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The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In continuation of the general debate on this agenda item, I am pleased to call on the second speaker for this morning, the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic, who has kindly consented to speak first in the absence of the representative whose name appears first on the list.

Mr. AL MUNTASSER (Libyan Arab Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): Mr. Chairman, since this is the first time that I am speaking in this Committee, I should like personally and officially to congratulate you on your election as Chairman of the First Committee. Your election is a tribute to your competence and diplomatic skill as well as to your great country. (continued in Arabic)

The First Committee and the General Assembly are still discussing the questions of disarmament either collectively or separately, following the procedure of previous years. My delegation would not take the initiative in placing responsibility for this situation on any single State or group of States, but the tons of paper used and the millions of words spoken have not succeeded in extinguishing a single flame of war and have not destroyed a single weapon. It is unfortunate that we still see the weapons industry flourishing and developing and we note the efforts that have been exerted to develop that industry to a degree which has made it a direct threat to man’s life on earth.

The arms industry has not only absorbed the funds necessary for feeding human beings, educating children and treating the sick but has also absorbed
man's genius and subjected it to finding the speediest means of polluting the environment, changing the course of nature and utilizing natural phenomena to eradicate what remains of the sound environment suitable for human life.

It is surprising that it should be possible, as the representative of the Soviet Union has said, for the waters of the ocean to submerge coasts while men in the desert are eagerly searching for a drop of water to satisfy their thirst, to maintain life for their cattle or to cultivate their land.

The military mentality has turned man's genius into an instrument for inventing means to restrict his freedom and to exploit him. It has attempted to use science, which is a vital product of man's genius, as an instrument for ending men's existence on this planet. It is high time for people to put an end to this criminal mentality, which has continued up to the present time to exploit man's resources and to use them for the manufacture of instruments of destruction.

The discussion of the disarmament items, either collectively or separately, is not a technical matter and should not be confined to those who possess destructive weapons. In addition it is a subject which refers to the humanity of man, it also concerns human existence as a whole, a fact that gives weight to the opinions expressed by people all over the world. And peoples who do not possess weapons are also entitled to speak about them; I mean the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America. Those people who still do not believe that it is possible for a single country to annihilate a whole people by using a single instrument of destruction, that it is possible for one country to burn the plantations that another country has taken great pains to cultivate by influencing the natural elements, and that the destructive weapons stored by some countries are sufficient to end human existence on earth, are entitled to say that life, existence and the destiny of man are linked to the stand adopted by a single country or to a certain mentality which exists in some countries and which may want to put an end to life on earth.

The subject is no longer one of academic discussion concerned with agreements or conventions concluded or about to be concluded, because agreements have not put an end to acts of aggression, have not halted the production of weapons and have not put an end to the surprising speed of the development of the arms industry. The fact that more than a quarter of a century has passed since the catastrophe of
Nagasaki and Hiroshima, the signing of the Charter of the United Nations and the signing of peace pacts has not been able to lessen the destructive power of nuclear weapons, either quantitatively or qualititively. The various resolutions calling for the limitation of weapons have not reduced the number of nuclear States; in fact, their number has increased.

In spite of the time which has passed since man has emerged from these terrible crises he experienced, the world is still a stage for experiments with instruments of destruction and an arena for the conclusion of military pacts, the building of bases and the threatening of people's destiny. Words and promises, that have not been respected, are no longer sufficient today to convince people that disarmament can be achieved either partially or completely and that the instruments of destruction have not become more efficient and more destructive. The negotiations and agreements to limit or restrict the destructiveness of nuclear weapons have not yet contributed to producing these results which we have long awaited.

We are not trying to undermine the importance of agreements which take into account the reduction of the dangers threatening human life, but exaggerated hopes about talks and conferences that do not seem about to be convened and about commitments to certain ethical rules about the use of various weapons will not be helpful in achieving good results. Dreams have in many cases led to the suffocation of the dreamer.

All the disarmament items which are included in the agenda of this Committee and which are being discussed together are vital and require a great deal of thought and discussion, but success on any of them depends on the fruitfulness of our meetings. If we do not intend to follow words with deeds, it would all be of no use.
Non-use of napalm and other incendiary weapons depends on the non-emergence of wars large or small. It also depends on the readiness of imperialists to give up their ambitions and the readiness of some countries to abandon the type of mentality that makes them think they have the right to impose their wishes on the peoples of the rest of the globe. As long as that superiority complex exists, imperialism will never be ready to restrict the arms industry either quantitatively or qualitatively, and will not be willing to give up the progress made in the development of those weapons.

Napalm is still in use, nuclear weapons are still being produced, and attempts to influence the environment, food and other basic elements of human existence continue. Such weapons are being stockpiled in the twentieth century, the century of the United Nations. I can safely assert that every conscientious human being in this world has witnessed the effects and sad consequences of this situation.

We want to point out that disarmament is not only the material process of halting the development of destructive weapons and destroying stockpiles. It is also a psychological process. If there is to be a political solution, the peoples must stem the tide of the trend towards self-destruction and the destruction of others.

This year there have been numerous conferences concerning human life, some concerned with the oceans, such as the Conference on the Law of the Sea, and others concerned with population and with food. The real objective of all those conferences was the development and improvement of human life. We ask ourselves what is to be man's destiny and the destiny of the oceans if human life is every hour and every moment threatened with total destruction.

Our people and most of the peoples of the world live in terror. They are working hard to improve their life. But they witness the abuse or misuse of human capacities resulting in more expenditure on armaments, and they see that no similar efforts are exerted in the field of development. Had there been real concern for human resources and achievements, those resources would not have been dissipated in this destructive manner.

Some have said there is a crisis in energy and in raw materials, but nobody has ever called for the destruction of energy and raw materials in order to satisfy the need for the instruments of war and destruction. The world is
nursing a monster, and nourishing the growth of that monster. When it is fully grown, it will turn and consume those who nourished it.

The arms race has been a burden to mankind in all parts of the world, and the imperialist threat to small countries and peoples, and the initiation of crises have threatened the budgets of those peoples, their whole economies, and their ability to acquire the means of defence. They feel directly or indirectly threatened. Food for their children, the cost of their education and the need to preserve their health are all being sacrificed for the sake of acquiring the means to defend their independence, their territorial integrity and their sources of natural wealth. I am not exaggerating when I say that what small countries spend on armaments goes towards the development of further means of destruction and threats, since it goes to the imperialist countries that are exploiting other peoples and maintaining domination over them.

My delegation does not underestimate the importance of proposals concerning each agenda item. We shall deal with them in time and comment on them. But we think the time has come to recognize that some nations have certain responsibilities they must meet. Perhaps the United Nations, after more than a quarter-century of existence, can make a beginning in this direction.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic for his very friendly words to myself and my country, which he was courteous enough to say in Spanish. Since my knowledge of Arabic is very modest, I shall limit myself to saying, quite simply, "Shoukra".

The Committee finds itself in a very anomalous situation. There are four more names on the list of speakers, and not one of those representatives is present. We must either wait for them or adjourn the meeting. Therefore, if there is no objection, I shall suspend the meeting for 15 minutes.
The meeting was suspended at 11.05 a.m. and resumed at 11.30 a.m.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the situation in which we have found ourselves this morning. From a meeting at which five representatives were listed to speak, at a given time four were absent. Had it not been for the graciousness and punctuality of the representative of the Libyan Arab Republic, who was in his place, we would not even have had a speaker to start the meeting.

The President of the General Assembly has at different times expressed to me his concern at the waste of time, and all that this implies, in the various Committees. My responsibility is, of course, for the First Committee.

It sometimes happens that representatives whose names are on the list of speakers for a given meeting do not wish to speak then but at a later time. However, it is not always possible to meet such wishes, despite the good will of the Chairman.

By way of example I would point out that from today until Monday, 11 November, when the general debate on this item is to end, we have seven speakers for the morning of each day except Thursday, 7 November, and Monday, 11 November, when there will be afternoon meetings for which we have eight and nine speakers respectively. It will therefore not be possible to transfer to the list for another meeting those representatives who are not present to speak when their turn comes to do so.

Furthermore, when we add together the speaking times estimated by the speakers themselves, we find that some mornings they add up to three hours of debate, when actually all the time we have is two and a half hours -- and that only if we start at 10.30 sharp. Hence, before we even start we are exceeding the time allotted to the Committee. And much the same applies to the afternoon meetings.

Accordingly, since we are subject to a strict time-table, which applies not only to the First Committee itself but also to our commitments within the General Assembly machinery as a whole, and especially the plenary meetings, and since we have already closed the list of speakers on the present item, when speakers are not present we shall, regrettably, not be able to place them on the list of another meeting in view of the circumstances I have just explained.
As a last recourse, those representatives who have not spoken because they were not present when it was their turn to do so, but who have a very keen interest in participating in the general debate, could have their names placed on a separate list so that in due course, if it were possible, we might organize a night meeting for the purpose of hearing them. As we all know, night meetings naturally are not very popular, and I am not concealing the fact that in raising the issue I am exercising a form of pressure on all members of the Committee to be present when their turn comes to speak, as otherwise they might become responsible for night meetings if night meetings had to be scheduled.

We have three more speakers on the list for this morning. Only one, the representative of Cyprus, is present, and I now call on him.
Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): As the world moves to almost the half way mark in the disarmament decade, nuclear weapons are again proliferating, both horizontally and vertically. The vertical stockpiling of nuclear weapons has continued uninterrupted since the beginning of the atomic age. On the other hand, the horizontal spread of such weapons has been intermittent and was for a time confined to the five permanent members of the Security Council. Now, however, those constraints are crumbling and the prospect of horizontal proliferation through another whole group of nuclear-weapon States appears imminent. This spread of nuclear weapons comes at a time when the non-proliferation Treaty is to have its first review. Under special scrutiny will be the question of whether certain nuclear Powers have fulfilled their obligation under Article VI of the Treaty:

"... to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race ...". (General Assembly resolution 2373 (XXII))

Many of the speeches in the general debate and in the general discussion in this Committee have dealt with nuclear disarmament and nuclear proliferation. Indeed, many of the disarmament items on our agenda are related in one way or another to this overriding issue of proliferation.

One of the most pertinent discussions of this whole problem took place at Divonne, France, in September, and was sponsored by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The conference was non-governmental and unofficial. The five conclusions of that Carnegie conference are, however, of interest, since they constitute answers to some of the problems facing this Committee on the eve of what seems to be a runaway proliferation of nuclear weapons, and they might usefully be mentioned here.

First, the Carnegie conference urged that the parties to the non-proliferation Treaty should fulfil promptly their obligations relating to the cessation of the nuclear arms race and to nuclear disarmament. That means substantial and early results, from the second round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, in the reduction of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles and conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. For the last 11 years the latter question has been a perennial item on our agenda without there having been any result or any change -- with
even a marked increase in over-all nuclear testing since the signing of the partial test-ban Treaty in Moscow in 1963.

Secondly, it was suggested that more meaningful action should be taken by the nuclear Powers for ensuring security. To that end an undertaking would have to be made by the nuclear Powers not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear party to the Treaty. It was also suggested that the creation of additional nuclear-free zones should be encouraged.

Thirdly, it was proposed by the Carnegie conference that the whole problem of so-called peaceful nuclear explosions should be studied and clarified through a prompt examination by experts appointed by the Secretary-General. Out of that study might come a proposal for an international régime to supervise all peaceful nuclear explosions of all States, should such explosions be found to be at all feasible.

Fourthly, it was further suggested that the sharing of peaceful nuclear activities should continue, and indeed be increased. However, nuclear materials and technology should be transferred only to those non-nuclear weapon States which have agreed to accept approved International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards on all their programmes.
Fifth and last, the Carnegie Conference insists that the national and international safeguards system must be strengthened and made universal and, above all, that much higher environmental standards must be maintained. That is a very important aspect.

Those five suggestions, while by no means constituting the answer to present problems of proliferation, nevertheless represent a valuable contribution. The report should be studied and some of its recommendations applied while there is still time.

I turn now to another of the disarmament items on our agenda. One more year has gone by without any effective steps having been taken to outlaw the use and production of weapons causing inhumane, indiscriminate suffering, despite the fact that such use and production have been condemned by the international community. The Geneva Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts was seized of this issue, and a Conference of Experts met a few weeks ago, also in Switzerland, to discuss napalm and other indiscriminate weapons. This subject is also again before this Committee and the Sixth Committee, as well as the second session of the Diplomatic Conference.

The need effectively to ban napalm and other weapons of mass destruction remains urgent, and prompt global action is compellingly necessary. The relevant resolution adopted last year by the General Assembly invited the Diplomatic Conference at Geneva to consider the question and seek agreement on rules prohibiting the use of weapons deemed to cause unnecessary suffering or to have indiscriminate effects.

As SIPRI has remarked, the laws of war do not recognize in belligerents an unlimited power in the adoption of means of injuring the enemy. The means of combat are restricted in two ways: weapons should not cause superfluous injury, and they should not be employed indiscriminately against combatants as well as non-combatants', without regard to their general effects. Under historical practice and custom, the weapons used should be such that enemy forces may be rendered unable to continue the combat. Any injury beyond that necessary to accomplish that aim is regarded as superfluous and inhumane. Napalm violates that restriction in particularly blatant ways. The relevant United Nations
report, that of 1972, points out that napalm is particularly barbarous because it causes injuries that are 'superfluous and particularly cruel to the civilian population'. The most salient points of the report are these: First, more than a quarter of the people struck by napalm are likely to suffer burns over more than 25 per cent of their bodies. Second, about a third of the napalm casualties die within half an hour, in intense agony. Third, if a badly burned victim survives the first day, he remains in a critical state, a state of agony, for 30 or 40 days. Fourth, despite intensive medical care, less than 20 per cent of such casualties live through convalescence, which is itself most painful and arduous. Not only are burn wounds intensely painful but treating them on a large scale requires enormous medical resources, resources far beyond the capacity of most countries.

It is estimated, according to SIPRI, that more people died in Tokyo and Dresden from the effects of a single night's napalm incendiary bombing than from the nuclear weapon bombardment of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It may be recalled that heat and fire were the major causes of death that resulted from the nuclear bombardment.

What I have said suffices to show the effects and the criminality of the use of these weapons, which are still not prohibited.

SIPRI has pointed out that the treatment of 1,000 napalm victims with 30 per cent burns requires 8,000 litres of plasma, 6,000 litres of blood, 16,000 litres of a balanced salt solution, 250 trained surgeons and physicians, and about 1,500 skilled attendants. Few countries can provide all those requirements. Furthermore, hospitalization of up to four or five months is essential for treatment, convalescence and eventual recovery.

Napalm has been made even more inhumanly destructive by the addition of substances which make it more sticky and of oxidizers whose effect is to prevent it from being extinguished — a particularly inhumane development.

The use of incendiary weapons often cause mass destruction, so that the civilian population suffers more from such use than do military personnel.

It is to be noted that in terms of military objectives the effects of incendiary weapons are probably no greater than the effects of other types of weapons. So why use them? The unnecessary inhumanity of their use is all too
obvious. The use of such weapons should be prohibited altogether, and particularly their use from aircraft together with other weapons of mass destruction.

In the light of the foregoing, it becomes compellingly necessary to take urgent measures for the complete and effective prohibition of the use of napalm and other incendiary weapons: they must be totally eliminated from the arsenals of States. For the inhumanity of napalm and other incendiary weapons is comparable to, and in some respects surpasses, the inhumanity of atomic weapons.

A most recent and pertinent example of the effects of inhumane napalm bombing is the bombing of my country, to which I refer with a sad and heavy heart. The extensive bombing in the course of the invasion of the island of Cyprus during the summer months was a most painful, indeed a tragic, experience. That bombing resulted in, among other things, devastating forest fires and other indiscriminate and wanton mass destruction. It was so difficult to alleviate the suffering caused by that bombing.

My country therefore speaks of this subject from experience. The echo of its agony should serve to emphasize the need to lose no time in totally prohibiting the use of these inhumane weapons. The tragedy involved in the unrestrained attacks, for weeks on end, against a small, undefended country speaks in sad notes of the growing deterioration -- to the point of breakdown -- of any vestige of international security and legal order, a subject closely linked to, indeed interconnected with, progress towards disarmament, which we are now discussing. It serves as a signal of where the world is heading in respect of the anarchy in armaments.

Fifteen years have now passed since the General Assembly, in 1959, resolved unanimously in favour of general and complete disarmament. Subsequently, in 1961, it adopted the joint declaration on the basic principles of disarmament. It appeared then that we were very close to an effective move forward. High hopes were aroused that at last there was an opening towards disarmament. But while conditions for a balance of power at every step in the process of disarmament were being unproductively discussed during the relevant negotiations over the years, the arms race was at the same time being feverishly and
effectively pursued, burying any disarmament attempt under an avalanche of multiple and new nuclear weapons. Thus the number of land based ICBMs increased from 30 in 1961 to over 2,500 in 1972, while military expenditure rose from $97 million in 1960 to approximately $250 million in 1972. Those figures certainly do not give grounds to feel, or even to hope, that any logical steps are being taken towards disarmament.
Efforts at disarmament or at the reduction or even limitation of armaments based on balance of power over many decades have completely failed. The basic reason is that balance of power is compatible with an arms race, and is not conducive to the reversal of the arms race and to disarmament. Indeed, balance of power is but the other side of the coin of the arms race. Both are based on antagonism in military power, with war in view, and on mistrust, and both are incompatible with the concept of trust and co-operation required for any disarmament effort.

Theoretically, balance of power may seem just as possible with disarmament, and it would be possible if there were the political will. But that political will is dependent upon whether the problem is approached in a spirit of trust and co-operation or, conversely, in an antagonistic spirit and in mistrust, with an attempt to get over the mistrust by the balance of power. But one cannot do it, and it has been proved by experience over the years that one cannot have co-operation compatible with mistrust and with one side trying to get an advantage over the other, or what they call balance of power.

We have no doubt that the same appears to be the difficulty in the SALT agreements which, despite all good intentions on both sides -- and we do not doubt the intentions in which the SALT negotiations are held -- have not resulted in the achievement of any of the ends they were intended for. And I believe the reason is the same. The arms race, in consequence, remains unaffected and is even fed by the requirements of the SALT agreements. Thus, under the SALT agreement signed in 1972, although certain restrictions were placed on land-based and sea-based missiles, missile-launchers -- that is, 1,000 land-based and 710 sea-based missiles for missile-launchers for the United States, and 1,410 and 950 of each respectively for the Soviet Union, yet by reason of there being no mention in the accord of multiple warheads, or of any other qualitative or technological limitations, it is expected now that by the end of 1975 the multiple warhead missile force of the United States will be increased by over four times the original force, the one I have just mentioned, and by 1980 over six times, and correspondingly of the USSR. In consequence, the result of the talks on arms limitations, as things stand today, is a constant increase of the arms race instead of any reduction.
The fact that there is no agreement so far to cut down on MIRV's and, more importantly, to arrest the qualitative improvements of nuclear weapons, in view of the dangers involved, is significant to the whole process. Also, quantitatively, if the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons is not arrested, the horizontal proliferation, which is a great danger, will be inevitable, and will have incalculable repercussions.

Therefore, all emphasis must be placed on the need to cut down the vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons and to arrest the qualitative arms race. Only then can there be some hope of a positive move towards limiting the arms race and towards disarmament.

However, as I said before, my personal belief is that the fault may not lie with those negotiating the SALT agreements or other negotiators, but with the wrong premise of basing every move towards disarmament on the mistrust involved in the balance of power, in a spirit of antagonism which requires meticulous provisions and which is but the result and the child of the concept of force.

The balance of power and the concept of force are relics of the pre-atomic age. They will have to be replaced by the new concept of mutual understanding as required by the Charter -- why do we have the Charter? -- of trust and co-operation, of harmonizing the relations of nations in the positive spirit of a united mankind, that is, of a truly united United Nations in the spirit of the Charter, not merely in the letter, and in meeting common dangers and common needs, the global dangers and global needs that face all nations and that can only be met through sincere and all-out co-operation -- not a supposed co-operation with each side aiming, under the cloak of balance of power, for an edge or advantage in the arms competition.

It may be difficult to change course from the beaten track and from the momentum of an antagonistic world built up over the millenia, and to try to ward off the growing dangers from that course in a nuclear age, a nuclear age that was not envisaged in the old time, that was not even dreamt of, thus allowing people then to follow that antagonistic course with impunity for the future of mankind, though it cannot be followed today. That is what should be brought home to the leaders of nations and those who are responsible for this world, for the
progress of this world. But all of us are responsible because all of us are responsible for the way in which the Government in each country and the leaders of nations, and the leading nations, act. Therefore, let us emphasize the need for a new approach to these problems, a more co-operative and positive approach.

The report of the Secretary-General on the reduction of the military budgets of States is an important new addition to the growing United Nations literature by consultant experts on disarmament matters. While inflation affects military budgets, as it does everything else, the new record high figure involved in military expenditure during 1973 is really unsettling. The experts tell us that since 1961 world military budgets have risen between $7,000 million and $8,000 million annually. Thus, the appropriations of developed countries for military purposes are 20 times their appropriations for development aid.

The experts estimate that if the major military Powers were to channel to development aid approximately only 1 per cent of the resources currently thrown away on military expenditure, this would be $2,000 million, or an increase of 20 per cent for development.

To engender progress in disarmament, two ingredients are needed. One is international security based on world legal order. That is very important. Unless there is international security, it is very difficult to disarm, and there can be no international security without an international legal order, which is the basis of it. And that is what is required by the principles of the Charter.

Progress towards those ends has been too slow and must be made much faster if nations are to take the giant steps needed to lower their nuclear and conventional stockpiles.

A second ingredient for progress in disarmament, as we said before, is the political will. But that, as I explained, is dependent on the approach to the problem itself. As a Member State, caught this very year in the throes of a war imposed on us, we must say something here about the so-called conventional arms and thus conventional disarmament.
Millions have been killed and maimed since the Second World War not by nuclear arms but by so-called conventional arms. The international community must put restraints on the sale of arms and trade in arms. Restraints must also be put on the use of conventional arms by updating the 1949 Geneva Conventions. We hope there will be real progress at the second session of the Diplomatic Conference in Geneva early next year.

In this same realm of non-nuclear matters, we support the initiative of the Soviet Union concerning prohibition of action to influence the environment and climate for military purposes. A study will have to be undertaken promptly, and followed by the negotiation of a convention.

Never in recent years has there been so much activity in the field of disarmament and so many negotiations, yet so far with few results. We hope that the many forums for the discussion of disarmament will continue, and will produce more results so that the year 1975, the very mid-point of the Disarmament Decade, may indeed be a better year, a vintage year for actual and substantial disarmament agreements. Nothing less will satisfy the yearning of mankind.

Mr. KINEKE (Uganda): This is the first time I have addressed this Committee on disarmament items, which I must say have been dealt with comprehensively by speakers before me. However, before I make a few observations on the subject which over the past several years has led to such constant and vigorous debates in this Assembly, allow me to join others who have spoken before me in congratulating you, Mr. Chairman, and the other distinguished officers of the Committee on your election to those high offices. My delegation has ample cause to believe that, because of your renowned experience as a diplomat of exceptional ability, those of us assembled here under your guidance will achieve positive and concrete results in all our deliberations in the service of peace and mankind. In this exercise my delegation pledges its full and enduring co-operation.
I shall be very brief in my observations. I shall dwell, therefore, on those aspects of disarmament which we believe are of direct relevance to the threat to international peace and security, quite apart from the grave economic and social consequences of the continued escalation of the arms race. My Government's policy since the partial test-ban Treaty of 1963 has always been to support all efforts to bring about general and complete disarmament. We believe that the discontinuance of the manufacture of all nuclear weapons for all time is the only meaningful step towards the establishment of international peace and security. With its attendant problems of the contamination of man's environment, the arms race clearly has other grave and harmful effects on peace and on mankind.

My delegation has followed with keen interest the new trend among the super-Powers, particularly the United States and the USSR, towards bringing about a spirit of détente, and we should like especially to join other delegations in welcoming the move by the two super-Powers on a new agreement on strategic offensive arms which it is hoped will cover the period up to 1985. While we welcome all these efforts, we are still concerned that, in spite of the resumed Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, since the last session there have been signs of an increasing rather than a decreasing accumulation of arms by certain super-Powers. It is not necessary to reiterate the fact that the Indian and Pacific Oceans have been a hotbed of rivalry among certain super Powers. This is clearly another way of intensifying arms expansion, with the result that the international community will soon be faced with yet another round of the arms race.

My delegation believes that it is high time all disarmament agreements reached through this Organization were implemented; otherwise, as members of several delegations have stated, the agreements will be nothing but an attempt "to seek confirmation by the small and medium countries of the monopoly of nuclear weapons by the super-Powers". My minister of Foregin Affairs, as leader of the Uganda delegation, made the position of the Uganda Government very clear during the general debate in the plenary Assembly. She said:
"Uganda is happy to note the growing interest among Member States in the attempt not only to curb potential arsenals but also to limit or destroy the existing ones... We neither support the proliferation of nuclear weapons nor wish to see the big Powers alone monopolizing nuclear weapons. We believe that disarmament should involve first and foremost the destruction of existing stockpiles of nuclear weapons.

"We fear that if the big Powers are left to monopolize the nuclear club, the former colonial Powers will have the instrument to return and colonize us in one form or another..."

"...even if present stockpiles of nuclear weapons are destroyed, technological knowledge should not be monopolized by the super-Powers only. If the developing countries are ever to bridge the economic gap between them and the developed countries, then it is necessary that they have access to nuclear technology in order to use it for peaceful and developmental purposes." (A/PV.2245, pp. 17-20)

We live in a world in which interdependence among all countries of the world has become the order of the day. It is a world in which the needs and interests of the developed countries cannot be isolated from the interests and needs of the poor and developing countries. Arms race or no arms race, nuclear technology must not be the monopoly of the super-Powers alone. Either we permit a situation in which even the small and medium-sized countries which have nuclear capability exploit their "know-how" without let or hindrance as long as it is for peaceful purposes, or the super-Powers get rid of all stockpiles of nuclear weapons.
Recent developments in the world have shaken the whole structure of international relations, not only in the Middle East, where attempts at a permanent solution have been thwarted by the continued defiance by Israel of United Nations resolutions, but also in southern Africa, where the continued militarization of the racist minority régimes of South Africa and Rhodesia is a constant threat to international security. We need a lasting peaceful solution to the Middle East situation, exacerbated as it is by the Palestinian refugee problem, as much as we need a permanent solution in southern Africa, where the right to self-determination of our brothers in that region has not only to be recognized and respected but also guaranteed.

It is the belief of my delegation that all countries, great or small, are interdependent both in terms of security and in terms of the economy. There is much to be learned from the energy crisis. My delegation is therefore of the opinion that the so-called détente initiated by the big Powers could be extended to all hotbeds of crisis. It is a choice of travelling either the broad road to peace, equal co-operation and progress or the road leading to new tensions, upheavals and catastrophe. It would not be too far-fetched to say that therein lies the very essence of general and complete disarmament, because we believe that there is a very close relationship between disarmament and development.

If it is true that this is the Second United Nations Development Decade, as well as the disarmament decade, as I am sure it is, then let us not merely welcome the Soviet proposal for a reduction of the military budgets of States permanent members of the Security Council by 10 per cent and diversion of the funds thus saved to peaceful purposes such as economic development assistance and social progress for the developing countries. We should also make an out-and-out effort to see that that proposal is implemented.

As the representative of Sweden already pointed out, why should we continue to tolerate a world situation in which arms expenditure has spiralled to the extent that 70 per cent of it -- that is, between $240,000 and $275,000 million, to cite the representative of Sweden -- is spent in the United States, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and France only, when the majority of mankind is experiencing mass poverty and starvation?
My delegation believes, as it did last year, in the convening of a world disarmament conference, but again as many speakers have already stated, our fear is that some of the big Powers might boycott the conference, which would inevitably doom it to failure right from the start. There is much to be done, therefore, in persuading all the big Powers to bow to the interests and needs of all mankind and participate fully at the world disarmament conference when it is held, we hope before or during 1976.

On the question of nuclear-free zones, it has always been the policy of the Government of Uganda to support efforts towards making every zone a nuclear-free zone. We therefore support efforts to make the Indian Ocean a nuclear-free zone, just as we have always supported Additional Protocols I and II of the Treaty of Tlatelolco calling for the total prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America. Last but not least, I would conclude by saying that we fully support the proposal by Iran and Pakistan for the establishment of nuclear-free zones in South-East Asia and the Middle East.

We are also firmly convinced that it is high time that nuclear and thermonuclear tests ceased, and a test-ban treaty was finalized. As I already said, this has been our position since 1963, and it is my delegation's view that every effort should be made to conclude a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I thank Ambassador Kinene of Uganda for the kind words he was so good as to address to me.

Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): I was indeed hesitant to take the floor on the disarmament question, lest I should be considered presumptuous if I said what the major Powers should do, hailing as I do from a country that does not wield world power. But I thought that we small Powers must be frank not only with ourselves — which we are — but also with the so-called super-Powers and those that wield world power.

What a prodigal waste of time and effort; what dissipation of pious hopes of accomplishing something tangible on the question of disarmament! Have we lost our credibility here in this Committee? Do our colleagues prepare their statements and recite them as students do in the classroom? Look at the gallery.
Only five or six years ago it seemed to be filled up with people who had fastened their hopes upon us. Why is it vacant now? Have the masses lost hope that the United Nations can bring about an understanding between the major Powers? I believe that, to a large extent, this is true.

Almost three decades have elapsed -- 29 years -- since the signing of the United Nations Charter, which proclaimed in the name of the peoples, not of the Governments, of the United Nations -- meaning the world -- its determination "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind". I was present when the Charter was signed.

But what have we found since 1945? Mankind has been subjected to several wars and conflicts. Do I have to name them? The sum total of those wars and the sufferings caused amounts to a major conflict, and had it not been for the deterrent of fear, we would have had a third world war. And people who are afraid are not normal; they do not act normally; they are tense. Therefore, what assurance do we have that the world will not blow up through miscalculation?
Mankind is still being subjected to war and conflict. I go back to the days when I was 20 and I remember the Locarno pact of 1925, the purpose of which was for Powers to renounce the use of force to change frontiers. All right, we had the Second World War, but what about the aftermath of the Second World War? I do not have to embarrass people here by mentioning where frontiers have been changed by force and how some major Powers have encouraged those changes. I also remember very well -- because I was involved in international affairs -- the Geneva Protocol which prohibited the military use of chemical and bacteriological weapons. The Locarno pact of 1925 and the Geneva Protocol of 1925 -- it seems only yesterday! What is napalm? Is it eau de cologne? Bacteriological warfare would have been used, and may have been used on a small scale, were it not for the fear of epidemics, and that in the aftermath of the Second World War.

But classic warfare is fading out of the picture and there is a new form of warfare which does not need such huge expenditure on armaments. It is a new form of warfare, it is warfare on the part of certain Powers which resort to subversion by overt or covert means. Most of the civil wars we have been witnessing recently were brought about by external forces, so what is the use of abolishing only certain categories of arms -- whether they are the arms of the First World War or those of the Second World War -- when mischief can still be wrought on a large scale by external forces which pull the strings.

I spent three or four days reading the speeches of the representatives of the major Powers trying to find out whether I could glean some hope for the future. I was greatly disappointed because no satisfactory agreement has been reached in spite of those platitudes about détente. The leaders dine and wine and then their defence ministries see to it that, like moles, their researchers are underground, secretly, trying to devise new weapons.

That, if I may say so, is a policy based on schizophrenia. You do not have to have schizophrenia among individuals. They are put in an asylum for the insane. But who can tell those who concoct, or cause to be concocted, new means for waging war, that they are abnormal. They are abnormal and I am sorry to say that many leaders, if not personally abnormal, are following an abnormal pattern that has backfired. "Fragmented treaties" is the term I would use
for all those suggestions about agreements for the future. You cannot see the whole picture because only one part or another is being concentrated upon.

It has been asked time and again, "what will prevent any nuclear Power from engaging in nuclear blackmail in the future." Just because a government is at the head of a powerful country, does that mean it becomes moral? We know very well from everyday life that the wealthy and the powerful get drunk with power as individuals. Why should we concede that those individuals at the helm should not get drunk but for the deterrent of fear: not so much the fear of their adversary or enemy, but the fear of their own people who would lynch them if they engaged in modern warfare. That is why they are resorting to subversion, war by proxy, and the planting of marionettes. That began in the wake of the First World War, like mandates. They put in their own puppets and marionettes. I dealt with those puppets or marionettes so I am not talking from the top of my head or from the history books. But they are doing it now and not even covertly. Sometimes, of course, they have to resort to covert means but they do it overtly. It is in the papers. Who is doing it? Who is the author of these external interventions but those who have the means of power and who can get away with murder. And here we come to talk about the Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear power.

I, for one, if I was to be asked by my Government would say, "as long as you do not have the will to work on nuclear arms, why should we be such fools as even to sign a nuclear power non-proliferation treaty." We have been approached time and again but we feel at ease, innocent. We do not have any nuclear industry and we do not intend to embark on the road of nuclear weapons production.

But what about those who have the fear that the nuclear Powers might resort to nuclear blackmail. One cannot blame them. Are they sanctified these people at the head of the nuclear Powers? They are human beings with all the ills, ailments, frailties and weaknesses of any person. Rather, they have more political ills and ailments and perhaps more fear -- like the very rich which are afraid to lose some of their money, and the very powerful when their power is not snowballing. Wealth, power and glory have rendered people drunk since time immemorial. Wealth and power are interdependent and
interconnected. Who are these people at the helm of the major Powers? Are they super-men? If they had been super-men in the past, they would not have thrown the whole of mankind into two world wars. In the Second World War 60 million people lost their lives. Why should we non-nuclear Powers trust them? I am not talking of persons only, but I am saying that the system is wrong. There is no new approach by the Governments of the super-Powers or the major Powers.
Why should the super-Powers — at least some of them — run about and say, "Come and sign the non-proliferation Treaty it is for your safety"? We do not trust them. Why should we trust them? We would be fools to trust them. But, at the same time, I say to the non-nuclear Powers, God forbid that we should set out on the road to development of nuclear weapons. This is a better way — to renounce their manufacture, but not by treaty. Treaties are broken. We have noted how they are circumvented by all kinds of legal considerations. And one of the most common reasons for breaking treaties is by saying "circumstances have changed — they no longer obtain", "a couple of generations have passed ... things have changed". It is very easy to break treaties. We have seen them broken time and again and the breaking of a treaty has often been rationalized sometimes justifiably, sometimes tyrannically.

The major Powers are devising those intercontinental missiles and mobile missiles while they express satisfaction — at least some of them — that there is going to be a nuclear-free zone in Latin America. Such a zone is now being thought of for the Middle East and another one that may encompass the whole world. Yet those mobile missiles can be flown from a plane or sent by remote control from any country that has them.

Whom are we fooling here? That is why I said that we should be frank. But we want to be frank with the representatives of the nuclear Powers and those Powers that wield world power. We have no quarrel with the diplomats here. Ambassador Roschin, for example: I think of him as a brother of mine. The trouble is not with Ambassador Roschin. Nor is it with the Ambassador of China, nor with Mr. Martin of the United States. The trouble is with those who are behind them, those who formulate the policies. Do our voices count with those people who pull the strings? Or shall we be like voices crying in the wilderness, as we have been doing for the last 29 years?

Had it not been for the fear of those who might make the mistake and plunge the world into a cataclysm that their own young people would lynch them, I think we would have had a global war in spite of the fact that so far fear has been a deterrent to a global conflict. Why? There could be a miscalculation.
People like to take risks and people like to gamble. People gamble with power as they do with money on the green tables at a casino. Those people who wield world power may develop a psychosis. A psychosis is not developed overnight. There are tensions, social and economic tensions, that exist inside every country — and now indeed we see a deteriorating global economic situation — that would have perhaps triggered a third world war had it not been for the fear that those at the helm had of their own people.

With all due respect to one of the illustrious past Presidents of the United States, none other than the late President Roosevelt, I wish to say that I watched what was being done — I was in Western Europe, and I watched things here at the time of the depression. He did everything in his power and initiated what was called the Works Projects Administration in order to get the people out of the depression, people who in this wealthy country had to line up for soup and sell apples in the streets — in the richest country in the world. And then he could not solve the economic problem. The Second World War came to the rescue. I am not suggesting that he in any way wanted the war, but it came to the rescue in solving the economic crisis.

And today we have a global crisis. The middle class is vanishing, and the middle class is the cornerstone of society. When I say the middle class, there is one even in the socialist countries — the technocrats, the people who are in a better position than the so-called proletariat. I honour the proletariat because they use their hands and produce something. They do not wag their tongues as we do here. We use no muscle, except that of the tongue, and our tongues are like fish in water — they must always move, saying something without producing anything, words but no action. We are going through an economic crisis. I shall not go into that subject, which is being discussed in other bodies of the United Nations — but this question of the global economic crisis is relevant to the subject of armament and disarmament. Who is going to bail the people out of the poverty resulting from inflation? Will it be the politicians? I know them. I have dealt with them for 50 years in different countries. They are of the same breed. Most of them — of course, there are a few good ones — base their policies upon expediency. In fairness to those who are good, I must say that they are caught in the cross-currents not only of their own internal politics, but
also of those of international affairs. And here we go about like a
paralysed ant, saying "how can we bring about disarmament?" The prescription
for disarmament lacks two ingredients: mutual trust and goodwill. You
can put anything in the medicine, but if there is no mutual trust and
no goodwill, it will not work. Do not misunderstand me. As I said, the
leaders are human, with the human frailities of every human being. Just
because they occupy positions of leadership do they get to be super-human?
Some of them think so and get drunk with power, and there is the trouble.
Look at you, Sir; you are occupying the Chair, and you are one of the most modest of men. But we do not go by the modesty of our chairmen or presidents within the United Nations.

Power makes them drunk. Alexander the Great reached India. His companions, the generals, told him, "We have overextended ourselves. We should return." What did he do? He began to adorn himself with oriental clothes. He got as far as Bactria, and he wanted everybody to pay tribute to him. They almost rebelled, and luckily he died at the age of 32.

Asoka, the Emperor of India: at one time he got drunk with power, but he was chaste by the misery he saw. He was the one who initiated non-resistance, which later evolved into civil disobedience. A great man.

Napoleon was drunk with power. Although he was a genius — the Napoleonic Law and so on — who could tell him he would get mired in Russia? "Who are you?" "I am the Emperor." He was the son of the revolution, and he became Emperor. Son of the revolution — "L'enfant terrible de la revolution" — Napoleon, drunk with power. Beware of those short men. With his hand held so and his three-cornered hat, he wanted to rule Europe.

In recent times, Hitler would not listen to his generals. He was drunk with power, with wealth. Hitler was a man of modest taste, we know that.

Power. And now we have another element. Those who are around the Governments are drunk with wealth and they mix government with their wealth.

Many countries boast that they are democratic. I call it democracy by subscription and contribution. You buy it and ritualize it. You have a wooden box and you have a ballot. Then they wash their hands. We have our elected people, and they can do anything they want, and they create a global economic crisis.

Why should we trust them? We like to trust them. There is no alternative. You must have politicians; you must have leaders. But I submit — and it is my duty to do so at this advanced age of mine — that if there is no approach to international affairs and to governments the world is doomed.

There are more problems facing us than how many intercontinental missiles — they call it SALT. What does that stand for? I do not know. You put salt on
wounds; you do not use it to destroy. You put salt on food. Those abbreviations
are not making fun of the matter. It is more serious than many of us think.

Those major Powers want the support of the small Powers. We are the cloth,
and each of them is trying to pull it towards himself. The people even of the
major Powers and our own people get frayed and tattered by that pulling. Is
that fair?

I said I would speak in an unorthodox manner, hoping perchance that my words
would fall on receptive ears and that there would be a new direction rather than
that we should engage in platitudes and fragmented treaties that do not constitute
a whole.

Four years ago a scientist -- and I shall not say of what nationality; I
may be thought to be a spy or something -- told me it was within the realm of
possibility that ultrasonic weapons might be used in future wars. That means
that sound engines would be projected over cities and would kill every human
being and every creature -- man and animal. He said that would be marvellous
for those who wage war because they could take over buildings without destruction.
What a wonderful thing: they would kill everybody, but the buildings would still
be intact. That represents a great deal of human progress, of human ingenuity
in armaments.

And the major Powers which have research programmes and spend billions on
what they are devising secretly, each in his mole tunnel, have keen ears. They
want to know what the other is doing in nuclear weapons. But nobody can know
unless they have very, very skilful spies who can infiltrate the research outfits.

There is no mention of other-than-nuclear, bacteriological, chemical weapons.
Are they excluded? Are we dealing with disarmament by enumeration or in general
terms? It is better to talk in general terms if the two ingredients, mutual
trust and goodwill, are present. Then we do not have to enumerate. Then we
can scrap our deadly weapons, and humanity can survive.

We do not want any illusory comfort. We cannot afford illusory comfort
from so-called limited treaties. I understand that there is no easy formula.
The choice is this: either to accept things as they are and invite disaster or
to see to it that a new approach will be tried by those at the helm in order to
solve the problem with moral authority rather than by emulation -- "I must emulate
or vie with the other by devising those diabolical weapons."
Of course disarmament is a complicated subject. We have heard that said time and again, and we have heard we should solve the problem piecemeal. But time does not permit us to take a long, protracted view. Disarmament is a matter that should be discussed perhaps in a more serious manner by the ten or twelve nations, with perhaps a couple of observers being appointed by the Secretary-General to tell us what they are doing, instead of the matter being brought up here year in, year out, and no progress whatsoever being made on it.
In conclusion -- and I am not saying this in a light vein, but sometimes anecdotes from the folklore of a people are more expressive than long speeches -- there is a character in Arab literature called Joha. He was a court jester, he amused the king; he was a lovely person. One day his friends saw him in a happy mood hurrying towards the palace. "Why are you in such a hurry?" He replied, "Leave me alone, this is the day of days. I am going to the palace to ask for the hand of the king's daughter." They guffawed, tittered and laughed. "The king's daughter, you, Joha? He replied, "Yes, why not, I am going to ask for the hand of the king's daughter." A half hour later, he emerged jubilant. Everybody was surprised. They asked, "Why are you so jubilant? What happened?" He replied, "Everything is going nicely for me. Fifty per cent of the whole question is under my control." They asked, "What, did she accept?" He replied, "No, I accepted, that is half of it, but she has not yet accepted."

And here some of the major Powers are like the king's daughter. She has not yet accepted. They can change musical chairs; some of them become Johas, while others become the king's daughter and then they change places. And we are the witnesses here. Do not let us also be like Joha.

Once, Joha saw somebody running. Then his companions in the distance asked him, "Why are they running?" He said, "Well, do you not know? There is a wedding and it was announced that all are welcome and can have free food there." People were hungry, so they began to run in droves. Then Joha said, "Good God, they believed me." Then he thought, "Perhaps there is a wedding after all." And he then began to run after them. That is what you are doing here. You bring certain things and you find many rallying towards one resolution or another. Everybody runs like Joha and there is no wedding, there is no food whatsoever, there is nothing tangible in what is being done here.

In conclusion -- and this is the final conclusion, if I may say so -- therefore, let those who have weapons of the type that, God forbid, will perhaps bring the world to an end, meet and let them have more power from their leaders, because essentially the men that are sent here are good and honest men. Let our colleagues here, who represent major Powers, advise their leaders instead of being advised, by having words put into their mouths, lest indeed we become ludicrous and the laughing stock of the world.
The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I call on the representative of Turkey to exercise his right of reply.

Mr. GUVEN (Turkey) (interpretation from French): I was delighted to see Ambassador Rossides occupy his seat, which has been vacant since the beginning of our work. As usual, Mr. Rossides likes to give a political slant to a problem, and uses this pretext to attack my country although sometimes in a camouflaged fashion.

My I say on this occasion that no problem can be solved by polemics and that it is not appropriate to use any subject whatsoever to attack another country.

Furthermore, some phrases used by Mr. Rossides in regard to certain cruel weapons require a great deal of clarification. But I shall not dwell on these points, since we are now considering disarmament.

May I also be permitted to say that what we really wish is to arrive at a just and equitable solution for all the parties concerned as regards the problems of the island and not start polemics. I am sure that certain passages of Mr. Rossides' statement will not assist in the solution to the problem which he referred to mercilessly.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should like to make a comment on this subject, since on a previous occasion we had a more or less analogous case. Your Chairman has not allowed and will not allow attacks on countries when it can be inferred that such attacks have a political character arising from a matter other than the one under consideration.

I listened most attentively to the statement made by the representative of Cyprus, Mr. Rossides, and he devoted a considerable part of his statement to napalm and incendiary weapons; he concluded that part of his statement by saying that the people of his country had been the victim of the use of such weapons.

With all due respect for the opinion of the representative of Turkey, I do not consider this to be an attack on Turkey, but a statement on a matter of fact on the part of a representative. Of course, the representative of Turkey
is fully entitled to deny the fact that such weapons were used. But, in all sincerity, I do not believe that one can claim that a delegation is making a deliberate attack by giving an example of the use of certain weapons. There was a similar case a few days ago involving other delegations.

I understand very well the state of mind of the representative of Turkey, but I can assure him that if I had noted that there was an attack on Turkey which, as he said, had nothing to do with the item under consideration, he would not have needed to exercise his right of reply because I would have called the attention of the speaker to the point.

I now call on the representative of Cyprus in exercise of his right of reply.

Mr. ROSSIDES (Cyprus): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for pointing out what I was going to point out in reply to the representative of Turkey. In fact, I would remark that not even the name of Turkey was mentioned; it was not even said that it was from a neighbouring country. It was simply said that recently my country had a painful and tragic experience from extensive bombing, and we were speaking from experience. There is no other country which this year or even in the past year had the experience of napalm bombing. So was it not permissible for the country that suffered from it to speak of its effects in forests and in other places, without even mentioning that victims of it were members of the United Nations Force, without mentioning Turkey, without mentioning other things that could have been mentioned?
There was nothing political, but a guilty conscience makes Turkey come out and speak. As the French say, "Qui s'excuse s'accuse." "Who tries to excuse himself accuses himself." But he need not accuse Turkey, because Turkey stands accused in the eyes of the world.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I regret that Mr. Rossides, with such broad experience at the United Nations, felt it necessary to add his last words. He could have clarified the matter very well without any need for his last allusion, which is clearly political and has absolutely nothing to do with the item under consideration. Therefore I declare his last sentence out of order.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.