world countries in the United Nations to a fact which the US Government is trying in any way possible to keep US and world public opinion ignorant of, that is, that Iran is a country which, since the coup d'état of 1953 until the fall of the Shah's régime, has under the direct administration of the US Government gone a long way toward political, economic, social and cultural decline. Our people's awareness saw that the time of collapse was approaching, and with their revolution they diverted the course to death to a course toward life.

There are hundreds of documents and evidence proving the continued administration of the country by the United States under cover of the former Shah's reign. From among all these I would remind you of the memoirs of

Eisenhower, US President at the time; Dulles, director of the terrible CIA at the time; of the CIA agents and of Eden, the British prime minister. Eisenhower refers to a change in the Iranian people's psychology—from being determined to becoming hesitant—as a deciding factor in the success of the CIA coup d'état against the legal government of Dr. Mosaddeq. In these crucial days the US Government is once again trying very hard, in connection with a crisis which it itself has precipitated, to create war hysteria in the United States and all the West.

What has happened? Why is it that the United States is hiding the truth from its own public? When have our people wanted to humiliate the great American nation or hurt its pride? It is being said, and they are quoting US officials in this, that US public opinion has been provoked and excited far more than at the time when the United States entered World War II. In the past, too, the history of man has witnessed many great calamities which resulted from similar provocations. This time the availability of mass media has made it possible to make provocation effective with unprecedented speed, and on an unprecedented scale. It is amazing that Iranians and our consulates are attacked in the United States; Iranians are arrested and deported; and the US Government not only takes no action to prevent such behaviour but it itself also embarks on military and economic measures.

Mr. Secretary-General, I believe that you also have no doubt that, having created the present atmosphere, the United States would have no objection to waging any kind of war. In other words, the US Government has created the psychological atmosphere for waging such a war. What does the US Government need from such a war? Why did this Government not heed our warnings at the time, and why did it allow the former Shah into its country? Now that we have requested his extradition, why is it that the US Government makes this legitimate request look in the eyes of the American nation as if the Iranian nation wants to humiliate America? Apart from the Nuremberg court, are there not dozens of cases of extradition of criminals, particularly criminals whose extradition has been demanded by the nation?

Mr. Secretary-General, now that censorship exists in a country which claims to be democratic and the American nation is not allowed to hear the voice of truth, you should echo this voice in the world. We do not ask if the US chief executive had plundered the riches of that country, brought them to Iran and kept them in Iranian banks, if the American chief executive had ordered troops to fire on the people and on a day such as 5 June 1978 had killed several thousand people; and if in answer to the question of whether he had ordered the shooting he had replied in the affirmative and had said he was proud of it; if he had turned prisons into a place for execution or torture; if in the last year of his rule he had embarked on massacres in all the cities of the country and then had come to Iran; if the US chief executive had made himself a protected person under the Iranian Government and had put the control of the US Army, the political police, the economy and the legislative apparatus and so forth in the hands of that government, and if he had then fled to Iran or were brought to Iran—would the American nation have accepted that the extradition of the criminal, treacherous and corrupt chief executive would hurt our national pride?

Mr. Secretary-General, is not the American Government guilty? Through false propaganda America wishes in the [word indistinct] of human civilization to arouse a nation in support of an international criminal. Is it right in your view if it is recorded in history that a government like the American Government with the aid of a propaganda machine succeeded in making a great nation turn against an oppressed nation—to say more properly, against all oppressed nations—and side with an international criminal?

Does the true prestige and pride of the American nation not consist of defending the rights of oppressed humanity? Every free conscience and, of course, every aware conscience expects the American nation to arise united and

impeach its Government because it has allowed the agent for the murder of the Iranian people, the agent for the decadence of the region and the agent of corruption and plunder to set foot on American soil.

The expectation of the secret conscience of the civilized humanity was that you, personally, and international organizations and leading religious, political and scientific personalities would impeach the American Government. Do not hesitate to believe that our nation by no means intends to take revenge on one person. We wish to elevate the spirituality of the oppressed humanity.

Mr. Secretary-General: Rest assured that if the American Government had not tried to humiliate our nation and did not even reject the legal prosecution of those people who have committed many crimes against this nation and if it admitted its guilt in supporting the bloodthirsty, tyrannical, illegal and destructive government, the two nations of Iran and the United States would now enjoy the best of relations with each other.

Now you are proposing to come to Iran. The problem and its solution is to be found in the United States. As soon as the American Government admits the elementary right of a nation and thus tries to compensate for the humiliation which it has afflicted upon our nation, the problem will be automatically solved.

Mr. Secretary-General: I believe that you agree with me that daily increasing incitement is not the proper solution to the crisis in whose creation we have had not the slightest share. The American Government, which in the past spoke so vehemently against the use of the oil weapon, last night decided not to purchase Iranian oil, and Mr. Carter asked the countries which buy Iranian oil to follow America's example.

Do you not think that the people in Muslim countries, whose oil is placed at the disposal of industrialized countries for a pittance, would use this opportunity to show their dissatisfaction and anger and that the general cutoff of oil would turn this crisis into a world crisis?

Mr. Secretary-General, due to my own socialized scientific research, I know full well that the sick American economy and the unstable situation of the dollar have inflicted a severe political and economic crisis on the American Government. Does America really wish to stabilize the position of the dollar at the price of endangering world peace? In that case, is your duty as United Nations Secretary-General to come to Iran or to take some steps in relation to the American Government? Let us hope that you will accept the legitimate demand of a nation which does not wish to be humiliated.

Our nations have nothing to lose except their locks and chains and their poverty, but your heavy responsibility demands that, at any price, you will prevent an atmosphere of war from casting its shadows over the world. Our proposal is simple and very practical. The American Government should, at least, accept the investigation of the guilt of the former Shah of Iran and its consequences. The American Government should return to the Iranian Government the wealth and property which the Shah, his family and the leaders of the former régime have transferred to the United States. Are these two proposals not just, and are they not in the interest of the spiritual elevation of the American nation and all humanity?

Bearing in mind that the American Government is immersing the world in a climate of war and the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran sees its own peace and the peace of the region and of the whole world endangered, it requests the convening of a session of the Security Council. We hope and expect that the respected United Nations Secretary-General will support the legitimate demands of a nation vis-à-vis the American Government and will insure that the Government will renounce its hostile attitude and accept our rightful demand. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran is grateful for the steps which you may take.

With friendly feelings. [Signed] Abolhasan Bani-Sadr.

25. Gotbzadeh Press Conference

LD131338 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1118 GMT, 13 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] Sadeq Gotbzadeh, supervisor of the Voice and Profile of the Islamic Republic of Iran, held a press conference with Iranian and foreign reporters today.

During this interview, which took place in the radio and television headquarters, Gotbzadeh answered various questions from the reports about the occupation of the US Embassy by the Muslim student followers of the Imam's policy, and the oil embargo imposed by Iran on the United States.

Here are parts of this interview: [begin recording].

[Question] Mr. Gotbzadeh: In your press conference today you have spoken of power. That is, you have not spoken as the supervisor of the Voice and Profile of the Islamic Republic. It is therefore surmised that you are included in the new combination [as heard] of the Revolution Council. Is this true?

[Answer] There is enough power attached to the post of supervisor of the Voice and Profile of the Islamic Republic of Iran, so I do not have to speak as a member of the Revolution Council. I spoke of [words indistinct] in connection with the action and feelings of the people of Iran toward US imperialism. Even if I had no position, I would say the same.

The Revolution Council will make an announcement in the next 48 hours about my part in the council. Naturally, there can be no confirmation or denial until then.

[Question] About the decision of the Iranian Government on the oil embargo on the United States: It is rumoured that the United States has boycotted Iranian oil, and the council reached its decision after the decision by the United States. Is this not so?

[Answer] No, it is not like that. A few days ago, Mr. Mo'infar, the oil minister, did all the necessary research about the possibility of cutting off oil exports to the United States. Naturally, the news about it was circulating. He later reported this to the Revolution Council.

The decision of the Revolution Council on this was that it should be implemented in two stages. As we are a member of OPEC it was agreed that Mr. Mo'infar should first announce this decision by the Iranian Government to the oil ministers of these countries—so that they would not say that they did not know—and then it should be announced to the world.

Then, Mr. Carter announced this decision—he knew what we were doing—in order to take advantage of this situation and to [words indistinct] the US public opinion.

In any case, we have a mutual problem: We do not want to sell oil and they do not want to buy. Therefore, there is no cause for anxiety.

[Question] Do you not suppose that the buyers of Iranian oil might export the oil to the United States?

[Answer] No. We will stop this; guarantees can be obtained. Of course, the question of Iranian oil going to the United States is not [as heard] and they know that there is no [word indistinct] for us this way.

They want to involve other countries in this—they know very well that Muslim countries will most likely take our side on this issue and oil exports to the world might be interrupted—and thus, the United States might be rescued from this severe crisis.

We believe that taking the Shah to the United States was done mainly for this purpose [as heard]. They knew what the reaction of the Iranian nation would be and wanted to take advantage of it.

Obviously, you might say that we are thus helping them. No, whatever step we take on this issue is to our benefit because we must once and for all cure this inferiority complex that the oppressed people of the world have concerning the invincibility of America.

Our action has so far proved two or three points at least: The Iranian nation is conscious of and clearly recognizes its real enemy in US imperialism and international Zionism and does not fear any event in taking a decisive and prompt stand. These elements that are of the utmost importance to us have given the nation decisiveness, alertness and strength during this event and have caused the nation to change; this is the greatest [word indistinct] that we have so far achieved. This, God willing, will [word indistinct].

[Question] During your press conference today, one of the reporters asked why the people and also the Government did not take a particular stand for the extradition of the Shah when he was in Mexico?

[Answer] That the Shah should live or die in any part of the world is one point. The other is that the germ of corruption and destruction which dragged our country into fire and bloodshed in the past 25 years has openly decided to insult the will, the feelings and the revolution of the people. This is what caused that natural reaction of the people. He was in Mexico and in Egypt, but the issue was not the same. This is the basic reason.

[Question] How do you see relations between Iran and the USSR, considering the current issue of Iran and the United States? Are we going to utilize Eastern technology in the future?

[Answer] We will have friendly relations based on mutual respect and the absence of exploitation with any country that is so inclined. We declare, once and for all, that we will not grant the tiniest unwarranted concession to anyone lest it should harm our political and economic independence in the slightest way. That is why while the Revolution Council cancelled the Iranian-US bilateral treaty—in the middle of the present crisis—it cancelled the [contracts for the purchase of] materials that would have led to the possibility of Soviet interference in Iran. This, therefore, clearly reveals the manner of our independence with regard to the world powers.

[Question] Do you not suppose that major industrial countries might follow the United States and refrain from buying our oil?

[Answer] First, no. Second, let them. We should be prepared to die so that we may live. Therefore, we are not in any way worried that we will be able to carry out this true fasting with the utmost strength for some time, and that victory will be ours with every step. There is not the slightest doubt on this point.

[Question] The Imam said that none of the members of the Revolution Council are permitted to hold talks with any US official. How do you suppose then that the extradition of the Shah will be accomplished? Do you have any special terms?

[Answer] All the reporters have been asking this question—which was answered. How can the extradition of the deposed Shah come about? Is he simply to be placed on a plane? Maybe this is practically possible. For this to be made possible, the Revolution Council has made three basic conditions:

First: Official US acceptance that there is a possibility that this person has committed a crime. That is not so difficult because everybody knows that during the last year of his reign he killed at least 65,000 people.

Second: An international team of our choosing should interrogate him and compile a dossier, so that he could be tried in a competent Iranian court.

Third: All the possessions that he and his filthy family have taken out of Iran belong to the Iranian nation and must be returned.

26. Student Leader Says Hostages Will Die If Troops Sent

LD161337 Copenhagen *Aktuelt* in Danish, 13 Nov. 79, p. 3 LD.

[Torben Andersen report "We Will Kill the Hostages if the United States Attacks."]

[Excerpt] "If the United States sends in its combat troops, we will kill all the hostages. That is the people's duty and we are all ready to die for it."

Yesterday afternoon *Aktuell* managed to make contact with a leader of the students who have occupied the US Embassy in Tehran and who hold 59 hostages, including 1 Italian.

The student refused to give his name. "I am a Muslim student and a follower of Khomeini." Calmly and steadily he described the situation in the US Embassy. He wanted very much to emphasize that all the hostages are well. Nobody is ill and all are receiving the necessary amount of food. "But our patience is running out", he said. "The Shah's alleged illness is a trick and today the committee will decide how long our patience will last."

[Question] What will happen when patience runs out?

[Answer] That is something I cannot disclose.

[Question] Several European newspapers maintain that you have mistreated the hostages.

[Answer] That is a lie. Everybody is fine and treated as well as circumstances permit.

[Question] What will happen to the Shah if he is handed over to you?

[Answer] He will be tried and then killed. He is Islam's chief enemy. If he dies in the United States it will be the work of the CIA. The only thing that can halt our occupation of the embassy is for the Shah to be handed over now! We will not negotiate with the United States or any mediators. The Americans know our ultimatum—the handing over of the Shah.

[Question] Could not the situation culminate in war against the United States?

[Answer] No, the entire world supports us in our legitimate demands to have the Shah extradited [answer ends].

The telephone interview with the US Embassy in Tehran was then cut off.

27. Military Personnel March

GF140730 [Editorial Report GF] Tehran Domestic Television Service in Persian at 1700 GMT on 13 November, relayed by Abadan, reports that "Army Green Berets and navy personnel of Iran's Islamic Republic, during a march in front of the US 'espionage nest' today, declared their support and readiness to sacrifice for the revolutionary and anti-imperialistic goals of Imam Khomeini, leader of Iran's Islamic revolution, and the Student Followers of the Imam's Policy". The Green Berets, the announcer adds, declared readiness "to fight in any and all parts of the world against US imperialism".

"Greeted warmly and passionately by the crowds gathered and stationed around the embassy, the representatives of the Green Berets, during their announcement of support for the Islamic students, stated that if the Imam should wish and so order, they were prepared to take over the responsibility of guarding and protecting the US 'espionage nest'. Soldiers who were being carried on demonstrators' shoulders said that our youth may rest assured in the certainty that the United States cannot take any irresponsible action against Iran."

At this point the announcer draws viewers' attention to certain scenes of the demonstration by army and navy personnel. The following slogans are heard chanted by demonstration leaders and are repeated several times by the crowd: "This Carter must be killed." "God is almighty." "Death to America." This last slogan is repeated at least a dozen times.

An unidentified speaker is heard delivering a short speech that includes: "Greetings to these brave compatriots who have once again discovered the conspiracies and plots of this world-devouring imperialism and its espionage nest and destroyed it in its womb." Once again slogans are uttered by leaders and the crowd is heard shouting them over and over: "Death to America." "Greetings to armed forces brothers." "Armed forces brothers, may God

protect you all." "Death, death to your bloodthirsty enemy." "Greetings to our Green Beret brothers." "Islam is victorious, America will be annihilated." "Khomeini is victorious, Carter is destroyed." "Khomeini is proud, Carter is shaking."

28. Bani-Sadr on Demands

LD142004 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1630 GMT, 14 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] According to a central news bureau report, Abolhasan Bani-Sadr, the supervisor of the Foreign Ministry, today took part in a press, radio and television conference at noon, attended by domestic and foreign correspondents.

He answered questions put to him and explained Iran's foreign policy and its policy with regard to the deposed Shah. Bani-Sadr said: The Iranian Foreign Ministry's foreign policy is to explain the Iranian revolution to the people of the world and prepare the ground for the victory of the Islamic revolution. He added: We are trying to draw the attention of world public opinion to the US attitude during the past 25 years in Iran, as well as to explain our particular legitimacy. Mr. Bani-Sadr continued: We have no intention of cutting off the export of oil to the rest of the world or of exerting pressure on the industrialized countries. We wish to live in peace in the world and have no intention of threatening the United States. It is the United States that, despite all its claims in opposing the use of oil as a weapon, has used this very same weapon and banned the imports of our oil. This shows that in the hands of the US administration the law is a tool which it uses whenever it wishes for its own interest and against others, whereas this practice is contrary to the interest of humanity. What we want is respect for man's integrity and honour in the world.

In another part of his remarks, Bani-Sadr said: The banning of oil by the United States does not bother us: there are other countries prepared to purchase our oil. Nevertheless, we do not insist in selling our oil in great quantities. Our nation is prepared to tolerate all hardships.

Commenting on the possibility of other countries joining the United States in banning the purchase of oil from Iran, Bani-Sadr said: This is impossible; however, we are not going to adopt a careless attitude. We have taken the necessary steps; our brother workers in the oil-producing countries are with us and should such a thing occur, then a world crisis will result.

Referring to the possibility of US military intervention, he said: We have received certain reports about the landing of US paratroopers in Kuwait and US military air deployments. Regarding this, we have notified the Muslim countries and governments that these crises are transitory, but what remains is that the area's nations ought to live with each other, and that it would not serve their interests to pursue a policy during such crises which might not be compensated later.

In another part of his remarks, Bani-Sadr said: Certain individuals have been assigned to study the agreements and documents concerning Iran and the United States. These documents will be published in the near future in pamphlets.

A foreign correspondent then asked: The US administration is in direct contact with the students in the embassy. Do you not think that the United States might reach an agreement with these students, thus bypassing you?

Mr. Bani-Sadr replied: If the US administration manages to persuade the students and the Iranian people to withdraw their request, then we will not do anything contrary to the will of the nation.

Our country's foreign minister [as heard] also said: The US Government is not showing any good will in this case; the existing total censorship applied by the US press with regard to facts about Iran owes itself to the US Government's attitude. He added: Our tools under the present circumstances are the mass media. You correspondents must bear in mind that there can be no compromise

between reporting facts and personal interests. We hope that you may always bear in mind the human issue. Bani-Sadr was then asked about Iran's policy toward Afghanistan and the consequences of the Iranian revolution in other countries.

He pointed out: We have a joint history with Afghanistan. The peoples of the two countries share the same religion and culture; therefore, we cannot witness any interference in our neighbourhood and remain idle about a policy which imposes a régime through inappropriate and forced policies. If independence is good, then we must wish it for everyone. We do not consider such issues as internal ones anywhere in the world. Consequently, ours is not a revolution which could be confined within borders. Whether we want it or not, what ought to be learned is that contemporary man will learn from this revolution.

The supervisor of the Foreign Ministry, Bani-Sadr, today answered correspondents' questions about Iran's foreign policy: [begin recording].

[Unidentified correspondent] Mr. Bani-Sadr, yesterday you rejected a US proposal in connection with the Shah's extradition, the return of his wealth and his trial in a court. Could you please explain why?

[Answer] What the United States said was that he would be deported; it did not say it would return him to us. Otherwise, this would be what we are asking. Therefore, if it returns him we will accept this. We even said that his crimes should be investigated, and the United States should accept the outcome, which means returning him to Iran.

[Unidentified correspondent] You have written two (letters) making certain proposals. Moreover, in the course of the past couple of days, certain other proposals have been made by the United States. Does this show that you have moderated your request, that you no longer demand the Shah's return?

[Answer] No, we have not moderated our demands [words indistinct]. We said that since there is no doubt of the deposed Shah's crimes, a team should investigate the case. Once it is proved that the Shah is guilty then the US Government should accept the verdict; that is, it should return the Shah to us.

[Unidentified correspondent] Certain countries, like Canada and Mexico, have closed their embassies in Iran. What do you think is the reason?

[Answer] Some embassies were under the impression that they have no security. I take this opportunity to call on my compatriots to treat foreign nationals residing in Iran with utmost good will, friendship and kindness, so that other countries may have no excuse whatsoever to turn this crisis into a world crisis. They were uneasy about this situation. Some of the countries were concerned, but their anxieties have been removed, and they reopened their embassies as of today. I hope the situation will improve further in the future.

[Unidentified correspondent] The United States has only called on students with student visas to report to the immigration office, having excluded those not having student visas. Why do you think this is so?

[Answer] This is some sort of pressure applied by the US Government. In my message addressed to Iranian students and Iranians living abroad, I asked them to stay where they are and put up with the difficulties.

29. Revolution Council Addresses People

LD151408 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1030 GMT, 15 Nov. 79 LD.
[Statement issued by the Central Committee of the Islamic revolution—read by announcer.]

[Text] In his exalted name. At this crucial moment when the den of American espionage has been occupied by the Student Followers of the Imam's Policy and when the Iranian nation has risen to liberate itself from the domination of the East and West, America and its puppet agents are planning to provoke naive and emotional youngsters to occupy other centres, such as the Vatican Embassy,

and thus provoke the sentiments of their Christian brothers against the Muslim Iranian nation. This is to warn the Iranian nation, particularly the younger generation, and seriously to call upon the people to preserve law and order and not to allow themselves to become a tool in the hands of counterrevolutionary elements and a handful of hirelings. Needless to say, the revolution guards and security forces will vigorously prevent any counterrevolutionary action and traitorous provocations.

30. Student Statement No. 37

LD171116 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1053 GMT, 17 Nov. 79 LD.
[Statement No. 37 issued by the Student Followers of the Imam's Policy stationed in the "den of American espionage"—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. Greetings to the valiant Iranian nation. As we have always declared in our announcements, we are only a drop in the tumultuous ocean of the Muslim community and in this great divine movement which has come into being among the Muslim nation and our only endeavour is to be able to remain steadfast in following the illustrious leader of this revolution.

This is why we have always said and will say that any decision concerning the hostages and also this centre of espionage and conspiracy rests with the nation, which finds expression in the utterances of the Imam. Therefore, following the orders of the great leader of the revolution, Imam Khomeini, about releasing the women and the blacks who are among the hostages and whose acts of espionage have not been proved, we have acted immediately and according to the orders of the Imam. Those individuals whose acts of espionage have not been proved will be handed over to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs so that they may be expelled from the country. At the same time, we shall announce the message of honour, freedom, independence and humanity of you dear nation, which is the message of Islam, through them to the people of the world, especially American women and blacks.

The rest of the hostages and the premises of the centre of espionage, as ordered by the Imam, will be at the disposal of you, valiant nation, until the return of Mohammad Reza Pahlavi and the return of all that he has plundered from this nation.

[Signed] The Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Policy.

31. Khomeini Interview on Hostages

LD181800 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1630 GMT, 18 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] Imam Khomeini, the leader of the Islamic revolution of Iran, today received correspondents of American television's CBS, ABC and NBC networks separately for an interview. At the outset of the news bulletin of the Voice of the Iranian Islamic Republic tonight we draw your attention to sections of the Imam's interview with the correspondents of the American ABC and NBC networks. [Begin recording in English with translation of the question into Persian, followed by Khomeini's recorded answers.]

[Question] (As you know) you are holding hostages at the American Embassy in Tehran in contradiction of all international provisions. Would you release the hostages? Would you release the hostages and when would you release the hostages?

[Answer] Do international conventions provide for the sending of spies into a country in the name of an ambassador or a chargé d'affaires or not? Or should there be ambassadors who do not want to commit treachery against a country, spy against a country, who do not want to set up the apparatus of a régime? It is this kind of people whom it would be wrong to take as hostages. But what our nation has done is to arrest a bunch of spies, who, according to the norms,

should be investigated, tried and treated in accordance with our own laws. As for what Carter has done, it is contrary to international laws; for a criminal—a criminal who has acted against a country—should come to the country concerned and be tried. No country is entitled to give sanctuary to a criminal and keep him there contrary to international norms. It is Carter who has acted against international norms, not us.

[*Question*] Mr. Carter has clearly stated that he will not return the Shah to Iran. On the other hand, the diplomats and their families are terribly upset about the situation. Is there any room for negotiation?

[*Answer*] Until he returns this criminal, and as long as Mr. Carter fails to respect international laws, we cannot return these spies. Even if we return these spies after the Shah has come, it will be because we have been lenient. Otherwise, they should be tried and be dealt with here in accordance with our laws.

[*Question*] My other question was [words indistinct] is what the Ayatollah is saying is the only condition is that the Shah be returned to Iran before the hostages are released. Is this your only condition?

[*Answer*] The only condition lies in the return of the Shah, and this is because we are being lenient toward them.

[*Question*] The United States and Iran are involved in an economic and political war, which is escalating every day. And the Ayatollah still refuses to see any representatives whatsoever of President Carter. Why?

[*Answer*] This is an economic and political war that Mr. Carter has brought about, and we are afraid neither of his political war nor of his economic war. For we believe, rather, that the political war will certainly be harmful to America and the economic war will not harm us. Nevertheless, until the Shah is returned, until the criminal is returned to us, and until Carter bows to international laws, we cannot find a way for negotiations.

[*Question*] [Words indistinct] has been reported as saying that it is not in the interest of Iran to have relations with the United States at all. Is it possible that at some point you will simply break all relations with the United States then [words indistinct] including the hostages and end the matter with the United States?

[*Answer*] It is possible, but this has to be studied. The relations that we have had with the United States up to now, and the kind of embassy that America has had in Iran, are not acceptable. But, if this spying den is transformed into a proper embassy and if the kind of relations the United States had with the former régime ceases to exist, and if we feel it suitable that some of relations be maintained, then I do not see any reason why relations cannot be maintained.

[*Translator interrupts*] What he really wants to know is whether or not the hostages will be returned if relations between Iran and America are severed?

[*Answer*] We should investigate and find out if the hostages are diplomats or people who came here to spy. We cannot return spies and there are no conditions of relations which say that spies should be returned. But if they are proved to be diplomats, and if relations are severed, then there will not be any objections [as heard].

[*Question*] Imam, would you be willing to meet President Carter personally? [Words indistinct] your persuasion on him, and if your answer is yes, would you be willing to meet him in a third country, say France, where you spent part of your own exile?

[*Answer*] Such a meeting would not affect the issue. If Mr. Carter wants to make us step down from our demands—from demanding the return of that criminal, something that he should do according to international regulations—it is out of the question. If the Shah is returned, then there will be no point in our meeting. Therefore, I am not willing to meet him.

[*Question*] I have talked to many of the people in front of the embassy. People and students assure me that whatever happens the American hostages will never be killed. Will you give us that same assurance?

[Answer] The issue is no doubt as they put it, and so long as the hostages are there, they are sheltered by Islam and they will not be harmed. They will be staying there enjoying complete ease. When our criminal is returned—although according to regulations we should try those who are being kept in the embassy—we are prepared to grant them a degree of concession and we will return them.

[Question] Do I take it that the answer is yes and that they will never be killed under any circumstances?

[Translator—in English] No, not under any circumstances. They should be tried and if the Shah is not coming back . . . [here the translator turns to the Ayatollah and explains the point in Persian]. Your Eminence, there is a delicate point here. If the Shah is not returned, naturally, as you have indicated before, they will definitely be tried.

[Answer] If this is prolonged, they will definitely be tried.

[Translator—in Persian] Then whatever the court decides will be acted upon. Is that so?

[Answer] Yes.

32. CBS Interview With Khomeini

LD191056 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1820 GMT, 18 Nov. 79 LD.

[Interview granted by Ayatollah Khomeini, leader of the Iranian Revolution, to a CBS Television correspondent in Qom on 18 November—recorded; questions in English followed by Persian translation; questions are transcribed from the English unless otherwise indicated.]

[Text] [passage indistinct] [Khomeini] Yes, there is no objection. But I ask them not to distort my words. Some people have come here for interviews and distorted our words and added some lies as well. This is against the morality of news reporting, and I ask of you that these words should be broadcast accurately, without any tampering and without your interference.

[Question] Imam, I understand perfectly what you are saying and I feel confident that when you see the result of what is broadcast in the United States you will be well satisfied. I thank you for receiving us and I hope that your cold is better. It is my understanding, Imam, that you have seen the questions that we intend to ask. There may be one or two follow-up questions in regard to your answers, but basically there will be no surprises. You know what we want to know and the world is, actually, the world is waiting for your answers, Imam, because the answers are of very great importance to your country, to my country and to the world at large.

Do you still say, Imam, that if the Shah, the former Shah, is not returned to Iran that those American hostages in the American Embassy compound will not be freed?

[Answer] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. This issue depends on the nation; this is the wish of our nation of 35 million, and we ought to consider why our nation wants the Shah's return and the hostages not to be released until the Shah returns. And why does Carter insist so much on keeping the Shah? As to the question of why our nation insists, the issue is not simply that the Shah should come to Iran; our nation regards the Shah as its enemy. What will it do with him? He is not a gift for our nation merely to keep here.

There are two aspects to our nation wanting the Shah to come here on which we insist, and one of these aspects is of greater importance than the other. One aspect is this: We are a nation whose economy is not very strong at the moment and a great deal of Iran's wealth is in the hands of the deposed Shah and his relatives which is accumulated in US and other countries banks, and all of it is the property of the nation. The reason we insist on the Shah's return is to ascertain the whereabouts of the property of the destitute which is in his hands

and in the hands of his agents, where it is and how it can be returned to the nation.

Another point which is even more important is that we want his return so that we can dig out the roots of the crimes this person committed over nearly 37 years in Iran, the treacheries he has done to Iran, the massacres he has committed; we want to find out on whose orders they were committed. When a person rules a country, he does not commit so many crimes without reason; he was an agent for others. He himself also said: I was on a mission to my country. We want to find the ones who ordered him to commit all these crimes in his homeland, to find out who they are. For this reason, our nation insists that this man must come and these two points should be established at a trial; whatever the court orders will be acted upon.

As for Carter's insistence that he should not return, we ought to see whether it is because Mr. Carter is a humanist, and whether it is Mr. Carter's altruism that makes him so insistent, and makes him confront the Islamic nation, intimidate it, and cause all these issues to arise and put the region in danger. Is it because of his altruism? We can see no trace of such altruism in Mr. Carter, for it is clear from his actions that he does not think in this way. It is not altruism if a person keeps a criminal under his protection or causes so much crime and death in so many countries. These are not the acts of a humanist, and he has not done this out of altruism. If he had any idea of altruism, there were 35 million human beings in Iran, one of whom was Mohammed Reza. They were all from the same country and nation. How come all this crime was perpetrated upon us, and so much killing was recently committed by this person? And this was during Mr. Carter's administration, and yet his altruism never even led him to ask this person not to commit all this. According to what we know, not only did he not make such a request but he instigated all this. When he is insistent, and it is clear that it is not because of altruism, then it must be because he does not want his secrets and the secrets of American leaders to be known.

By the Shah's presence here we shall expose the secrets of Carter and his predecessors, and we will show the American nation what sort of president they are dealing with, how these presidents have played havoc with their nation and disgraced their nation among the Muslims. It is for this reason that we want him to come, and Carter wants him not to come for the same reason; his insistence that the Shah not come is because of his fear that secrets may be revealed, for he will not be able to lead a normal life in his own country and his presidency too [words indistinct].

If the American nation is informed of the issues, and the mass media tells it what has happened in this country thanks to the American presidents and other superpower leaders, if it understands this it will not support Carter. I would even say that support for Carter probably comes from a category of people who are under his own supervision, like the support which used to be given to the Shah here, to the deposed Shah. For example, whenever a US president came to Iran, a large number of people would be brought out to welcome him in the name of the nation, whereas the nation never had any proper knowledge of such affairs and was never prepared to welcome the Shah and his guests. But they had large numbers of people who would do these things. Probably Mr. Carter also has a large number of people placed, for instance, in the security organization, and people who are attached to him, and they are the ones who humiliate our students abroad and treat them harshly. Mr. Carter himself, this Mr. Altruist, also treats our students there like this, and causes them to be persecuted, causes dogs to be set on them and other similar crimes; this Mr. Altruist is like that. And we are an oppressed nation; we want the person who was treacherous to us to be investigated, to get to the bottom of what he did.

[Question] But that is not an answer to whether the hostages will be freed.

[Answer] That was an answer. The nation does not want to (?release them).

[Question] Then the hostages will remain there, in the American Embassy compound, what, for life? Forever?

[Answer] They will until the Shah returns. The fate of the hostages is in Carter's hands. These hostages can be released by Carter; when he delivers our criminals to us, we will (release) the hostages.

[Question] And only if Mr. Carter, the President of the United States, returns the Shah, only then will the hostages be freed?

[Answer] [Words indistinct] that is it, that is it [passage indistinct].

[Question] Imam, President Carter accuses your Government of practising terrorism and says that your régime will be held accountable if those US hostages are harmed.

[Answer] A nation of 35 million terrorists? Mr. Carter must be asked whether this is your diagnosis in political matters too. The entire nation of 35 million has supported them, yet they are terrorists? I have noticed that his words, regrettably, were not judicious when he said: They are not students, they are not even tramps, they are terrorists. In your logic, students and tramps are the same; do you regard tramps and hooligans and students as all the same? Is humiliation of students in all the countries of the world not tantamount to this? Do you regard our nation as terrorists? Is your diagnosis in political affairs like this too, to regard our nation as terrorist? You may be assured that our nation is Muslim, and Muslim is not terrorist, and they treat them with complete clemency, better than your treatment of our students abroad. Is your persecution of our students, setting dogs on them, terrorism? Or keeping people in a safe place, which was their own place, where all (?services) are available to them? They have received visitors and we have allowed them to be visited every day. Is this a terrorist act or a humanitarian act? The acts which you commit are the ones that resemble terrorist actions.

[Question] Imam, President as-Sadat of Egypt, a devoutly religious man, a Muslim has said that what you are doing now is a disgrace to Islam, and he calls you, Imam—forgive me, his words, not mine—a lunatic. I know that you have heard that comment. I have heard President as-Sadat say on American television that the Imam is a disgrace to Islam and, in his words, a lunatic.

[Answer] The Islam practised by Anwar as-Sadat is different from that of Muslims. Islam, according to Anwar as-Sadat, comes to terms with contradictions to the essence of Islam. In the Koran it is said: Do not make friends with the enemies of Islam. But he has made friends with Carter and Begin in contradiction of Islam.

It is clear that his words have been interpreted differently by you, since you consider him a devoutly religious man and a proper Muslim. The Koran states that those who make friends with the enemies of Islam are not Muslims. As-Sadat claims to be a Muslim, but together with the enemies of Islam he attacks Muslims. Does Mr. as-Sadat know what Israel is doing in southern Lebanon and what Palestine suffers from this criminal? He makes friends with them and considers himself a Muslim. His words should be judged according to the standards of Islam to ascertain whether he has graced Islam by his actions or not.

The work of our nation should be judged according to Islamic standards to determine whether it has committed treason against Islam and has disgraced Islam. What has been done by as-Sadat, as I have said, and others like him, even his own nation does not agree with, and Muslims have condemned him. But what we have done is as follows: We were a nation under pressure from the United States and other superpowers. Our independence was lost and our freedom was lost. Our resources had been plundered. We rose in order to restore our freedom. We rose to gain our independence. Does Mr. as-Sadat consider a revolution to maintain independence, a revolution to protect Islam, a revolution to realize the Islamic republic, to be against Islam? Does it threaten the honour of Islam for a nation to eliminate the oppressors and the monarchic régime and replace it with an Islamic republic?

When we want to put a criminal on trial, a criminal who has betrayed Islam, betrayed the glorious Koran, betrayed the Muslim nation, is it a threat to the honour of Islam when we want to try him? Or is the person who says: My aircraft is ready to welcome someone—is he traitorous to Islam and the Muslim? Has he betrayed Islam and the honour of Islam, or our nation, which wants to bring this criminal back and put him on trial and expose his crimes and treacheries? It appears that the words Islam and treachery mean something different to Mr. as-Sadat. Therefore they ought to be investigated and each word should correspond to its true meaning.

[*Question*] Then he is a traitor to Islam, as-Sadat?

[*Answer*] He is a traitor to Islam and the Muslims. When he signed the Camp David agreement with Carter and Begin and did so against the interests of the Muslim, this was treason to Islam. The fact that he supports the traitor to the Muslims is treason to Islam and as-Sadat is a traitor to Islam, and the Egyptian nation ought to dismiss this traitor just as we dismissed that other traitor.

[*Question*] He [interviewer presumably addressing interpreter] calls upon the Egyptian people to overthrow as-Sadat the way the Iranian people overthrew the Shah, is that right?

[*Answer indistinct*]

[*Question*] We (?hear), Imam, that today, perhaps today, some black hostages and some female hostages will be released from the American Embassy compound. Is that true? And then there is a follow-up question [words indistinct].

[*Answer*] We have freed women and black hostages because women enjoy special respect in Islam and blacks have been suppressed by the United States and have been subjected to cruelty, and we do not consider them to be so guilty. They might have come here under pressure. Therefore, in order to follow the orders of Islam and God, we have done this, and we do not expect anything from Mr. Carter and we do not want a reward. The only [words indistinct] from Carter is that he should return this criminal to us. All international laws indicate that a person accused of having committed crimes in a country should be returned to that country, and he has acted in contradiction to all principles of logic and international law.

[*Question*] I ask you as an American and a human being, talking to an Iranian and another human being, is there no room for compromise? Or is Iran now in effect at war with the United States? [Persian translation of this question is as follows: You have a holy face, a face of someone caring about the people, as it were. As a human being I only hope, I pray, that, God forbid, there should not be any harm done to relations between the two countries, or something extraordinary to arise.]

[*Answer*] I, too, pray to God that Carter will bear in mind his country's interests and those of our country and return the criminal to our country. Once this is done, there will automatically be no problems.

[*Question—transcribed from Persian translation as English is indistinct*] I have met your grandchildren here, I, too, have children and grandchildren. Truly and from the bottom of my heart I hope there will not be any trouble.

[*Answer indistinct*]

[*Question*] Imam, are you or is Iran in effect at war with the United States now?

[*Answer*] War? What is meant by this? If it means that the Iranian military is engaged in a war with the US military, this is not so. If it is a question of a war of nerves, Mr. Carter has brought about a war of nerves. We always avoid any form of war; we are a Muslim nation and believe in peace for all nations. It is Mr. Carter who does not allow peace to exist. The continuation of this peace for us and for the American nation and for the nations of the region requires that Mr. Carter set aside his humanitarianism a little bit, give back the Shah, who has committed all kinds of crimes, so that our problems will be solved.

They should turn the den of espionage they have set up here into a humane establishment, not an apparatus for ruling a nation, not an apparatus of espionage for a nation. These are the two problems we have, and if these problems are solved there will be no problem. We do not oppose or quarrel with the American nation. The American nation is the same to us as other nations. We are at peace with all nations. But if Mr. Carter wants something to take place which could lead to that situation, we shall deal with that as well.

[Question] But if the President says he refused to return the Shah, and if the Imam says he will not free the hostages, then what can be the answer?

[Interpreter] This question is not included in the list of questions provided.

[Answer] I will not answer the question, and I will not even listen to it.

[Question] If the Imam is so convinced that the US Embassy was a spy setup, why did he not close it down and break off relations with the United States; why did he wait for this group of young Iranians to take it over?

[Answer] We never even considered the possibility of an embassy being a centre of espionage. If our young people considered this possibility when they went there, that is different from what I imagined to be possible. I did not consider it possible that the United States would act contrary to all international regulations and turn that place into a centre of espionage and conspiracy and a centre for governing the nation. Now, since our young people went there—and they might have gone there with these possibilities in mind, although I did not know what they were—and have been supported by all our nation, only now have we realized the significance of this matter and now we will close down this centre of espionage.

So long as Carter is in charge of affairs I do not think that we will be able to co-operate with the US Government.

[Question] As long as Carter is in office, the Imam is not sure. But Carter is going to be president for at least another year.

[Answer] The question of relations is really up to the Government. Whenever we deem it right to sever relations and the Government also deems it right, then this will be done.

[Question] Is that under consideration?

[Answer] It is being considered.

[Question] It is under consideration that Iran will cut off relations totally with the United States?

[Answer] Yes [passage indistinct].

[Question] Back in 1976, Imam, at the Niavaran Palace, I interviewed the Shah and read to him from a psychological profile that the CIA had drawn of him. In it the CIA [word indistinct] the Shah a brilliant but dangerous megalomaniac. Just this past week, in the *New York Times*, several analysts and psychologists talked about you and one said: the spirit of revenge is very deep within the Ayatollah. I wonder if you would comment on that.

[Answer] These psychiatrists talk without considering the matter, they do not talk politically. They talk without due consideration and they do not consider politics. They have said that the Shah is a clever man. If he has any cleverness in him he would not have been plagued by the situation in which he is now. He would have listened to the advice of the ulama of Islam. If he is plagued by this situation it is because he is half-witted [words indistinct].

33. Gotbzadeh Interview

LD200020 London BBC Television Network in English, 2010 GMT, 19 Nov. 79 LD.

[Interview in Tehran with Sadeq Gotbzadeh, Iranian Revolution Council spokesman and minister for national guidance by Adrian Porter, carried in the "Panorama" programme; date not given—recorded.]

[Text] [Announcer] In Tehran my colleague Adrian Porter has been talking to the minister for national guidance, a member of the Revolution Council and the Ayatollah's chosen link with the English-speaking world [begin recording].

[Question] You do not accept that the Shah is in the United States and the United States allowed him to stay there on purely humanitarian grounds because he is suffering from cancer?

[Answer] This is ridiculous, this is absolutely ridiculous, this humanitarian purpose. He could go anywhere else in the world. And after he got to New York, Kissinger met him for one-and-a-half hours. That is ridiculous, it is an excuse. You don't believe it I hope.

[Question] Do you mean that you don't believe that the Shah has cancer?

[Answer] Well, we don't believe that he was as sick as they pretended because our Government demanded two Iranian doctors go and examine the Shah. The United States has refused that on [words indistinct] that one also I am sorry, and Kissinger had gone to see the Shah for one-and-a-half hours immediately after his arrival over there. So therefore we do not believe that he is sick. We believe that it is all planned.

[Question] You talk about this crisis, but isn't it true in fact that Iran started the crisis by seizing the American Embassy?

[Answer] No, on the contrary, the Americans have started the crisis by having the Shah over there. For them nothing had happened, and there was so much flagrant in this act that they deliberately, I think, insulted our people and our revolution—tried to sort of create tension and international crisis—they know how we feel about that.

[Question] You have mentioned that one of the reasons why the Embassy was invaded was because it was committing acts of espionage, but how could you know before going into the Embassy that it was committing espionage.

[Answer] Let's have a very clear answer—in two ways. You see, we know all the time. We have talked about it for years that the American Embassy is a centre of espionage, and (?a centre) of active espionage. After the revolution we were hoping that they cease this kind of action, and we gave them another chance. But by having the Shah going to the United States, this action, to all Iranians, it was absolutely clear that the United States continues to escalate its provocation, its sort of acts of interference in our affairs because the Shah's money is being spent everywhere, in Kordestan, Khuzestan and all that. From that time the people, I mean the young people, decided to go to the Embassy. It never was sort of in doubt in anybody's mind in Iran that the American Embassy was the centre of espionage. But the thing is that [word indistinct] was hoping that they cease but they have not ceased that, they continued to do that and then the Shah escalated that.

[Question] Is there an ultimatum about this that unless the Shah and his possessions are returned to Iran something may happen to the hostages?

[Answer] Well, from the students they have not had any ultimatum or threat but let us put it that way. We cannot tolerate the presence of the Shah over there and this type of American way of dealing with us. So our relations get worse and worse.

[Question] But if the Shah is not returned what might happen to the hostages?

[Answer] Well, that I can't say anything about at this time.

[Question] Is there danger that they could be killed?

[Answer] Only the . . . all depends on the time and place and the stress that the people submit, and the attempts, probably the Americans and Zionists, may make to release them, you see. A number of factors are involved. We know that they are planning to attack and release them. In that case, in a way all of them will be killed.

[Question] You say you know that they are trying to release them.

[Answer] We have information that they have made some sort of planning

but that we may make it difficult for them to (?cheat) them, the guardians, because the guardians have told us very clearly that if there is any attempt they will kill all of the hostages.

[Question] Are there any conditions for . . . is there any kind of negotiation going on at the present moment over these hostages, between Iran and the American Government?

[Answer] None whatsoever. There is no negotiation.

[Question] It seems that the Iranian Government condones the seizure of the embassy and the holding of these hostages?

[Answer] The Iranian Government actually had nothing to do with the act, but since this action has been accepted, supported and admired by the entire population and, well, the Iranian Government cannot go against its own people, its own population. On the contrary, accept the verdict, carry on the will of the people.

[Question] Are you aware of the enormity in what you have done in upsetting the whole basis of diplomatic security throughout the world?

[Answer] Well, this is another question. You see, whether there really (?has been) any diplomatic immunity in the world, that its basis has been shattered and threatened, these kind of things have been always for the big powers. These laws have been made to guarantee the crimes that the representatives of the big powers have committed in the small countries.

[Question] But this immunity has been accepted by all the nations in the world.

[Answer] Well, all nations which have never been independent accepted them, and this diplomatic immunity does not guarantee the act of espionage, the crimes and whatever you have. This was not the American Embassy, it was a centre of the espionage not only in this country and in other countries, it was a centre of . . . I mean of ordering the Iranian Government what to do or what not to do.

[Question] Yes, but you discovered this after you seized the Embassy; this is not your reason for going into the Embassy in the first place.

[Answer] No, no, we discovered because we knew it. We were hoping after the revolution they cease this kind of things, they would forget, and we gave them a new chance, probably they would forget, but unfortunately they did not.

[Question] So what was the reason for going into the Embassy then; was it because you knew they were spying, or because you wanted hostages for the Shah?

[Answer] No, you see the thing is, from after the revolution we were hoping that the Shah will—I mean, the United States will stop this kind of interference. But the interference continued to have its symbols and reasons, and eventually the Shah went to the United States. That shows that the United States clearly and vividly tries to interfere more actively in the affairs of Iran, so the students could not tolerate and acted upon it.

[Question] So—yes, but what is more important in your view: the fact that the US Embassy was responsible, as you say, for spying, although there has not been much proof, or because the Shah is in the United States at the present moment?

[Answer] Both were together, because that was the centre of spies and the Shah went to the United States to utilize this spy centre in the maximum way, so both of them were the reason for the students to have done that.

[Question] What is going to happen if the Shah does leave the United States and goes to another country? Are we going to see students seizing the embassy of that country in Tehran?

[Answer] No, you see the Shah was in other countries before he went to the United States. The question is not that. But obviously there is another thing: the big powers should reduce their acts of espionage here. And that is another thing that will not happen in the other embassy. That is for sure, but we will not

tolerate [sentence as heard]. Actually, we are going to continue to demand the return of the Shah from any country that he may possibly go.

[Question] What would happen to the Shah if he did come back to Iran?

[Answer] He will be tried before an international court.

[Question] You would allow an international court to be set up here?

[Answer] International law observation. It can be observed, anyone on the face of the earth can come here and we will have in court, tried and judged [sentence as heard].

[Question] Are you aware of how much anger has been caused in the United States among the people there by your actions here in Tehran?

[Answer] Well, we've been having the reports, but this kind of anger, this kind of panic is created by the mass media, by the Zionists, by these people who are trying to create these things in the United States and in the other countries as well—it is only election year—and try to do their best to benefit out of it.

[Question] But do you feel concern over the fact that innocent hostages are being held in Iran?

[Answer] How innocent hostages being held is less worse than the biggest criminal of the country be protected? I do not know what would any country in Western Europe or the United States feel if there was one big country protecting Hitler and, well, for having innocent hostages being kept. So this is how we feel about it.

[Question] You say the students have done this, but in fact at any moment it appears that the Iranian Government could have ordered these students, as they have done, to release some of these hostages?

[Answer] No, no, no, it was not as easy as that.

[Question] Well, it seems so because as soon as Ayatollah Khomeini sent a request or an instruction that some of the hostages should be released, they were released.

[Answer] Oh, we have been negotiating that almost all week. You have not been in on the negotiations so you do not know what is happening.

[Question] You are not concerned that this action might lead to US pressure upon you in many ways such as a trade embargo, with the United States trying to have other countries join them in stopping the flow of goods to your country, and stopping shipping, stopping at your ports?

[Answer] They have done everything they could so far. I do not think they can do anything more than that. But we don't care. We continue our struggle. When you enter on a struggle you should never be blackmailed: the minute you are blackmailed you are lost. So no matter what the United States does, when we decided to go on we go on [end recording].

34. Ahmad Khomeini Interview

LD201459 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1030 GMT, 20 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] The morning, following Imam Khomeini's order regarding the release of the American women and black hostages, four women and six American blacks whose guilt of espionage had not been proved were released by the Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Policy.

The representative of the Voice and Profile of the Islamic Republic of Iran interviewed brother Seyyed Ahmad Khomeini [son of Ayatollah Khomeini], who had come to Tehran from Qom in response to the request of the Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Policy and who had made remarkable efforts in the arrangements for the release of the hostages, en route to the airport from the US den of espionage. The text of the interview is as follows:

Brother Seyyed Ahmad Khomeini was asked: Have you made any decisions concerning the release of the rest of the hostages?

Brother Seyyed Ahmad Khomeini replied: The freedom of the hostages

depends on the decision of the nation, which will be announced by the Imam.

He was asked: Everybody says that you had foreknowledge of the occupation of the embassy. Is that so? Have you known previously the brothers and sisters who follow the Imam's policy?

He replied: I was in contact with the organizing group but I strongly deny any foreknowledge of the revolutionary act by the brothers and sisters who follow the Imam's policy.

He was asked: Will the political, economic, military and cultural dependence of Iran on the United States be broken off in this event, or will it continue in the same manner?

He replied: The Imam has decided that the policy that existed for many years before the revolution and during the eight months following the revolution should be discontinued.

He was asked: Do you agree or disagree with the issues that Mr. Bazargan brought forward in Hoseynich Ershad [mosque in Tehran]?

He replied: He has a bone to pick with a number of clergymen but he includes everybody. Actually, nothing can be solved this way. If we have a complaint or grievance about someone, we should name them; everybody must be frank so that unity can be achieved.

He was asked: Some say that a group has surrounded the Imam and only tell him their own cases.

He responded: What kind of question is that: It is absolutely not so. For example, consider the stand the Imam has taken against the United States. Did the previous state officials take such a stand: Did the Revolution Council have such a stand? Did the Imam not say that a group came from the rotten roots to order release of the hostages? Has the Imam not stood alone against America and uttered his historic "no"? Wasn't everybody in favour of the arrival of Carter's special envoys? Why, then, did the Imam stand, on his own, against America and not allow even one official of the Government of the Islamic republic to contact them?

I say this frankly: If the Imam listened to anybody he would have carried on with his teachings and discussions when he was in Qom and there would not have been a 5 June [1963, when he opposed the Shah and was subsequently exiled] and he would not have been exiled to Turkey and would not have gone to Najaf [in Iraq]. If he were influenced by anybody the 15 years of absolute silence in Najaf would have affected him and the disheartening words heard in that country would have changed him. If anybody's words affected his mind and soul he would still be in Najaf and there would have been no question of his move to Paris. I say that if he were influenced by anybody all the religious and political defeatists—who were either agents or did not have a correct understanding of Iran's political events—in Paris would have done their job and persuaded the Imam that only the Shah should leave the country. If he were influenced by anybody, if he were distracted, every argument and policy heard in Iran would succeed except the Imam's arguments and policies. Why have you forgotten? Did everybody not say in unison that the monarchical régime would not be changed and an alternative must be thought of? Why did he say that the Shah would go, the monarchical régime would fall and would be replaced by the Islamic Republic? The Imam said those words in more than 100 interviews. If anybody's words affected him and if a particular group implemented his thoughts, you can be sure that our stand against America would not have been such. If he were influenced by anybody—when he decided to come to Iran, there was nobody in favour and everybody from Tehran and the provinces told him to wait. The Imam's insight is so magnificent that it awes everybody. This is extremely unfair; it is obvious who has engineered these problems—those who are actually nice people could be influenced by these words and say things without considering other factors.

The representative of the Voice and Profile of the Islamic Republic of Iran said: Let us go back and ask another question about the den of espionage. Will all that the student followers of the Imam's policy discover in the spy lair be published?

Brother Seyyed Ahmad Khomeini answered: The answer to this question is up to them.

35. Khomeini Speech

LD202309 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1730 GMT, 20 Nov. 79 LD. [Speech by Ayatollah Khomeini delivered on 20 November; venue not specified—recorded.]

[Excerpt] This month of Moharram is very different from former months of Moharram. One of its differences is that during the former month of Moharram we were faced with the oppressive Pahlavi establishment, because that establishment was a branch of the corruption of the mother of corruptions.

In this month of Moharram we are faced with the mother of corruption; we are faced with those who have brought all the weak nations under their domination and who in every place have appointed one of their agents to be in charge of the nations so that they can plunder them. Thanks to God, in our battle with that filthy branch, as the result of the endeavours of our beloved nation and the endeavours of you gentlemen who are the people of the pulpit and other preachers throughout the country, especially Qom which has always been the source of blessings, thanks to God our nation became victorious through dependence upon the almighty God and through the unity of expression.

Mr. Carter has said somewhere that if they wish to keep these diplomats who are in this den of espionage and if they wish to try them, it would create an outrage in the world. In the eyes of these oppressors the world is different from the real world. The oppressors see the world through their own arrogant outlook and through the psychological illness from which they suffer. This disease has caused them to regard the great masses of the world as not belonging to the world.

Mr. Carter himself and other people like him around the world, who number less than 50,000 out of the 3 billion inhabitants of the world—it is these leaders of countries who encourage others to indulge in oppression and mischief. The outlook of people like him is that all the nations are worth nothing. Those people are part of the world and make up a small number of people like Carter and his clique, and some people in other places have, unfortunately, joined his clique too. This is what they regard the whole world to consist of. This is the outlook of the oppressors. They do not see the other great strata of various societies which are an ocean compared to which Carter and the people like him are only drops. It means that this disease of self glorification has caused them not to see the people.

This is why when on the throne of his presidency and looking at matters through his sick outlook and seeing a few ministers and others who belong to assemblies or are his lackeys in other places, and seeing that they get angry, he regards them as the whole world and says that if you do anything to these diplomats—he regards them as diplomats, those whose acts of espionage have been proved on the basis of evidence, he regards them as diplomats, and he regards the world in terms of himself and these people. Mohammad Reza also had this illness to some extent, and the same illness led to his destruction—the illness only to see himself and a few flatterers and a number of clowns around him, to see only these people and not to have any consideration for the nation, to understand that in every country the nation counts.

The governments are a minority who should work for the service of the

nation, but they do not understand that the government should serve the nation and not rule over the nation. The Shah was also afflicted with this illness. He thought he was everything, that he was the ruler and was the entire nation. He attached no importance to others. This is why the country committed those acts of treason. All that treason was due to the same fact—he could not see anybody who could reprimand him. He could not imagine that there is power other than bayonets and machine guns. This illness led to the commission of crimes, because he could not see another power except himself, and this led to what we all witnessed. Carter, too, is afflicted with the same disease, except in a more severe form—the more power, the more severe the disease.

In the defeat of the Shah, America, meaning the American Government—whenever we speak of America or any other place we do not mean the nation unless we specify the nation; we have no confrontation with the nations and the nations do not have a confrontation with us—the American nation [as heard] faced an economic defeat and to some extent a political defeat. No matter how much Mr. Carter tried to keep Mohammad Reza in power, he repeatedly sent people to us saying that the Shah should stay, then he wanted to keep Bakhtiar, but he was not able to, and was defeated [sentence as heard]. Although it was a defeat, a major defeat, compared to the second defeat that he shall face it was small [shouts of "God willing"].

[The second defeat was] to give asylum to a person who is guilty and who has been guilty for 30-odd years, and the 35 million people of our country can testify to his guilt. It is possible that a number of people may know of his guilt and not testify, but 35 million people know, and hundreds of millions of people in other countries of the world know that this man is guilty, was depressive, was a criminal and committed many crimes in this country, caused much deprivation to this nation and imprisoned, exiled and killed its citizens. To give asylum to such a person is political defeat in the world. But due to the illness that Mr. Carter is suffering from, he is not able to understand this. To leave these people who are spies and who are in this den of espionage behind and not to return this guilty man to this country is in itself another defeat which is greater than the second defeat [giving asylum to the Shah], because if Carter does not send the Shah, it is possible that the hostages may be tried, and if they are tried, Carter knows what will happen.

At times, Carter intimidates us with military threats, and at times with economic threats but he himself knows that he is beating an empty drum. Carter does not have the guts to engage in a military operation, and they [as heard] do not listen to him. This mistake is due to that same illness that these superpowers suffer from, and this in itself is a mistake, as he thinks that all countries are like a ring on his finger, that if he says do not sell wheat to Iran, all countries will fold their arms upon their chests, bow and obey. But he has realized that even in his own country he is not obeyed. His own secretary of agriculture said that this would be a mistake.

And what need do we have of America's wheat? We have oil. We have that substance of which Churchill, the great British statesman during the war—when confronting the Germans and frightened that he might lose, speaking to the British House of Commons about all their problems, saying that we have suffered this and that and have been defeated—said: However, victory belongs to those who are sitting on a wave of oil. We are sitting on a wave of oil.

You plundered us and took away our oil, and gave us guns and rifles, but these weapons were for your sake and not for ours. We have oil. The world needs oil. The world does not need America. The world does not need Carter. The world needs oil. Other countries will turn to those of us who have oil and not to you, who sighs to be made president but does not know what to do. All Carter's efforts and endeavours are aimed at his being re-elected president when his term comes to an end, but he is barking up the wrong tree. He thought that if

he were to frighten Iran, and if he were to say that we shall impose an economic embargo on Iran and shall damage Iran's economy, his nation would applaud him, and later he would be made president. But he misunderstood that right now a vast section of the society, namely the negroes, have left him. Five hundred black clergymen have opposed him and have demonstrated. Later, others shall join them, except those whom Carter regards as the world.

If the world consists only of those people who are Mr. Carter's friends and associates, then the whole is with America. But if the world is what it is, and if it consists of the oppressed people, if the world reality is that the oppressed people run the world and the oppressors offer nothing except corruption—if that is the world, then the world is not on your side. This world does not approve of a president who claims to be a champion of human rights, but creates so much evil for humanity and kills so many people. A person who claims that I support human rights will not be allowed to [does not complete sentence] Iranians are human beings too.

How is it that during your rule over the past few years and for 50 years during the rule of your predecessors, this nation experienced so much hardship, but neither you nor others who claim to be supporters of human rights, nor the assemblies that you have formed in order to play games with us, uttered not one word asking why Mohammad Reza was doing all those things. On the contrary, you supported him. On the contrary, you tried to keep him in power. The ludicrous thing is that when suppression was at its height in Iran, some people used to say that the Iranians are given too much freedom, and this is why all those voices are being raised. The people are shouting we want to be free because they have too much freedom, they are suffering from a surplus of freedom. Such thinking is due to the illness which these people have.

Carter should not imagine that we will take one step back on this issue, and on what is our right in the world. The whole world knows this, and according to all international regulations a guilty person should be returned to the place where he committed his offence, and should be tried there. We demand that Reza Pahlavi be tried here. If they returned our guilty person [does not complete sentence].

We shall close down the embassy. This centre of espionage will no longer continue here in the name of the embassy, unless all this spying business stops and they decide to have an embassy; not a place of espionage. If they return him, this is possible. If they close this place of espionage and if they return him it is possible that we might have relations which will be useful to us. So long as that person is there, we shall not sever our relations, because we must keep these people here. These people who are now with us are spies, not diplomats.

However, it seems that due to the psychological illness which Carter has and which people like him have, they also regard the spies as diplomats. They should change themselves. The heads of countries who act like this towards their nations, who act like this towards the oppressed people in the world, should change their minds. These thoughts will no longer have any customers in this world. They belong to a time when the people had not awakened. But now the people everywhere have opened their eyes and ears. We see that during the past few years, especially the past three years, a transformation has come about in our country. The people have changed. They are the same people, but their thoughts are different thoughts, their thoughts have changed. In the same way that the nations have changed and these nations are not the former nations that you ruled over and that would completely submit to you, so too, your heads of States, whether American heads of States or others, should also change. If they do not change themselves, it is not in their interest, and they will be dragged towards destruction.

At times I have told the people who have come from abroad that one of the problems of governments is the problem which exists between them and their

nations. One of the problems is the problem which exists between the nations and the governments, because the governments regard themselves as rulers, as the source of authority, but they allow no power to the nation. This is why they are deprived of the support of the nation.

What was well known to us was the situation in Iran itself. So long as the government regarded itself as the ruler of the nation, the dominant force over the nation, the shahanshah and aryamehr, the nation was not with it. If the nation was with it, it would not have been possible for Reza Pahlavi to go from here to another place. This was changed to another government which, of course, is not completely Islamic, but a breeze has blown from that quarter, a breeze has blown. The very fact that this breeze has blown has caused governments to not regard themselves any more as absolute rulers that may grab, beat and spend. It is not like that.

36. 21 November Developments concerning US Embassy

Students Statement No. 45

LD211504 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1427 GMT, 21 Nov. 79 LD.
[Statement No. 45 of the Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Policy—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. Fighting Iranian nation, the American Government has become extremely frightened in the face of the Imam's decisive stand and the great and glorious Hegira march throughout Iran. Frightened of being disgraced as a result of the trial of the spies held hostage, America has resorted to threats and intimidation. According to reports received, America's largest naval fleet in the Indian Ocean has been dispatched toward the Persian Gulf; and, also according to reports received, it intends to launch a military attack, against the Iranian territory. We strongly warn the American Government that:

1. If it is felt that the US threats are becoming a reality, all the hostages will be killed at once.
2. In the event of the slightest military offensive by America, all Americans residing in Iran will be endangered and the embassy, which has been a place of espionage, will be blown up.
3. The American Government must know that Islamic countries will not remain silent in the face of its aggressive acts.
4. Enemies must know that in the event of a military movement on Iranian territory the fighting and Muslim nation will defend its dear country with everything at its disposal, with tooth and nail, and will destroy the enemy.

We assure the valient Iranian nation that all the hostages and the areas around where they are in the embassy are being guarded with the utmost care and force, and the slightest suspicious move is controlled, and that the prevailing conditions are such as to enable us to destroy all the hostages and the building housing them at once. We ask all the brothers and sisters, while reinforcing their battle readiness, to maintain their calm completely and not to demonstrate any uncalculated behaviour, as this would be what the counter-revolution wants.

[Signed] The Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Policy.

37. Khomeini Addresses Pakistani Officers

GF222200 Tehran Domestic Television Service in Persian, 1700 GMT, 21 Nov. 79 GF.

[Speech by Ayatollah Khomeini delivered in Qom, 22 November, to visiting high-ranking officers of the Pakistani armed forces after their pilgrimage to Mecca—recorded.]

[Text] In the name of God the merciful and compassionate. How fortunate you were to have the opportunity to visit holy Mecca, that centre of inspiration and shining city. May God accept this pilgrimage visit of you brothers.

[Voices in unison] Amen.

[Khomeini] All of us in the Muslim nations are brothers. We share their joys and sorrows, and we do hope they share in our sorrows and joys.

Today, our nation is confronted with great satanic forces which, during the last 300 years, imposed illegitimate governments upon us, upon Muslim nations, upon nations of the Orient. And during the last 50 years it was the government of Reza Khan and Mohammad Reza that was imposed upon this nation. They betrayed us and recently this betrayal and crime of theirs reached its peak. These crimes were supported by superpowers, especially the United States, so much so that the patience and forbearance of our nation [words indistinct]. They toppled the shahinshah régime which was an illegitimate régime and established the Islamic republic here. And while we are engaged in reconstructing the ruins and destruction inflicted upon us during this period of terrifying rule and reign of foreigners, aliens and their parasites who ruled these countries. We are now confronted with the United States. And we hope that our brother nations, the Islamic nations—just as we were caught in the web of foreign tyranny and aggression, just as our nation rose up against them—that our brother Muslim nations will also arise against them.

It is a cause of joy that Pakistan has risen against them. Today, I saw in the paper that all Pakistan had risen against the United States. Apparently all universities have declared a three-day shutdown, and this is promising news for our nation and people that they are not alone.

* * *

What should we be afraid of? Should we be afraid of their planes? Should we be afraid of their ships? We are the same people who consider martyrdom to be happiness. Even now, our people keep asking me to be martyred. What could possibly frighten a nation of people who wish to be martyred? [passage indistinct].

They want to massacre us. They cannot do that. And suppose they could. Our people would destroy them with their claws and teeth. Our youth [students at embassy] have just declared that if they ever try to do such a thing, they will destroy the entire embassy with all those people in it. If it should come to that point, we could not control those young people, who are in the prime of their youth and pride and have been oppressed in the past. We could not control them.

We cannot control a nation of people who were oppressed for 50 years and subjected to tyranny for some 30-odd years by an individual who massacred them, who killed their brothers, their fathers, husbands. We cannot control such a nation simply because the United States might decide to act stupidly. People will not simply sit idle and watch them land their paratroopers and so forth. Why don't they just try and see? Let us see how they can do it. We will destroy every one of them. We may all be killed or we will annihilate all of them.

38. Bani-Sadr Address

LD221835 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1630 GMT, 22 Nov. 79 LD.

[Speech by Abolhasan Bani-Sadr, supervisor of the Iranian Foreign Ministry, to a seminar of heads of news centres—read by announcer.]

[Text] A correspondent asked: What is this? Has anybody ever conducted diplomacy in this way?

Bani-Sadr replied: This is new diplomacy. Like our revolution, which is new, this is also a certain type of diplomacy. We do not want diplomacy behind closed

doors. As you see, since we took over we have been conducting a dialogue with the people of the world and explaining things to them, rather than explaining things to their politicians. We have not adopted a course of negotiation, rather we have adopted a course involving explanation. In order to succeed in this political course—the same course which we used in our triumphant revolution—we have had to work day and night; day and night work by all those, both within and without, who wanted to initiate a drastic change in international relations in having the deposed Shah extradite [sentence as heard].

Bani-Sadr then asked: Where are we now? America is threatening us with war. It was reported last night from America that the US Security Council has voted to declare war against Iran. It is said that Carter is under pressure. Only yesterday two incidents occurred; one in Islamabad and the other in the Great Mosque, both of which will further aggravate the climate.

As for the UN Security Council, it unanimously condemned Iran and demanded the release of the hostages. When I went to the foreign ministry, it transpired that foreign ambassadors in Tehran were attempting to hold a meeting in order to condemn Iran unanimously. The Arab foreign ministers council in Tunisia has pretended to have condemned Iran. Consequently, America was hoping to place us in total isolation. You may not have forgotten that in 1967, following the attack on our Arab brothers, they had created this very same sort of climate.

Therefore, as I explained, we took action in line with the policy I pointed out. Today, standing before you, I can be certain that America has not succeeded in isolating us, and despite all its attempts to have the initial verdict renewed by the Security Council, America has not succeeded; for out of the 14, 12 have voted against it.

In the Arab world the number of our supporters exceed those of our opponents. In Africa and Asia loud voices supporting our legitimacy are heard. As for Europe, although it sympathizes with America, there is no doubt that it does not agree with America. In preparing for an all-embracing onslaught to crush our Islamic revolution, in America the black minority, constituting 20 per cent of America's population, plus liberal figures, have raised their voices in protest to the effect that we are right. We are not being unreasonable; we are saying that you have imposed a person on a country through a coup d'état, that this person over 25 years has not spared oppression or crime. Now you have taken this person there, providing him with all kinds of luxury.

If you claim that this person has no criminal record, then why only a few days ago did the French Government extradite two Italians for having disturbed the Italian people's conscience by assassinating Aldo Moro? Is it only the Europeans who have the right to have a conscience? Is our nation supposed to lack a conscience? Has not this conscience been troubled by the deposed Shah's crimes and treasons? If you claim that the deposed Shah's assets cannot be returned, the question then arises: Are you not the same government which returned the Tsar's assets to Russia? What regulations allowed you to do this then? You should adhere to the same regulations.

As for our adherence to the Vienna Convention, the question is: Who wrote it? The convention which is said to be acceptable to us; where were we to accept it? It was the Pahlavi régime [which accepted it]. Do you not think that if we were present at that convention we would have stipulated that espionage and transforming an embassy into a place of espionage is not allowed, that it is punishable? We, the oppressed people, would not have proposed this, even supposing this were a right and, as it were, not a camouflage for crimes. This is a right which has been violated; this is a transgression upon an inch of territory, territory on our soil [sentence as heard].

According to this same convention, the US Embassy is considered to be part of US territory. Now we tell you that for 25 years you have violated everything

we have. Now, the thing is, we are saying: You must accord us this bigger right and, in return, we will accord you this smaller right. If it is a question of right, then this is a right also. After all, did these conventions and international agreements authorize you to conclude 25 agreements with a friend enslaved by you during the final two years of his life—agreements amounting to \$52 billion which were of not the slightest benefit to our nation? Were you authorized to do this in accordance with international agreements?

Mr. Bani-Sadr then answered questions concerning economic and monetary relations, as well as on Iran's relations with neighbouring countries, and other domestic and foreign issues.

39. Bani-Sadr Press Conference

NC221632 Paris AFP in English, 1617 GMT, 22 Nov. 79 NC.

[Text] Tehran, 22 Nov. (AFP)—The Iranian people "will fight to the last drop of blood" if the United States tries military action to free its occupied embassy here, Foreign Affairs Minister Abolhasan Bani-Sadr said today.

Mr. Bani-Sadr also told a news conference that he hoped "the world today would not accept a great power like the United States attacking Iran to have 50 people" being held hostage.

He said only the extradition of the former Shah from the United States would free the Americans, who have been held captive 18 days, and the West should not allow itself to become involved in a war "to defend a criminal".

Mr. Bani-Sadr also reaffirmed Iran's refusal to negotiate the matter, saying the pressure of public opinion would solve the dispute and not diplomacy.

40. Gotbzadeh on Trials

NC221337 Paris AFP in English, 1329 GMT, 22 Nov. 79 NC.

[Excerpt] Tehran, 22 Nov. (AFP)—The trial of the hostages held in the US Embassy here would begin "soon" if the United States continued to "play for time" in refusing to extradite the deposed Shah, the director of the Iranian radio and television service Sadeq Gotbzadeh said today.

Speaking to a French television station, Mr. Gotbzadeh did not exclude the possibility of the death penalty being imposed on any of the hostages.

He also told AFP that any contact between Iranian leaders and American representatives could only be on an "individual" and not an official basis, in a comment on reports from Washington that a US Congressman, George Hansen, had succeeded in talking to the Iranian authorities here.

Mr. Gotbzadeh, a member of the ruling Revolution Council, recalled a council resolution ruling out any possibility of contact between the two Governments.

Mr. Gotbzadeh joined other leading Iranians in minimizing the threat of American military intervention, while Foreign Minister Abolhasan Bani-Sadr appealed "to all Muslim people" to help in "the victory of Islam in Iran".

In a broadcast marking the start of the Muslim 15th-century reckoning, Mr. Bani-Sadr accused the US of "using all its efforts to isolate us in order to exterminate us".

He called on Iranians to be like steel, "cold and invincible", and not react to "American provocations".

41. 27 November Developments concerning US Embassy

Bani-Sadr Comment on Crisis

LD290923 Milan *L'Unita* in Italian, 27 Nov. 79, pp. 1, 16 LD.

[Siegmond Ginzberg undated interview in Tehran with Iranian Foreign Minister Abolhasan Bani-Sadr: "From United Nations to US-Iranian Crisis".]

[Text] Tehran—For the first time we found Bani-Sadr optimistic. "Yes" he told us, "I am optimistic, because now it is easier to resolve the embassy affair."

[Question] Easier? In what way?

[Answer] For one thing, because it is now easier to monitor popular reactions than it was three weeks ago. Easier because I have answered a real aspiration of our people in the field of foreign policy.

[Question] This is one reason. But perhaps it is insufficient to justify optimism. Are there no other reasons?

[Answer] Yes, there are others, but they cannot be discussed yet.

[Question] Are they domestic or external reasons?

[Answer] Partly external.

[Question] For instance?

[Answer] The fact that the UN Secretary-General has written to us—and I imagine he did so with tacit US consent—that he is willing to form a committee of inquiry into the violation of human rights by the Shah's régime.

[Question] What else?

[Answer] The fact that it seems that the US courts and administrator do not intend to impede the restitution of cash and goods transferred illegally to the United States.

[Question] Yes, but meantime the aircraft carrier *Kitty Hawk* is continuing to steam toward the Persian Gulf . . .

[Answer] The Americans have let us know that they have no intention of settling the affair by force.

[Ginzburg] Evidently diplomatic efforts have continued with a greater intensity than was apparent over the past few days, and probably through many channels. But to what extent can one believe Bani-Sadr's optimism? On other occasions he told us one thing, the Imam said another and the students occupying the embassy something else again. Is it possible, we asked, that it is so difficult to convince Khomeini of the dangers of the situation?

"No," Bani-Sadr replied, "this is not the point. I believe that Khomeini is fully convinced of the dangers. The real point is that the impasse is not just on one side, but on both sides. There is an impasse on the part of the entire people, for whom the Shah and America are symbols of a very precise and specific reality."

[Question] Is not this kind of cult of popular spontaneity somewhat excessive?

[Answer] The Bazargan government's experience shows that one must take the people's feelings into account in this revolution. Unless one takes them into account, one can at any time cause a leak which could threaten to bring down the entire dam.

[Question] A leak such as that of the US Embassy?

[Answer] Precisely.

[Question] Are you not afraid of meeting the same end as Bazargan in view of the impulsive nature of the processes involving the people's masses and the multiplicity of centres of power?

[Answer] I accepted the post in the full awareness that all these things exist. That there are rivalries, personal struggles, factional thrusts. But this is the real situation and one must act within it. Be that as it may, the affair which began at the embassy is a great risk, but also a great opportunity.

[Question] In what way?

[Answer] An opportunity for a new revolution—economic and cultural. The process begun in economic relations with the United States is a historic opportunity for breaking our dependence on other countries and for transforming our economic system for the foundations up. Such thorough transformations are neither simple nor painless. Moses had to wander on Mount Sinai for 40 years with his people so that the generations corrupted by subjection to the pharaoh would be followed by generations capable of making the promised land

flourish. So the Americans are now preparing Moses' Mount Sinai for us. A generation which can manage without economic dependence on the United States will be a generation capable of saving Iran from economic death, from the economic death which—let us not forget—had already begun before the Shah's departure.

[Question] As long as a military intervention does not completely turn the tables?

[Answer] No, I do not believe there will be a military intervention.

[Question] Even if as a result of an accident one of the hostages lost his life?

[Answer] No, I do not believe that could happen. The students occupying the embassy are very aware of this danger. Have you never wondered why they are so carefully preventing the journalists from seeing the hostages and concealing their whereabouts? It is precisely because they are aware of the possibility of a provocation.

[Ginzberg] We also asked him why his visit to the UN Security Council in New York, originally scheduled for yesterday, has been postponed. "The Secretary-General," he replied, "did not contact us in connection with the date for the meeting. The 9th and 10th days of Moharram, which commemorate Husayn's martyrdom, are in our country traditionally highly charged with popular feeling. Moreover," he smiled, "there is a historical precedent: In 1951 Mossadeq, too, requested a postponement of a UN Security Council meeting precisely because it coincided with Ashura'h".

42. Khomeini Denounces Carter

NC291927 Paris AFP in English, 1926 GMT, 29 Nov. 79 NC.

[Text] Tehran, 29 Nov. (AFP)—Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini today announced his intention of putting US Jimmy Carter on trial after the trial of the Shah.

In an impassioned reply to President Carter's policy statement yesterday on the Tehran embassy hostages crisis, the Ayatollah told Western correspondents at his headquarters in the holy city of Qom: "After the Shah stands trial we are going to demand that President Carter and similar 'Nixons' be judged."

He continued: "When Carter goes to church, his prayers are like the prayers the Shah used to offer up when he worshipped at Mashhad" (a holy city in northeastern Iran).

President Carter was "appalled" at the idea that "his crimes will be denounced", the Ayatollah added. He then accused Mr. Carter of being primarily interested in the forthcoming US presidential election campaign, saying: "He (Mr. Carter) imagines his manoeuvres will serve his propaganda effort in the forthcoming elections."

The Ayatollah went on to accuse Western newsmen of being won over to the US cause and of spreading lies.

He said that if the hostages in the US Embassy were tried and found guilty, they could still be pardoned under Islamic law—"provided the Shah and his fortune are returned to Iran".

The Ayatollah continued: "We would have appreciated it if Arab governments perceiving how we were destroyed by a régime (the Shah's), made some effort to understand us and back us up—and had not gone over to the side of the oppressors of the Arabs."

He expressed regret that Arab nations were not using their oil resources as a diplomatic weapon.

Commenting on Pope John Paul's appeal for the freeing of the Tehran embassy hostages, the Ayatollah declared: "If Jesus were alive today, would he be on the side of Carter and the Shah?"

The Ayatollah concluded with "an appeal to all Christians and Jews

throughout the world to adhere to their faith, following their prophets who arose from among the oppressed masses".

He added: "We desire to be friendly with all peoples and to have friendly relations with them."

43. Students Repeat Trial Threat

NC300656 Paris AFP in English, 0648 GMT, 30 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] Tehran, 30 Nov. (AFP)—Iranian students holding about 50 Americans hostages here said today that the Americans would "inevitably" go on trial if the former Shah was expelled from the United States without being extradited to Iran.

The threat was contained in a message to Iranian students abroad.

44. No UN Representative

NC301352 Paris AFP in English, 1336 GMT, 30 Nov. 79 NC.

[Excerpt] Tehran, 30 Nov. (AFP)—Iran's Islamic régime will not send a high official to the UN Security Council meeting scheduled tomorrow on the occupation of the US Embassy here, Foreign Minister Sadeq Gotbzadeh said today in a news conference.

He also repeated previous statements by Iranian leaders that the country was ready to fight "to the end" if the United States tries military action to free the 50 American hostages held since 4 November.

45. Gotbzadeh Press Conference

LD302350 Tehran in English to Europe, 1930 GMT, 30 Nov. 79 LD.

[Press conference by Iranian Minister of Foreign Affairs Sadeq Gotbzadeh on 30 November, correspondents not identified.]

[Text] The Islamic Republic of Iran's foreign minister and head of the Islamic Republic of Iran's radio and television, Sadeq Gotbzadeh, held a press interview this afternoon with foreign reporters and correspondents. The following is the full text of this interview:

[Begin Gotbzadeh recording] Ladies and gentlemen, there's limited time. Well, the announcement that I would like to make is that according to the decision made by the Revolution Council, we are not attending the Security Council's meeting tomorrow. And obviously, we keep our contacts with the authorities of the United Nations for further discussion and deliberations of the Security Council. This is the announcement I would like to make, and now I am open to any questions.

[Question indistinct] Well, I welcome this decision because with such a decision [words indistinct] and it shows also to what extent the American foreign policy was [words indistinct] to get him out of there and to expose the Shah as he is before the international public opinion.

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] (?We met with) the Mexican authorities and explained our situation and our viewpoint.

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] Well, I have heard that they are there and well. I really don't know. I have never talked to them. I don't know [passage indistinct]. Well, after all, I don't believe that, at least I hope to believe that these international instances are not totally under the influence and order of the Americans. Secondly, I hope also that they don't take such measures; and thirdly, if in spite of all these things and all our legitimate demands they go on with the condemnation, the decision is not binding [as heard] and we don't accept it.

[Question] If the Shah goes to Egypt, what will you do?

[Answer] If the Shah goes to Egypt we'll continue to demand his return from Egypt and I'm sure it's going to be a great deal of trouble in Egypt to return him to you.

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] At the moment we haven't come, we'll cross the bridge when we come to it, we haven't come to (?that yet).

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] As far as we are concerned, from the beginning the crisis was started by the United States by taking the Shah over there, as we believe now, then they have lied over the condition of his health and our request of sending two physicians to examine if it's the truth has been turned down by the United States. Then the crisis started. (?And) that precise opposition diffused this crisis and it was escalated. But unfortunately the United States had chosen the hard line and continued to escalate the crisis as they wanted.

But this time we are firm in our decision and are not going to be dissuaded from what we have decided and it is for the United States to accept now and accept that what we have done, as we warned [words indistinct] to our revolution and we don't back down [words indistinct] in argument.

* * *

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] I don't think that the question of compromise arises. We have demanded the return of the Shah because we believe that it is not only the problem of the Shah himself. As the Shah actually himself has declared, if he goes on trial it will be the trial of the last few presidents of the United States who have interfered in our affairs and have kept the Shah in power. [Words indistinct] it's extremely important for us to put on trial actually the policy of intervening in our affairs by the United States over the past 25 years. Therefore, it is the (?distorted) history of our country by the United States, it is the plunderingness [as heard] of our country by the United States and it is the tortures and killings that happened in this country by the United States Government which are going to be on trial. Therefore, this is the legitimate right of a people to go on, to investigate, to explore the cruelties, the miseries that we had and the victims that (?they had), to show not only to our people but to the whole world the (?point) of the injustice which (?the nation has) suffered and I'm sure that the countries around the world have been submitting to the same sort of pressure and the governmental intervention by the United States [words indistinct].

[Question] Mr. Foreign Minister, what did you think of the efforts by Congressman Hansen and former Senator Abourezk and would you accept any discussion with an American in future?

[Answer] Senator Abourezk is acting as a lawyer, therefore he is not sort of mediating anything and [words indistinct]. And Congressman Hansen, well, I don't think that was of any good whatsoever, it was good for Mr. Hansen, it wasn't good for the (?cause).

[Question] Would you accept it if (?another American was here) to discuss the situation?

[Answer] [Word indistinct] Official Americans but certainly not of an individual. Anybody can come here and discuss [words indistinct].

[Question] On what basis would you have the United States (?pursuing talks) in Iran?

[Answer] Well, (?when in doubt) I have to find a solution for the United States? You see, we have proposed a solution, that is to say the process by which they can return the Shah to Iran and I have repeated that. If the United States accepts this fact, that the Shah could be a criminal and immediately accept an

international hearing, a (?jury) acceptable to us, of our choice, to investigate the case and the United States promised to accepting as binding [as heard] the decision, at that time the United States could return the Shah easily, that is through the international (?influence). Now, even we can go further and we say if the Security Council eventually agrees to open up [words indistinct] to do the job, I think that would be another (?problem). But nevertheless, we've got to have the Shah here.

[Words indistinct]

[Question] If the United States agreed to such a forum at which the Shah's guilt would be determined, would the hostages be released if the United States agreed to the forum or would you hold them until the Shah was eventually returned?

[Answer] Well, you take it for granted that the decisions and declarations of the United States are (?trustworthy). Unfortunately, our past experience shows that we cannot trust them. Therefore, the mere agreement doesn't satisfy us. We have to see the actual (?work) of this committee and if the United States eventually bound itself as a result of this decision and the [word indistinct].

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] Well, those people who were in the embassy [words indistinct] taken by the students over there, and among them are a certain number of people who are much higher than the chargé d'affaires in their activities and their relations with the CIA. As far as the chargé d'affaires is concerned, he has come himself to the Foreign Ministry, and the Foreign Ministry at that time decided to give [words indistinct] asylum to them and [words indistinct] asylum according to the promise that the foreign minister at that time had given and (?he) honoured.

[Indistinct questions]

[Answer] [Word indistinct] are going to be in a position to discuss about the further developments of this subject.

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] Well, the Americans do not agree with our conditions. We do not agree with their conditions either. We are equal, and certainly there is not, there is not any date for the trial of the spies.

[Question indistinct] [Words indistinct] As I understand you, you have been suggesting that the United States might find a way to extradite the Shah if there were [words indistinct] international tribunal in the United States that would hear evidence against the Shah. That would avoid the extradition problem and would permit the publication of [words indistinct].

[Answer] Well, you are constantly confronted—and it is one of those ironies of our time—you are constantly confronted with such a number of words from the American side, and it is not only concerning Iran, it is practically concerning other countries around the world. And that it, the American public opinion wants this and that. The electioneers require that [words indistinct] that one resident wants to be elected and the other shouldn't be elected. Or the legal system of the United States permits this or that. That is to say, the whole world should revolve on the concepts and the way of life that the Americans have imposed around the world. My point is simply this: according to what law the United States has interfered in our affairs, have sent spies here, have committed the crimes here? According to what law they are trained (?to be) torturers and our country in the United States? According to what law and regulations and what (?process), process of law they have made these contracts that they plundered our country. If they can find any process of law to do all (?these injustice) I am sure they are intelligent enough to find a process of law to return the Shah.

* * *

[Answer] Well, the Shah is out of their hands. As I said before, first of all we have not come to that, we haven't come to the bridge to cross it yet, and

certainly the crisis will not be totally defused at the time, and [words indistinct] we've got to [words indistinct] go on to see what's going to happen. If the Shah goes, definitely the hostages will not be released immediately.

* * *

[Question] Ayatollah Khomeini yesterday said that Carter, Nixon and Johnson should be tried, Mr. Minister. Could you comment?

[Answer] Well, it is—certainly Ayatollah Khomeini has said (?it). The Shah has said it before him. He said: If I should go on trial the other presidents [words indistinct] should be on trial, too.

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] Well, as I said, the trial has not started yet, and we will see what's going to come out of the trial.

[Question] Mr. Minister, why has there been such a [words indistinct] turnaround in your attitude to the United Nations Security Council? Mr. Bani-Sadr [words indistinct]. Surely you have nothing to lose by presenting your case to the council.

[Answer] Well our . . . [pause]. Let's put it that way. The manner in which the Security Council was called upon, or had decided to convene, created some suspicion in our public opinion, because, if you remember, we have asked the United Nations that the Security Council be convened, and that request has been turned down. And all of a sudden we found that the Secretary-General has asked for the convening of the Security Council within 24 hours, the Americans totally and immediately agreed upon. And that manner, frankly speaking, has created some suspicion here, and accordingly the Revolution Council decided not to participate at this time.

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] That would be very good. I am sure that would create a good atmosphere between Iran and the United States, and I am sure the hostages will be released, and we have already promised it is going to be (?an) open trial, and even the representative of Mr. Carter can participate in the trial, and the other representatives of the press, and see what's going on, and we are going to have a good show for the whole world how the criminals can do the job, and with what help, and whose help, for 25 years.

* * *

[Question] The hostages are being held, in part, [words indistinct] by which to have the United States return the Shah. If the Shah leaves the United States, how can the onus remain on Washington to have him returned? And what would then be the legitimate reason for holding the hostages?

[Answer] Well, let's put it that way: If you capture a thief and tell him to return what he has stolen from you, and you say that if you don't that I've got to take you to trial, and all of a sudden the (?buy), his friend comes, and he gives the material to him and says well go away, and at that time (?he says), well look, guy, I don't have your material with me. Now let me go. How do you feel about that?

[Question] If the Shah went to another country [words indistinct] the United States [words indistinct] interfere in the affairs of that country in order to return the Shah?

[Answer] (?Well), it's simple as that. The United States has the power to not let him go, to prevent it now.

[Question indistinct]

[Answer] This is the responsibility of the United States. The Shah is in United States, and I'm sure that the United States, who has the power to destroy the

whole world in a couple of hours, has the power to keep the poor Shah over there.

[*Question*] Mr. Minister, [words indistinct] Do you foresee a moment when the Revolution Council (?should) come to a political decision, because of certain circumstances [words indistinct]. Could you foresee such a moment?

[*Answer*] At this time I don't foresee any such circumstances. I'm terribly sorry that this has been (?finished).

46. Students on Shah's Departure

OW021010 Paris AFP in English, 1008 GMT, 2 Dec. 79 OW.

[Text] Tehran, 2 Dec. (AFP)—The militant Iranian students occupying the US Embassy here today told the AFP that the departure of the deposed Shah from the United States was going to speed up to the maximum the trial of the (American hostages).

The students interviewed by AFP refused, however, to disclose any firm date for the trial. "The trial may not be for right away, but we are going to step up to the maximum the preparations, as we already announced", a student spokesman said.

The students said at a press conference yesterday that "letting the Shah leave the United States would be a worse mistake than letting him in".

47. Gotbzadeh Paris Radio Interview

LD021410 Paris Domestic Service in French, 1200 GMT, 2 Dec. 79 LD.

[Interview with Iranian Foreign Minister Sadeq Gotbzadeh by Paris radio reporters Yves Mourousi in Paris and Yves-Paul Vincent in Tehran—live.]

[Text] [Mourousi] The Shah is now in San Antonio, and here is the first question, Mr. Minister of Foreign Affairs: What was your reaction this morning on learning that the former Shah of Iran had left the hospital?

[Gotbzadeh] First of all, he has left the hospital in a sense, as being in the hospital does not mean that he was ill. And from the beginning we have been saying that he was not ill at all. Now he has gone apparently to another place in the United States, so he is still in the United States fortunately.

[Mourousi] Last Sunday we were in contact—and I greet you, we already know each other—last week we were with your predecessor, Bani-Sadr. But since last week, since Sunday, you have become the Iranian minister of foreign affairs. I would also note that you have been very close to Ayatollah Khomeini. What has changed in Iran's foreign policy since your appointment?

[Gotbzadeh] Oh, there is no major change, because I have known Ayatollah Khomeini for 16 years. I know the line of his thought and I know exactly the line of thought and policy of the Revolution Council, and my relations with the students are also good. The Revolution Council thought that under the present circumstances, I should take charge of foreign affairs, because Mr. Bani-Sadr had two very important portfolios for which he did not have enough time. I believe that effectively one has to follow Imam Khomeini's line of thought and try to maintain a good dialogue with the students.

[Mourousi] So then, you are with Yves-Paul Vincent today. Yves-Paul Vincent and myself are tempted to put you the same questions we put to your predecessor last week. We are simply one week later, one more week during which the hostages have been in captivity. What is your position, your personal position, in the matter of the hostages of the US Embassy?

[Gotbzadeh] Listen, the essential problem which we have been faced with since the crisis is that everybody is talking about the problem of the hostages and never about the cause of this affair—the Shah and his arrival in the United States. The essential problem is simply that the United States—a country that

has ruled Iran for 25 years, that brought about the coup that brought the Shah to power, that committed enormous crimes in our country in the political and human, cultural and economic field—now, following the Iranian revolution, that country has taken the liberty of an extremely flagrant act by having the Shah, the symbol of all the crimes in our country, stay there. At that moment we could not take this insult, this humiliation of our revolution, and for this reason people have reacted in the manner that they have.

[Mourousi] Mr. Minister, there is nevertheless some contradiction in the action of Iranian policy. First one asks for the convocation of the UN Security Council, one asks that the United Nations get moving, and just when the United Nations decides to make a move, Iran says: We are withdrawing, we have no intention at all of going to the UN Security Council. Now, how do you explain the ambiguity of this position?

[Gotbzadeh] Listen, it is not really like that. We asked for the convening of the UN Security Council down there in the United States. After about 10 days they rejected our request, and then suddenly we heard that in 24 hours the UN Security Council would be convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Of course this affair, this ignoring of our request, this rejection of our request has caused an enormous feeling of suspicion in the population that perhaps the Council will meet to condemn us. At that moment, we decided not to go, and let me make this very clear to the people in the United States: If the line of thought, the policy of the UN Security Council (?takes the direction) of a policy of equilibrium, indicating that there is the slightest little chance from our position, at that moment we shall reconsider our stand on going to New York.

[Mourousi] Now then, the United States said, when the Security Council session was suspended after the meeting during the night: We believe that we shall arrive at a satisfactory solution at the Council. So, what kind of solution would satisfy both the Council and at the same time the Iranians?

[Gotbzadeh] We do not think that the Security Council can reach a satisfactory solution under the conditions in which it is meeting. And I have informed the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Waldheim, that this depends on the manner in which the Council expresses itself under the present circumstances regarding our very simple and very clear request—there is no ambiguity in this—for the return of the Shah by the United States, and then, of course, the crisis would completely disappear. So I hope that the Council will acquit itself in this matter by seeing both sides at the same time—surrender the Shah to the Iranian people for a trial for his crimes, and at the same time the problem with the United States will be over.

[Mourousi] So you are asking the Security Council quite simply to confirm what you wish, the extradition. To ask the United States to extradite the Shah and in return there will be no more problem regarding the hostages. Now are you sure, you, Mr. Gotbzadeh, that you are not going to have problems with the students if you try to thrust a solution on them, because apparently Mr. Bani Sadr did have problems.

[Gotbzadeh] The problem is simply that if our requests are satisfied, I do not believe that we shall have the slightest difficulty with the students, because their initial demand has been this, and is still valid. Even at the beginning of the crisis we tried to propose certain procedures for the extradition of the Shah, which unfortunately have not been accepted by the United States. The United States has been trying to escalate the crisis by freezing our assets, and the oil problem, and what have you, and so now we are simply saying: Give up the Shah, and the affair will be closed.

[Mourousi] So you are ready to wind up the affair if the Shah is handed back to you. And tell me, are you going to hand the three diplomats who are at your place to the students, so that they join the other hostages at the embassy?

[Gotbzadeh] As I said very clearly yesterday, they have come to us at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and they are there now. They are free.

[Mourousi] In their movements . . .

[Gotbzadeh] Free to wait there; we are going to insure their safety, their safety there, but the moment they go away, the moment they leave the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, we are no longer responsible. So they are there, they are safe.

[Mourousi] Mr. Minister, now as far as the trial of the hostages is concerned, is there no longer talk about it for the moment?

[Gotbzadeh] We do not talk about it, because as we have said already, if the United States decides to continue the crisis and does not follow the reason for accepting our proposal, does not understand the reasoning and feelings of our people, then the trial of the spies here becomes topical.

[Mourousi] And will this trial start soon, while the Shah is on US territory, or when the Shah leaves US territory? This is a rather unclear situation. Are you controlling this situation? Can you say that the trial of the spies as you call them, will start on this or that date?

[Gotbzadeh] We cannot set a date, because not the slightest decision in this connection (? can be taken), and I do not think that it can be done in the next few days.

[Mourousi] Mr. Minister, the referendum is being held today. We were talking about it before, at the beginning of the news. What is this referendum, which has practically already been won by the Ayatollah, going to change in everyday life?

[Mourousi] You have been very threatening to President as-Sadat recently, should he welcome the Shah.

[Gotbzadeh] Oh, there is not much difference between as-Sadat, the Shah, (?Hitler) and the rest. They are all the same.

[Mourousi] You see them all as criminals?

[Gotbzadeh] About the same, yes.

[Mourousi] But you do not request extradition as far as the others are concerned?

[Telephone link with Tehran lost at this point]

48. Careful Guarding of Laingen

LD021256 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1220 GMT, 2 Dec. 79 LD.

[Statement issued by the Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Policy stationed in the "spy den of America"—read by announcer.]

[Text] In the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful. From the former embassy of the United States to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Islamic Republic of Iran:

As we have informed you before, the spying chargé d'affaires of America and his two companions, who are in that ministry, are the Iranian nation's hostages. Now we emphasize that with the new documents and evidence discovered, these persons are proved to be the heads of spies of the embassy and should be guarded carefully so that the nation of Iran can decide about them at an opportune time.

[Signed] The Muslim Student Followers of the Imam's Policy.

49. Students Threaten to Begin Trials

LD021502 Tehran Domestic Service in Persian, 1430 GMT, 2 Nov. 79 LD.

[Text] According to reports from news agencies, the deposed Shah today left Cornell Hospital in New York for Texas. The White House announced that the deposed Shah will be continuing his treatment in Wilford Hall, a military hospital near San Antonio, Texas.

Meanwhile, Reuter reported that the Student Followers of the Imam's Policy who have occupied the American spy den in Tehran and demanded the extradition of the deposed Shah, have threatened that if the deposed Shah leaves America, they will put their American hostages on trial.

Reuter reports that the students, who were angered at the prospect of the deposed Shah travelling to another country, told this agency in a telephone conversation that if the deposed Shah leaves the United States for any destination other than Iran, they will start trials of their hostages immediately.

SELECTED DOCUMENT 2

RESPONSE BY THE UNITED STATES, 11 DECEMBER 1979¹, TO QUESTIONS PRESENTED BY THE COURT ON 10 DECEMBER 1979²

Reference is made in the Application to the seizure of two United States consulates in, respectively, Tabriz and Shiraz. The Court would be grateful to receive such information as the United States Government may possess as to what happened to the premises and personnel of these consulates and, in general, to its consular staff in Iran.

A. The operations of the US consular posts in Tabriz and Shiraz had been suspended since February of 1979 when our posts in several Iranian cities were attacked by demonstrators. Therefore, no American personnel were at these posts at the time the incidents occurred. The premises were seized by demonstrators in early November, and we have no current report on their status. Four of the diplomatic agents held hostage since the seizure of the Embassy in Tehran are members of the consular section of the Embassy.

In paragraph 8, that is, the final paragraph of the declaration by Mr. David D. Newsom, he furnished certain information concerning the categories of persons stated to be held in the United States Embassy or elsewhere in Iran. The Court would, however, be grateful if you would provide it with more details, making clear the particular status of everyone in each category and specifying the manner of their accreditation.

B. The 6 December declaration of Under Secretary David D. Newsom identified at least 28 of those persons held hostage in the Embassy as members of the diplomatic staff. To the best of our knowledge this includes five members of the political section, three members of the economic section, four members of the consular section, five members of the administrative section, four members of the cultural affairs section, and six³ military attachés. The 6 December declaration also identified at least 20 members of the administrative and technical staff of the Embassy held hostage. To the best of our knowledge this includes a medical officer, six members of the communications section, five³ members of the military attaché staff, and nine marine security guards. The members of the diplomatic, administrative and technical staffs were accredited through the usual or customary procedures: Iranian diplomatic or official visas were placed in their diplomatic or official passports, the personnel were notified to the Government of Iran by the Embassy in Tehran in accordance with established practice, and they were issued proper identification by Iran either as diplomatic staff or as members of the administrative and technical staff entitled to privileges and immunities. This information as to accreditation is based in part on records in Washington and in part on the understanding of officers with recent knowledge of the practices of the post, but we, unfortunately, are currently unable to obtain access to that portion of our records in the Embassy in Tehran.

Mr. David D. Newsom, in response to my request of 4 December 1979 for certain information, stated in paragraph 3 of his Declaration of 6 December 1979 that Mr. Ramsey Clark had gone to Iran on 7 November 1979 in a vain attempt "to deliver a message from the President of the United States to the Ayatollah

¹ See p. 500, *infra*.

² See p. 37, *supra*.

³ See pp. 503-504, *infra*.

Khomeini and to seek the immediate release of the hostages". He further stated in that paragraph that the United States Government has "communicated positions on various matters relating to the crisis to the Iranian Chargé d'Affaires in Washington" and has also "put specific questions to the Chargé d'Affaires". Would the Agent of the United States please be good enough to furnish the Court with a copy of the message intended to be delivered by Mr. Ramsey Clark and of any documents or questions communicated to the Iranian Chargé d'Affaires in Washington.

C. Diplomatic efforts are still being attempted through many channels, including the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and many countries. We believe that these efforts must be carried out in confidence and could be adversely affected by the disclosure of the contents of démarches earlier made or intended. We therefore regret that circumstances do not, at this time, permit the United States to enter these communications into the proceedings of the Court. We would advise the Court in general terms, however, that the message to be delivered by Mr. Clark contained a protest of the actions of the Government of Iran and a call for release of the hostages. Mr. Clark was also authorized to discuss all avenues for resolution of the crisis. The communications to the Iranian Chargé were of a similar nature and also included requests for an improvement in the condition of the hostages. Should the Court determine it essential to any aspect of our request presently before the Court to receive additional information in this regard, we would appreciate being informed of the specific need and the particular aspect of the matter affected by it, so that we might balance the considerations in the best interests of the hostages.

The first submission of the United States request for the indication of provisional measures is worded as follows:

"That the Government of Iran immediately release all hostages of United States nationality and facilitate the prompt and safe departure from Iran of these persons and all other United States officials in dignified and humane circumstances."

Would the Agent of the United States be so good as to provide further details regarding the persons referred to herein as "all other United States officials"?

D. This statement was made in order to ensure that all US officials who may be in Iran would be permitted to leave. In addition to the United States officials believed to be held hostage at the Embassy in Tehran, the United States Chargé d'Affaires, political counsellor and Embassy first secretary, members of the Embassy's diplomatic staff, are confined at the foreign ministry and are unable to leave.

SELECTED DOCUMENT 3

RESPONSE BY THE UNITED STATES, 12 DECEMBER 1979¹, TO A QUESTION
PRESENTED BY JUDGE GROS ON 11 DECEMBER 1979²

It should be recalled that, in February 1979, not only the United States Consulates at Tabriz and Shiraz but the United States Embassy in Tehran were attacked. The attacks were on a large scale, and damage to United States facilities was so extensive that, for some six weeks after the attacks, the work of United States officials had to be conducted from the residences of the United States Ambassador, the Deputy Chief of Mission and other outlying offices. There was a lack of access to files and to the most ordinary working material, including paper and other office supplies, which are normally required in the operation of diplomatic and consular facilities. At the same time, the formal governmental structure of Iran did not appear to exercise much power or authority; events moved quickly and were in a constant state of flux.

In these confused circumstances, the Ambassador of the United States at Tehran and his colleagues made oral protests, during and after the attacks, to officials of the Government of Iran. United States officials also raised orally the concern of the United States Government that the Foreign Minister of Iran failed to come promptly to the Embassy to express in person his regrets at the attacks.

Subsequently, the United States Embassy sent a note or notes to the Iranian Foreign Ministry listing the damages to the United States Embassy and, it is believed, the Consulate in Tabriz (there does not appear to have been consequential material damage to the Consulate in Shiraz). Copies of these notes are believed to be in the files of the United States Embassy in Tehran and are not currently accessible to the Government of the United States.

In the foregoing connections, the Court may find of interest the following excerpt from a briefing by the press spokesman of the Department of State on 14 February 1979:

"There was a period, which I do not have a fix on, when the attackers were in there. I understand that the Chancery is so badly tear-gassed that it is not usable at this time. There was, by the initial wave of attackers, some acts of pillaging of the Ambassador's residence. But I just don't know at this point how long, in fact, once the followers of the provisional government came back in—how long they were inside those buildings, or what the status is right now—I was just handed a note. I thought I said this, but on the question of the responsibility for the attack, we clearly have stated that the government not only wasn't responsible for the attack but that the government acted quickly and efficiently to try to deal with the attackers and to get them out of there. And I want to reemphasize that."

As the foregoing statement indicates, the Government of Iran, at that time, appeared to recognize its obligations under customary international law and treaties in force to deal with the attackers. This is confirmed by the following telegram from the United States Embassy in Tehran, signed by Ambassador Sullivan, of 11 March 1979:

¹ See p. 502, *infra*.

² See p. 501, *infra*.

“Attack on Embassy. We received on March 11 a letter from Prime Minister Bazargan dated March 1 expressing regrets for the February 14 attack on the Embassy and GOI willingness to reimburse us for the damages sustained. The full text of the letter, complete with spelling and other errors, follows: ‘The Provisional Revolutionary Government of Iran present their compliments to the Embassy of the United States of America, and while expressing their deep regret at the incident which occurred on February 14, 1979, would like to state that the said regrettable occurrence was instigated by anti-revolutionary elements. The Government have made arrangements to prevent seriously the repetition of such incidents. It is requested that the regrets of this Government be communicated to the United States Government. Furthermore, this Government would like to declare their readiness to indemnify the damages caused by the above incident. The Provisional Revolutionary Government of Iran avail themselves of this opportunity to renew the assurances of their highest consideration.’ (Signed) Mehdi Bazargan, Prime Minister.”

It is not known to the Government of the United States at this juncture whether the United States protests referred to above expressly invoked the Treaty of Amity, Economic Relations, and Consular Rights with Iran or other treaty rights of the United States which bore upon the incidents in question. As noted, records of those protests are, to the best of its knowledge, in the files of the United States Embassy in Tehran and are not accessible to United States authorities. In any event, it does not appear that the Government of Iran was then disposed to contest its responsibility to the United States for the attacks on United States premises for, while attributing these attacks to “anti-revolutionary elements”, it expressed its deep regret, gave assurances that it would prevent further attacks, and declared its readiness to pay for the damage caused by the attacks.