



Thirteenth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FOURTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York
on Monday, 24 November 1958, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. URQUIA

(El Salvador)

Question of the peaceful use of outer space [60] (continued)

- (a) The banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries and international co-operation in the study of cosmic space;
- (b) Programme for international co-operation in the field of outer space.

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.994. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 60

QUESTION OF THE PEACEFUL USE OF OUTER SPACE (continued)

- (a) THE BANNING OF THE USE OF COSMIC SPACE FOR MILITARY PURPOSES, THE ELIMINATION OF FOREIGN MILITARY BASES ON THE TERRITORIES OF OTHER COUNTRIES AND INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE STUDY OF COSMIC SPACE
- (b) PROGRAMME FOR INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN THE FIELD OF OUTER SPACE

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As the Committee will recall, at our last meeting an agreement was reached to the effect that at today's meeting we would continue the discussion of the question of outer space and the peaceful use thereof if delegations were ready to continue with that discussion. If not, we would take up the question of Cyprus.

In view of the fact that a revision of the twenty-Power draft resolution has been submitted, the Chair takes it that the Committee is ready to discuss the question of the peaceful use of outer space. At this meeting we have to take up the specific discussion of the draft resolutions submitted to the Committee on the question of the peaceful use of outer space. There are two of these draft resolutions. The first is contained in document A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1, submitted by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; the second is contained in document A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1, submitted by Australia and nineteen other countries -- that is, the twenty-Power draft resolution. We will now, therefore, discuss the two draft resolutions. No amendments to the draft resolutions have been presented as yet.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Last week the United States delegation, on behalf of the twenty co-sponsors of the draft resolution set out in document A/C.1/L.220, entered into rather prolonged discussions with the representative of the Soviet Union to try to bring about an agreement on what the United Nations should do to develop the peaceful uses of outer space.

We were encouraged in this by the fact that the Soviet Union had responded favourably to the interests which other members of the Committee had shown in giving the United Nations an important role in outer space exploration. The co-sponsors were therefore willing to incorporate in a new draft those elements of the Soviet text which were compatible with their original concept.

The United States talked to the Soviet Union with this as its objective, and we believe that the revised draft does in fact include the most important elements suggested by the Soviet Union.

To begin with, the seventh and eighth preambular paragraphs of the revised text are actually taken from the Soviet draft resolution. More significant is another new paragraph in the preamble, the next to the last paragraph. This paragraph explicitly states that an important contribution can be made by establishing an international body for the study of outer space within the framework of the United Nations. We believe that this paragraph incorporates the major concept of the Soviet draft by stating directly what the previous twenty-Power draft had only implied. We are glad to make this change and we think it improves the draft resolution.

We have also included from the key operative paragraph of the Soviet draft all of the functions which it proposed that any United Nations body on outer space should have. These are now listed under paragraph 1 (b) of the revised draft resolution as proposals to be taken into consideration by the ad hoc committee.

Other proposals have also been made, and the revised draft provides for their consideration.

I think one can say in all candour that the substance of the draft resolution as now revised takes into account the various views which have been advanced, and especially those of the Soviet Union. We very much hope that the draft resolution will receive the unanimous support of the Committee.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

I am sorry to have to inform the Committee, however, that in spite of prolonged consultations between the Soviet Union and the United States, no final agreement was reached because of a failure to agree on the composition of the ad hoc committee. I should like to summarize the reasons why we were unable to reach agreement with the Soviet delegation on the composition of the committee.

In brief, it came about because the United States and the Soviet Union worked from entirely different premises about the nature of relations between States, the structure of the United Nations and the nature of the world. In our discussions with the Soviet Union, the United States continued to work on the basis of the principles which I stated in the Committee on 13 November, that is that the members of the ad hoc committee should be chosen from States that have already demonstrated capabilities or an active interest in the peaceful uses of outer space. That was the first criterion. The second criterion was that the composition should also be representative of the General Assembly. Those were our two criteria in making up the composition of the ad hoc committee.

I suggested two possible types of composition to the Soviet Union in line with these principles, without specifying countries other than, of course, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, the United States and France. In both of them, the Soviet group was granted a share of seats: one out of nine in the first slate, and two out of thirteen in the second, which was either on a par with or superior to their ratio of seats in the General Assembly.

The Soviet representative, however, did not work from the two criteria which actuated us, that is, that of capability and interest in outer space and of being representative of the membership of the United Nations. Mr. Zorin continued to advocate the principle proposed in the Soviet draft resolution, that is a slate composed of four countries from the Soviet group, four countries which he considered to be "Western" and three which he considered to be "neutral". His maximum concession was to say that he would permit the addition of one Latin American country, while reserving the right to accept or reject the specific country.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

In insisting on his formula, the Soviet representative argued that the Committee must meet the Soviet principle that there should be equality of representation between what he called the two sides.

This "two sides" idea is similar to the one that the Soviet Union unsuccessfully tried to persuade the General Assembly to adopt last year for the Disarmament Commission. It is a concept which the United States cannot accept. It is applicable neither to any other United Nations activity nor to any outer space committee. There are no two sides to outer space. There are not and never have been two sides in the United Nations. There is one group of Members which always votes alike, on the one hand, and then there are over seventy others which make up their minds on a basis of national independence.

We do not, therefore, accept the idea of two sides, and frankly we do not understand it. The United Nations has never appointed any committee based on the idea of two sides. We think this is neither the time nor the place to begin. We must not fasten the satellization method used by the Communist bloc on to the rest of the world. Frankly, the United States could not name four nations of which it could predict with absolute certainty that they would always vote with us. We just could not do it, and we are glad that this is the case and that the world is still free.

However, not only did the Soviet representative insist on the so-called principle, but he also demanded the right to accept or reject every possible member of the committee as a requirement for Soviet co-operation. In other words, he insisted on the right not only to negotiate on an equitable geographical distribution, but to decide that this or that United Nations Member from Latin America, this or that United Nations Member from the Commonwealth, this or that United Nations Member from Western Europe, this or that United Nations Member from Asia, or this or that United Nations Member from Africa, could or could not serve on the ad hoc committee. In fact, he actually named some which he would not accept.

The United States could not be a party to such an undemocratic and, I think, arbitrary procedure. To use a French phrase, "Ce n'est pas dans nos habitudes". It would be contrary to our whole way of doing things and of operating here in the United Nations.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

We put forth no such demands of our own. We confined ourselves to discussion of the general composition of the Committee by regions and by well-recognized categories -- categories which have been accepted here ever since the beginning of the United Nations.

The United States will not knowingly jeopardize the sovereign equality of Member States and thereby the effectiveness of the United Nations.

Having started from such divergent points of view, the United States and the Soviet Union were not able to agree. The twenty co-sponsors therefore consulted again on Friday afternoon. After careful thought, we decided that the proper course was to make the changes in the draft resolution which is before you and to put forward a recommended slate which could command wide support and which would be consistent with the principles which we had adopted.

After consultations with other United Nations Members, the twenty co-sponsors therefore decided to propose the membership of eighteen contained in the revised draft resolution: that is, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, India, Iran, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Poland, Sweden, the Soviet Union, the United Arab Republic, the United Kingdom and the United States of America. This includes the nations most advanced in outer space technology as they are listed by the International Council of Scientific Unions and it also reflects the membership of the General Assembly -- which are the two criteria that we have always tried to meet.

We consider it to be a well-balanced and competent group which can effectively contribute to the study it will be asked to undertake. The composition is similar to that of the Radiation Committee and of the Preparatory Commission of the International Atomic Energy Agency. It is as large as it should be; perhaps it is already too large for maximum efficiency. It gives the Soviet group, with three seats, a greater share than that group holds in the General Assembly. In fact, it includes other nations specifically mentioned by the Soviet Union. The co-sponsors have made every effort, in consultation with others, to produce an equitable and competent membership.

In addition, as I have said before, the substantive terms of the draft resolution, I think, meet the Soviet point of view in every essential feature.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

We urge, therefore, that this draft resolution be adopted without alteration.

In spite of the disappointments we have had, we hope that the Soviet Union will decide to co-operate in this new Committee. We hope so because not only has it much to contribute; it can make a contribution that is absolutely unique, and I am glad to admit that here because it is obviously true. But, if the Soviet Union does not take part in the work of this Committee, I do not think that that is a reason for the United Nations to waver or to falter. While the Soviet contribution would be uniquely valuable -- and I stress that -- we of the rest of the world can still do useful work together. The time to start United Nations activities in the field of outer space is now. No nation, no matter how powerful, should be allowed to dictate the terms on which the United Nations should act or to prevent it from acting. The time has come, I think, for this issue to be decided, and we urge the Committee to proceed to vote as soon as possible.

Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): The fact that my delegation did not take part in the general debate does not indicate that we were not interested in the important problem we are considering in this Committee but rather that we were not sure as to how this subject should best be studied.

I would recall that the era that might be called the age of outer space was born without the co-operation of the great Powers. It was rather the great military rivalry of the great Powers which spurred them on constantly in their frenzied arms race and finally led them to penetrate outer space when they discovered that the earth was too small to contain their efforts at competition. It was the manufacture of gigantic instruments of extraordinary precision, capable of hurling thermonuclear bombs or extremely heavy satellites immense distances, that ultimately gave man the power over outer space. Naturally, this does not diminish the glory of the American and Soviet scientists who were able to achieve such stupendous triumphs. However, as was the case in the discovery of nuclear fission, the penetration of outer space brought with it, first of all, problems of a military nature and, in spite of the hopeful title of our item, it was only secondary that it led to the examination of the possible

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

peaceful uses of outer space and the beneficent use of rockets and other inventions to make possible the transport through outer space of weapons of mass destruction.

The very close interdependence of the two phases of the question, that is to say, the military or destructive force and the peaceful or constructive force, linked to the fact that at present only two countries have achieved the fabulous advances in astronautics which we all know and admire -- all this has led my delegation to the belief that the greatest efforts of the First Committee should be directed towards promoting harmony between what I might call the "spatial" Powers, so that they might put their heads together and present us with a joint draft resolution with the object of setting up a body wherein, by patient and objective study, the different scientific, technical, political and legal problems involved might be worked out.

All the foregoing does not mean that my delegation in any way ignores the usefulness and the value of the erudite and eloquent statements that we have heard in the Committee, and I would mention specifically the statement made by my eminent friend, Ambassador Belaunde of Peru. I am convinced that these statements have served a great purpose. They have clarified doubtful points. They have proved the inaccuracy of certain juridical theories based on false analogies and derived, in the final analysis, from a geocentric concept which, in view of the circumstances, must be recognized as anachronistic. For example, how can we speak of the right of sovereignty over a space that is indivisible and yet eternally changing, a space through which the planet on which we live constantly moves in its elliptical orbit, eternally rotating on its axis, while at the same time it is a tiny part of a multiple system moving along in the majestic procession of the Milky Way?

My delegation notes with pleasure that the opinions of the majority of representatives agree on denying to the planets of the solar system and their satellites a condition of res nullius, which means that they would be capable of being appropriated.

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

By the very nature of things, outer space must be regulated as a res communes. But this does not mean that we have to refuse international regulation over the use of such a res communes. Equity and prudence obviously must label as usurpation any idea of anyone landing on the moon from earth and trying to occupy it and thus exclude those who might be late-comers. The question of responsibility for damages that might be caused by objects hurled into outer space, including interference in signals from radio broadcasting emissions because of the same frequencies coming from planes and ships, the need to regulate the orbits of satellites when the number of satellites has grown to the point where necessary orbits may have to be regulated, the urgent need to set forth the principle of free access to outer space subordinating it only to the norms necessary for equitable use of that space in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, all these questions -- and I am mentioning only the very few that have been most insistently mentioned here as requiring consideration -- make it most appropriate that an international study group be set up that will have to compile, co-ordinate and assess the information extant at the moment, within the framework of our international Organization.

We feel that active participation is indeed indispensable not only of the Members of the United Nations whose advanced knowledge in this extremely new astronautical science is recognized by all, but also of other countries chosen in accordance with the rules prescribed by geographical distribution and applied in the bodies of the United Nations so that general representation will be given the interest of the international comity of nations.

For all the above, we find it rather sad to see that the delegations primarily concerned have been unable to agree on a single text. The revision of the Soviet draft resolution had given us great hope, although, of course, we felt that it might have been preferable not to anticipate matters and not to give the names of those countries to compose this preparatory group, since this type of work can better be done and decided upon by discreet conversations held backstage.

We will vote in favour of the twenty-Power draft resolution because we feel that this document in its general outline follows the general views of my delegation more closely, especially in the revised version of the draft. We will also vote in favour of it because indirectly we see included in the draft resolution

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

the idea mentioned by the delegations of Argentina and Brazil that the principle of the sovereign equality of all Members of the United Nations should be proclaimed, and that all nations should be allowed to enjoy the same benefits accruing from the use of outer space, regardless of the scientific and economic development of the countries of the earth.

Regarding the Soviet draft resolution, if it be put to the vote, I shall ask for a separate vote on the paragraph numbered 2. On that paragraph I shall abstain, and on the rest of the draft resolution I shall vote affirmatively.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I hope that despite all this, some agreement will be arrived at before we have to take this matter to the plenary. This would contribute to guarantee our achieving the purposes that we all have in mind, not only those submitting draft resolutions to the Committee, but the rest of us -- all members of the Committee. It would, no doubt, be a very happy omen for better times as far as differences between countries are concerned, differences that in the question of disarmament have, unfortunately, separated the great Powers.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Three other delegations have asked to have their names on the speaker's list, but I note that the representatives of those countries are still absent. Therefore, if any delegation wishes to speak on the question of the draft resolutions, would that delegation please say so?

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): The United Kingdom delegation very much hopes that the revised draft resolution (A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1), which we are co-sponsoring, will receive the unanimous support of this Committee.

As the Committee will recall, I stated on 18 November that in our view there was even at that time common ground between the Soviet position and that of the twenty Powers. The draft resolutions on both sides visualized the need for international co-operation to deal with the problems of outer space. This point, I think, is fully covered in a manner which ought to be satisfactory to all concerned in the revisions introduced into the original twenty-Power draft resolution.

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

There is, of course, a point of difference in approach in regard to the establishment of permanent machinery. The Soviet draft envisages the establishment of permanent machinery at the present stage. We think this is premature and likely to complicate rather than advance matters, as I pointed out on 18 November. And our views on this point remain unchanged.

We are, of course, prepared to agree that the establishment, sooner or later, of some kind of permanent international machinery may prove to be desirable. And we have sought to make this point rather more clearly in the revised draft. But I submit that none of us here can claim a sufficient body of knowledge at the moment to make it possible to reach informed judgements about the nature and functions at this stage, of such permanent international machinery. What is wanted now is a study of what is required -- and that is what is proposed.

I should also like to say a few words about the size and composition of the ad hoc committee. As the Committee knows, we favoured a small ad hoc committee of nine members or so, as being the right size for effective work. But we also recognized that this was a difficult problem, and we did not have rigid views on it. For the reasons which Mr. Lodge has just explained, with cogency and clarity, we cannot accept the Soviet conception that there should be parity as between the Soviet world on the one hand, and the so-called West on the other. Such a conception does not reflect the ratio of countries as represented in the United Nations. It seeks rather to reflect a conception of power politics which is repugnant to the whole basic idea of the United Nations. It introduces an incongruous note at the outset of what should be a co-operative international effort.

The third paragraph of the preamble of our draft resolution recognizes that we should avoid extending into this new field the rivalries which are only too familiar, and thus impeding progress by the introduction of quite extraneous issues. An ad hoc committee with the composition proposed by the Soviet Union would have precisely this effect. But, as I say, we accept the need for a body rather larger than nine -- and the composition proposed in the revised twenty-Power draft resolution does, in our opinion appropriately combine the criteria of technical capacity and experience with the recognition of the need to ensure a measure of equitable geographical distribution in accordance with United Nations

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

principles and practices. In our view this is a well-balanced and fair composition for a committee which has a novel and important task.

It is our hope, therefore, that the revised draft resolution will command unanimous support and thus enable the sub-committee to be appointed and to get down to the important tasks which lie before it.

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia): In the course of the general debate on the question of the peaceful use of outer space, the Czechoslovak delegation expressed its conviction that attainment of an agreement on the ban of the use of outer space for military purposes with the liquidation of foreign military bases on the territory of States at the same time would constitute a significant contribution towards both relaxation of international tension and solution of the complex of problems of disarmament and towards broad and the most effective international co-operation possible of scientists and technicians in the study of outer space. In this connexion, the Czechoslovak delegation voiced its position that neither of the two aspects of the problem of the use of outer space -- the military and the peaceful one, which are closely related -- can be considered without having regard to the international situation obtaining.

The present course of the deliberations in the Political Committee has shown that the United States is not willing at the present time to conclude a broad international agreement which would include the ban on the use of outer space for military purposes, the liquidation of foreign military bases on the territories of other States and the establishment of an appropriate effective control system within the framework of the United Nations, as well as the question of international co-operation in the study of outer space. Under such circumstances, on 18 November 1958, the Soviet delegation submitted a revised draft of its own draft resolution (A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1), which gave to the present General Assembly a possibility of reaching agreement at least on one aspect of the matter. The step of the Soviet Union was rightly appreciated by all delegations in this Committee.

The Czechoslovak delegation continues to hold the view that the question of the ban on the use of outer space for military purposes and the liquidation of military bases on foreign territories remain the permanent objective to be attained sooner or later. It considers, however, that if there is a possibility of reaching agreement at least on one issue of the entire complex of problems on the peaceful use of outer space, it should be utilized.

The Czechoslovak delegation has studied the revised draft resolution of the Soviet Union and is convinced that this draft provides a real basis for a possible unanimous solution of the question which, as indicated by the course of

(Mr. Nosek, Czechoslovakia)

the general debate, is desired by an overwhelming majority of the delegations represented here. The Soviet draft resolution envisages the establishment within the framework of the United Nations of an international committee which would provide a basis for international peaceful co-operation in the study of cosmic space, even if at the outset its activities would be carried on in a more limited scope than envisaged in the original Soviet draft resolution. The international committee for co-operation in the study for cosmic space for peaceful purposes would become a principle international centre for the co-ordination of the co-operation of scientists of all countries. Experience gained in the activities of the International Geophysical Year has shown that such co-operation is feasible and beneficial.

Today, the Political Committee has before it two draft resolutions -- the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union which I have already mentioned and the draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the United States and the other nineteen delegations (A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1). The main difference between the two drafts arises in the proposed composition of the preparatory body to be established by the current General Assembly.

At the present time, as is well known, there are only two great Powers which conduct research of outer space, namely, the Soviet Union and the United States. It is certainly only right and just to demand that this fact should be taken into consideration in deciding the composition of the preparatory group or committee, and that it should include both great Powers and small countries from different parts of the world. In the view of my delegation, the composition of this group or committee must be such as to provide real possibilities for co-operation in this important field. The composition of the preparatory committee as proposed in the Soviet draft resolution does represent, in the view of my delegation, a proper forum for fruitful co-operation based on equality, which, among other occasions, proved to be beneficial in the discussions of experts on the suspension of nuclear weapons tests held in Geneva.

The Czechoslovak delegation is convinced that the composition of the preparatory committee as suggested by the delegation of the Soviet Union is best in keeping with the above-mentioned demands, and therefore we support this draft resolution.

Mr. PERDOMO (Honduras) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation did not take part in the general debate on the peaceful use of outer space because, since it was such an obstruse and complicated question, we did not feel that we could make any contribution to the debate. Therefore, we felt that discretion was the better part of valcurand that it was better to listen to those delegations which know more about the subject expound their views. However, we do feel that we ought to take part in the discussion of the draft resolutions before the Committee -- the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet delegation and the draft resolution submitted by the twenty Powers. Both are similar, and yet dissimilar. We may say that in their dissimilarity they come closer together because they agree on the aims sought, that is, the exclusively peaceful use of outer space, use for eminently constructive and humanitarian purposes. This obviously is due to the fact that at present outer space is being used equally by both for military purposes, because it has been used to test the power of intercontinental ballistic missiles that can carry nuclear or thermonuclear warheads.

The two draft resolutions are good as far as we can see. They both have elements that can be useful. The differences in them are mainly procedural. However, before analysing these draft resolutions, I must say, when all is said and done, that when the Soviet Union gave up its original draft which linked the peaceful use of outer space to the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other countries and submitted document A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1, it acted in a way that warrants our appreciation because it showed that it was being guided by a desire to compromise.

(Mr. Perdomo, Honduras)

The Soviet Union has also earned the appreciation of humanity because of its contributions to the investigation of outer space which have given a tremendous impulse to astronautics. We trust that the Soviet Union will continue along the road of international co-operation to the benefit of the world and the cause of peace. Humanity is in need of this common effort so that the earth may no longer be a battlefield, but rather a paradise where all human beings can live in peace and experience the joy of living.

The draft resolutions that we are now discussing coincide basically on the following points: (a) that outer space be used exclusively for peaceful purposes; (b) that international co-operation such as was so usefully applied in the International Geophysical Year is imperative for the exploration and exploitation of outer space for the benefit of humanity; and (c) that a body be established within the framework of the United Nations to carry out international scientific studies and investigations so as to accumulate the greatest amount of information possible on the uses of outer space.

However, the two draft resolutions differ in that the Soviet Union, besides the study group, suggests the setting-up of a preparatory group to draft a programme of rules and regulations for the proposed international committee; then it indicates the composition of the preparatory group, and then recommends that the preparatory group in its work of preparing the programme and the rules and regulations should proceed on the basis that the international committee for co-operation in the study of cosmic space should have certain functions.

However, the twenty-Power draft resolution merely suggests the setting-up of an ad hoc committee composed of countries which it mentions; in other words, it bypasses the preparatory group proposed in the Soviet draft resolution. Then it specifies the points which are to govern its activities in space research and imposes upon the committee the duty of reporting to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session the result of its work, and at the same time requests the Secretary-General "to render appropriate assistance to the above-named Committee and to recommend any other steps that might be taken within the existing United Nations framework to encourage the fullest international co-operation for the peaceful uses of outer space."

(Mr. Perdomo, Honduras)

We do not think it proper that in a draft resolution the countries composing the personnel of the special committee or the preparatory group should be specified; we believe, **rather**, that this Committee is the proper body to decide which members will compose the preparatory group, especially since, as is mentioned in the Soviet draft resolution, in the designation of the members to compose the preparatory group the balance of power between the opposing blocs was taken into account. We believe that international co-operation of this type should proceed with complete openmindedness, leaving aside all political interest or convenience.

We are certain that the members of the Political Committee, when electing the members of the Special Committee, will bear in mind not only the contributions already made but also the scientific and technical capacity of those who are to compose the group. In the Soviet draft resolution countries such as Italy, Japan and Sweden are overlooked -- countries which can contribute in great measure to the fixing of the objectives of the committee or to whatever scientific research may be assigned to them. And why not also include Spain, with its legendary history, which, just as it discovered new continents across the seas may also discover new worlds across interstellar space?

We assume that the small differences existing in the two draft resolutions are not insuperable and that a common denominator can be found which will obtain the unanimous approval of the committee and of the Assembly. If agreement is reached it will be clearly demonstrated that the international co-operation which we are seeking in the study and uses of outer space for peaceful purposes is attainable. This is a matter on which agreement is absolutely necessary if we are to achieve positive results. If there is no agreement in this Committee then we cannot expect of the ad hoc committee which will undoubtedly be set up the excellent results which we have a right to expect of it. It is sufficient that only one of the great Powers refuse to co-operate technically and scientifically for the work of this committee to be stalemated from the very beginning.

The Soviet draft resolution assigns to the proposed preparatory group the task of working out a programme and the rules and regulations of the committee. As we understand, once this is done the preparatory group disbands.

It seems to us that the committee itself should work out its own rules and regulations.

(Mr. Perdomo, Honduras)

In our opinion the twenty-Power draft resolution is more practical, since it indicates the points about which the activity of the Special Committee should develop. Furthermore, it imposes upon it the obligation to report to the General Assembly at its fourteenth session, and requests the assistance of the Secretary-General, authorizing him to recommend whatever other measures the committee could take into account within the present framework of the United Nations.

We repeat, what we want is agreement. If agreement is achieved we shall be lighting a torch which will cast its brilliance over a world that at present is lighted by sinister flashes..

Mr. CHRISTIANSEN (Denmark): The Danish delegation wishes to express its sincere regret that, despite many efforts, it has not yet been possible to reach unanimous agreement on a formula for international co-operation on the peaceful utilization of outer space. We are, however, still hopeful that human wisdom will prevail and lead us to such co-operation before it is too late.

In the situation before us it seems to my delegation that the adoption of draft resolution A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1 is a good approach towards a solution. To the best of our conviction, it is not only desirable but also necessary immediately to concentrate our efforts in order to create agreement on the vast problems of outer space. It is a large, new field which has been opened to mankind by human research, thus creating new possibilities for the welfare of humanity. But at the same time new problems have come into existence.

Today when we discuss outer space it is well for us to recall the fact that it was about twenty years ago that the problems of atomic power came up. In 1945 the first atomic bomb was exploded, thereby raising fateful problems. These problems might have been solved a few years later if we here in the United Nations had agreed upon the proposed plan that all atomic energy should be centered under an international organization. The United Nations did not succeed at that time, and since then we have witnessed the development within the field of the nuclear weapons which we dread and which, as I just mentioned, might have been avoided. Let us not repeat our failure. Let us now start the work of creating a modus vivendi to ensure that our knowledge of outer space be used for constructive, peaceful purposes and not for destruction..

(Mr. Christiansen, Denmark)

The Danish delegation deems it to be of decisive importance that it is laid down in the preamble of the draft resolution that it is a common aim that outer space should be used for peaceful purposes only. This is further stressed later in the resolution.

Another provision which my delegation would like to stress is that the problem of outer space should be solved pursuant to the Charter of the United Nations which, in Article 2 (1), lays down that the Organization is based on the principle of sovereign equality of all its Members. This equality can only find its adequate form through international co-operation on the uses of outer space under the auspices of the United Nations. Through such international co-operation, from the start, we aim, as is further mentioned in the twenty-Power draft resolution, at avoiding the carrying of present national rivalries into this field.

As rightly stated in the twenty-Power draft resolution, the study of the development of man's research in outer space has added new dimensions to man's existence and opened new possibilities for the increase of his knowledge and the improvement of his life. But we are only at the beginning. Several of the representatives here have reminded us of the famous explorers who, many years ago from European coasts, set out across the great seas and made discoveries which no man had before dreamed of.

What will man find in his future research of outer space? The answer is still uncertain. We only know that we are at the beginning of something new and boundless and at the threshold of unknown consequences which could prove to be dangerous.

It is the task of our generation to find the proper form of man's activities in outer space. As a very first step towards the solution of this task, the twenty-Power draft resolution proposes that a representative and balanced Committee, consisting of eighteen members, be set up to prepare the work of these big problems. The composition of this committee seems to us to have been proposed with due consideration given to all justified aspects of the problem before us. On the whole, we are of the opinion that, since agreement has not been reached on a common draft resolution, the twenty-Power draft resolution offers the best answer to the challenge with which the space age has faced us. That is why the Danish delegation is a co-sponsor of this draft resolution.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Though this subject has been before the Committee for a comparatively short time, we seem to have traversed a considerable amount of ground, not by way of making progress, but by way of departing from the great hopes that were aroused and the objectives which we thought were the purpose of our discussion. Whatever may be the temporary irritations caused, whatever may be the misconceptions that maybe aroused by observations, it is necessary for my delegation to state the position on this subject as we find it.

I want to say that we are not today discussing what we met here to discuss. We have heard the representative of Denmark -- I refer to him because he was the last speaker -- refer to the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. Neither of these draft resolutions that are now before us is either designed towards that or springs from that context. I should like to say very bluntly that it is not the medium of outer space that is likely to lead to man's destruction, but what comes through outer space. It is possible, I suppose, through outer space to send out weapons and missiles of a character used in conventional war. Perhaps innocent things might be sent too -- I do not know according to scientific developments. But it is what traverses that space, with all the speed and all the other technical facilities available for quick destruction, that menaces humanity. So the real crux of the situation is the avoidance of the weapons of mass destruction. That is, that a new medium which has been found shall not make the weapons of mass destruction even more deadly and potent than they are today. That was the context in which we met here, and we hoped against hope, in spite of the disappointments of the last ten years, that this particular subject would not follow the same beaten track of the cold war that has bedevilled the discussion on atomic energy, but that a decision would have been reached today, when the world is menaced not only by the balance of horror which was based upon two countries -- now on three -- but by the threat that it may spread all over the world and the control of these weapons of destruction, if any machinery of control is devised, after negotiations, will become ineffective and its capacity for enforcement impossible.

Now a new medium has developed -- so-called outer space. I am not at all sure whether the weapons of mass destruction through long-range missiles, necessarily come through outer space. That depends on outer space -- and the lawyers will decide what outer space is, I suppose.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

My delegation has no intention of going into all the legal finesses to which reference has been made here, for the reason that whatever may be the ownership or the liens on outer space by different nations, its enforcement must be terrestrial; that is to say, any trespassing upon anybody's competence in outer space is usually met by punishment of the people on earth, and therefore, it really comes down to the mass destruction war.

The United States and the Soviet Union have both avoided these questions. In the second draft put by the Soviet Union, it drops the whole of this question of the use of outer space for this purpose and, instead, we are treated to the setting up of a committee -- what it is in essence is a drafting committee, a committee of rules of organization for the future. And here I want to address my words, if that is permissible, in a direct way to the representative of the United States. He was the one individual responsible for telling this world, with all the prestige of the President of the United States behind him, that when the "Atoms for Peace", atomic energy for peaceful purposes, came in, that was the alternative, or rather, the kind of thing that would draw away the stinging power, the destructive power, of atoms for destruction. And what is the position today? The Agency that was set up, in spite of all that has gone on, is shadow play. There is not one nation in the world, except Japan, that has enlisted the services of this organization; and yet, the Secretary-General of that organization -- a citizen of the United States, who cannot be accused of anything but conservative politics -- comes out and says by implication that it is doing nothing. And that is what is going to happen to this.

You can have a study group -- that is taking place in the International Geophysical Year. But this Committee, when it is trying to pay compliments to either side, or when it is saying that we are getting somewhere towards finding a unanimous resolution, must be aware of the fact that we are not dealing with this subject. We are not dealing with threats to humanity. We are not dealing with the greater vista of destruction that is opened by this medium for the weapons of mass destruction. We have also to take into account the fact that only a few weeks ago this Committee failed in finding agreement on the question of the suspension of the testing of nuclear weapons; and no agreement has been reached at Geneva.

It is not proper that an Organization like ours should run away from the realities when a problem of this kind is put before us.

Having said all that, my delegation would consider that any agreement between the United States, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union on the other -- even an agreement to differ -- is a step **forward** and a contribution towards peace. For that reason, we, in common with the rest of this Committee, would have welcomed any agreement, however small; and so, when the first difficulties in regard to terrestrial bases--that was taken out of the Soviet draft resolution -- arose, the United States came forward adopting consider **all** parts of the preamble, but not the operative parts, and -- I would not call it a composite draft resolution, but a kind of minestrone draft resolution was produced, and we thought that there was some hope.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

The crux of the functioning of any committee, however, is that the United States and the Soviet Union must co-operate. In fact, if we could write on a clean slate, the best committee that could be drawn up for this purpose would be a committee of two, and these two delegations should be locked up until they had reached agreement. We should have a committee of the Soviet Union and the United States alone. It is they who have the competence to enlist the support, the co-operation, the sympathy, or anything else, of whoever will co-operate with them.

But such a committee is not possible. Thus, we in the First Committee are reduced to the position of discussing, not outer space, not studies in this respect, but the acceptability of the composition of a particular committee. That may appear to be a rather small way of looking at the matter. On the other hand, unless the committee meets, the position will be the same as that of the Disarmament Commission two years ago.

I invite the First Committee -- and, again, I know what the newspapers will say tomorrow, if they say anything at all -- to examine the resolutions that have been adopted during the past five years, ever since the one on Korea. This Committee has adopted many resolutions by huge majorities, on the basis either of the cold war or of party loyalties or of national groupings or of the fear of this or that. How many of those resolutions have become effective? They have been effective perhaps to the extent of avoiding a worsening of the position, to the extent, as I have said before, that any agreement -- even an agreement to differ -- is better than no agreement at all.

The position has deteriorated. I think that the world had some hopes that we would learn from the mistakes made with regard to atomic energy. And here I should like to say that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union has been solely or even primarily responsible for the situation in that respect. There have been others with power, but not enough power. They have produced various nice schemes obstructing every possible solution. The history of disarmament in this Committee has been the following: When one side agrees to a proposition which the other side had previously agreed to -- and it therefore looks as though both sides are together -- the other side finds a new difficulty. Thus, it is always a question of finding a difficulty for every solution, and not a solution for every difficulty.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

The First Committee therefore has two draft resolutions before it -- two draft resolutions not having much to do with outer space, two draft resolutions not providing humanity with any hope of banning this medium of mass destruction, two draft resolutions not providing even any hope that the large amount of knowledge at the disposal of the United States and the Soviet Union will be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. And how does one use this exclusively for peaceful purposes unless one gets an agreement on the non-use of the weapons of mass destruction?

Thus, what we have before us is another expression of the cold war. The name of my country appears in the list of proposed members of the committee. I have no instructions to say either that we can function or that we cannot function there. Like the other eighty Members of the United Nations, we are people who are bound to respect the views of this body, subject to our national interests, our own sovereign independence and our constitutional procedures. When we are invited to join a committee, we say this: Will the committee meet? Will it function? Will it contribute to peace? Or are we simply taking sides to promote the cold war? I think that both draft resolutions are cold-war resolutions.

My delegation believes that this matter is being unduly hurried. Direct negotiations have been taking place between the Soviet Union and the United States. We should bear in mind that in this matter it is the sponsors of the two draft resolutions who have been thinking of various compositions for the committee and trying to find ways and means. It is very good that these negotiations have taken place, and the fact is that the responsibility rests with the sponsors.

The position now is that there is a proposition from one side and a proposition from the other side. There is no compromise draft resolution before the First Committee. I think that when the Committee votes that should be held clearly in mind. It is not sufficient for people who have the power, people who have majorities, or people who have fanatical or insistent views on a particular position -- even if they are in the minority -- to alter the original text and say that that is a compromise. A compromise is essentially a meeting of the minds on both sides, with each side perhaps not getting all it wants. A compromise is not a revised edition of the original proposal, proposing things which the proposer thinks will meet the other side or which he can put out as being a better

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

proposition than the other. That is not the idea of a compromise; it is neither the literal meaning of the word "compromise", nor common sense.

I therefore should like to put forward the following suggestion, if the Committee would agree and if it meets the views of the United States, on the one hand, and the Soviet Union, on the other. We have now reduced this question to finding common agreement on the composition of the proposed committee. If this committee is going to make the rules and decide the constitution of any permanent body in this respect, it appears to us that it is only fair and reasonable that the committee must be such as to inspire confidence on both sides. Those of us who are familiar with the matter know how much give-and-take took place in the preparatory body which drafted the rules, and so forth, for the Atomic Energy Agency. But that give-and-take was possible because the composition had already been agreed to, whether or not people liked it. That was the result of compromise. Similarly, we must now find some compromise in the present matter; that is all that remains. We can for the time being put on one side some of the difficulties regarding the operative clauses of the draft resolutions; they are more amenable to treatment.

I have no doubt that the First Committee can adopt a resolution. I have no doubt that the resolution will obtain a two-thirds majority. I also have no doubt -- and I say this to both sides -- that there will be large numbers of nations represented in this Committee which will abstain from voting on either draft resolution; for, while they are prepared to contribute their small ability, as it may be, while they are prepared to co-operate, while they are prepared to play their part, as Members of the Assembly, in reaching decisions, they do not want to enlist themselves on one side or the other in what is only another cold-war effort -- especially in present world conditions.

I make no formal proposal, but I would request other members of the Committee to ponder, while the next representative is speaking, whether we should not again suspend this discussion and try to find a composition that meets the views of both sides. If that is not possible, and if the Committee is going to proceed to the vote, my delegation reserves the right to explain its vote at the proper time.

Mr. NONG KIMNY (Cambodia) (interpretation from French): The Cambodian delegation is very sorry that, despite the sincere efforts made by a number of delegations, no agreement has been forthcoming on the important issue before us. Nevertheless, it is with a feeling of hope that we now express our views on the draft resolutions before the Committee.

To begin with, the Cambodian Government has welcomed the initiative of the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union in bringing the question of the peaceful uses of outer space before the United Nations. Following the remarkable scientific and engineering advances which resulted in the launching of the first Soviet Sputnik and, shortly afterwards, in the launching of the first United States Explorer, mankind suddenly found itself, owing to the genius of its scientists, confronting a new realm of endeavour: that of cosmic space. In this first stage of the space age, remarkable explorations have already taken place. As examples we may cite the Sputniks, which weigh thousands of pounds, and the United States moon rocket, which has traversed more than a third of the distance between the earth and the moon.

As I have said, these scientific and technological advances resulted in great hopes that tremendous horizons would be opened up to the human imagination.

(Mr. Nong Kimny, Cambodia)

However, there are fears lest military utilization of outer space also take place. Hence the importance of the United States and Soviet Union initiatives in bringing the question of the peaceful uses of outer space before the United Nations. This was a wise move. Political wisdom requires the efforts of scientists to be harnessed for purposes in harmony with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

There was a week's debate, which was not particularly encouraging owing to the discrepancies of the points of view, but then a more hopeful situation arose owing to the submission of the revised Soviet Union draft resolution. That revised draft resolution, in our opinion, came fairly close to the twenty-Power draft resolution. We welcomed the new Soviet Union draft resolution with gratification.

The problems involved in the exploration and exploitation of outer space are so complex and complicated that the first logical step would seem to be to entrust the careful study of the question to a qualified organ. As the representative of France so aptly pointed out the other day, it would be more expedient first to agree on a method to follow, instead of engaging in a debate on the substance of the question. Only once we have reached sound conclusions based on careful studies by scientists and experts -- only then, I say, can the United Nations be expected to have sound decisions.

The study of this question of the peaceful uses of outer space has multifarious aspects, some of these being of scientific and juridical interest. We have listened carefully to the brilliant observations of some representatives, and we are grateful to them for having cast light on some of these aspects, at times with a good deal of eloquence.

We feel that the ad hoc Committee, as provided for in the twenty-Power draft resolution, or the preparatory committee, as called for in the Soviet Union draft resolution, could secure the assistance of specialized United Nations agencies and organs that have already studied the question, as well as governmental and private organizations that are expert in this field. In examining, dispassionately and in good faith, the two draft resolutions before us, the delegation of Cambodia still thinks that agreement on a joint text should be within reach. The representative of Haiti last week suggested an apt and

(Mr. Nong Kimny, Cambodia)

felicitous formula when he said that the two draft resolutions touch and even merge in some parts. The only fundamental divergence applies now to the membership of the special or ad hoc Committee. Our delegation, therefore, wishes to venture to exhort the two main sponsors to make a final effort to devise a text which would command unanimous assent of this Committee.

If I may look back upon history, I would say that the so-called atomic Powers missed a magnificent opportunity to give the world a beautiful example of co-operation in the control of atomic and thermonuclear fields, and that is why they have been engaged in fruitless debates for years -- because they missed that opportunity. In the matter of the peaceful uses of outer space, it would appear that the omens are rather more favourable. From the lessons of history, the United States and the Soviet Union, which are in the van of the exploration of cosmic space, still have time to take the necessary measures for achieving the kind of understanding and harmony which all mankind is hopeful for.

U THANT (Burma): My delegation, like many other delegations, had entertained fond hopes for the establishment of a United Nations organ, which would be responsible for the progress of international co-operation in the field of the study of outer space, with the ultimate objective of banning the military use of outer space, and the institution of appropriate international control over the observance and enforcement of any such position within the framework of the United Nations.

At one stage of the general debate, we were heartened to note that the viewpoints of the two great Powers directly involved, namely, the United States and the Soviet Union came within negotiating distance of each other when the latter made a very significant revision in its draft resolution. We then thought that an agreed formula would soon be forthcoming. Now we have before us two revised draft resolutions, one submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1) and the other by the United States and nineteen other sponsors (A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1). It seems to my delegation that only one fundamental difference remains between the United States and the Soviet Union. This relates to the composition of the preparatory group to be named by our Committee to consider the programme and rules of procedure for a permanent international committee for the study of cosmic

(U Thant, Burma)

space for peaceful purposes. It is, in fact, just a drafting committee. The Soviet Union has proposed the formation of an eleven-nation body, while the revised twenty-Power draft resolution called for a membership of eighteen.

My delegation does not wish to take sides on whether the principle of absolute parity between the West and the East should be applied in the present case, or whether or not a lopsided composition would be best in the existing circumstances. All I want to say is that we cannot support any formula which is not acceptable either to the United States or the Soviet Union, which are the two principal countries at present directly concerned with the exploration of outer space. My delegation is convinced that non-participation by either of these two great Powers in the proposed preparatory group within the framework of the United Nations will not only render it futile, but is also fraught with dangerous consequences.

With a view to breaking the deadlock, my delegation endeavoured on Friday last to propose that the contemplated preparatory group should be composed of only two countries, the United States and the Soviet Union. Many of my colleagues appeared to be in agreement with that view, but, after informal discussions with some delegations concerned, we had to drop this proposal, as it was not likely to be accepted.

Let me appeal to the sponsors of the draft resolutions, as my colleague from India has just done, not to rush through with their proposals, which are not acceptable to the other side, but to continue to exhaust all possible avenues of negotiation and conciliation.

If the two draft resolutions before this Committee are put to the vote, my delegation will abstain in the voting for the reasons stated above.

Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): Although sometimes it is a bit difficult to repeat what has already been said in this Committee, occasionally a useful purpose may be served in placing on record the position which a delegation holds on an important issue. Speaking on 19 November, my delegation stated that in dealing with the problem of the peaceful uses of outer space, the United Nations should insure the triumph of the spirit of co-operation that guided the scientists which participated in the large scale scientific endeavours of the International Geophysical Year.

This spirit of mutual co-operation and understanding which marked man's first faltering steps into the cosmos should serve as a good basis for the achievement of a mutually acceptable agreement on the modalities of the peaceful uses of outer space and international co-operation therefor. On 19 November there were already two draft resolutions before us, the one of the Soviet Union and the one of the United States and several co-sponsors. We said then that the draft resolutions were rather close together in content, even though my delegation preferred the Soviet draft resolution inasmuch as it held out the possibility of a more complete solution, but that if the sponsors of the two draft resolutions were to make efforts toward the achievement of a mutually acceptable text, which could be agreed to by the Committee, then the delegation of the Ukraine would welcome such an outcome of the interesting and important debate on the peaceful uses of outer space.

In speaking these words, we had in mind the possibilities open to the Committee in connexion with the submission by the Soviet delegation of a revised draft resolution (A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1). But we also had in mind that the delegation of the United States and the other sponsors of the second draft resolution would follow the advice of Senator Johnson who, speaking on behalf of two parties, the Democratic and the Republican, advised the Committee not to project into the outer space the disputes and the disagreements which plagued the surface of the globe.

Having listened to Mr. Lodge's speech, however, my delegation reached the conclusion that disputes and disagreements are in fact being projected into outer space when international co-operation in the study and exploration of cosmic space is just taking its first faltering steps or approaching such steps.

(Mr. Palamarchuk, Ukrainian SSR)

Perhaps the representative of the United Kingdom is right in saying that joint international efforts are advisable. But may I suggest that such efforts should be on a footing of equality rather than on a basis of a one-sided approach which would be in effect the outcome of any adoption of the United States draft resolution. The principle of equal rights is not the same as a two-sides conception, as suggested by Mr. Lodge. The principle of equal rights is after all the very principle of the United Nations. When we are told that the United States has made important efforts at compromise, surely we should bear in mind that the position of the proposed Committee is a very important thing. In the United States draft resolution there are under this heading altogether unacceptable proposals which nullify such other aspects of the United States draft resolution that could conceivably be unanimously approved by the Committee.

On listening to Mr. Lodge, we wondered whether there were any real negotiations in the broad and genuine meaning of that term. I merely raise this question because in order to make a judgement we should hear the other side as to the true shape of the picture. The main thing that interests us is the decision which the Committee will finally adopt, or else, will it simply be another resolution to be added to the pile of other resolutions previously adopted which have added nothing to international co-operation? Will a resolution be adopted that will lay the foundation for fruitful international co-operation in this new and almost unexplored realm of outer space? It is desirable, nay essential, to have genuine international co-operation, and this is what the Soviet draft resolution calls for.

In order to have genuine international co-operation the decision must be acceptable not to just one country or group of countries, but to all parties involved. The unanimous adoption of a resolution on so important a question as the one on the peaceful uses of outer space would have incalculable consequences. Many representatives have pointed out that all of mankind is interested in the exploitation of outer space. In taking the first step toward devising methods of international co-operation in this matter, we cannot follow procedures advocated by one group of countries and not acceptable to others.

(Mr. Palamarchuk, Ukrainian SSR)

Only a decision acceptable to all Members of the United Nations could be the proper cornerstone for the building of international co-operation, this structure which should guide the conquest of outer space and which we are called upon to build. We should therefore heed the views of the delegation of India and give an opportunity to delegations mostly concerned in this matter to consult further, to study the possibilities of achieving an agreed decision in this Committee.

Mr. WALKER (Australia): I intervene merely to make one brief comment on one of the remarks made by the leader of the Indian delegation. I do so not in any way to take issue with the Indian delegation, but merely to make clear the viewpoint of the Australian delegation.

Speaking as one of the sponsors of the twenty-Power draft resolution, I would like to say that Australia does not regard this draft resolution, as we have proposed it, in any way as a cold-war proposal. Australia regards it as an attempt to facilitate international scientific co-operation without regard to ideological frontiers. The efforts of the sponsors to reach agreement with the Soviet Union indicate, I believe, that this is the sole objective of our draft resolution. I would also add that Australia does not wish to see cold-war attitudes extended into the proposed ad hoc committee on the peaceful uses of outer space. That is all I wish to say at this stage.

Mr. MICHALOWSKI (Poland): In the opinion of my delegation, this Committee is confronted now with a most deplorable situation. We all expected that over the weekend negotiations would take place between the sponsors of the two draft resolutions and that today we would have one joint draft resolution acceptable to all of us.

Instead we have been informed today that negotiations took place not between the sponsors of the two draft resolutions, but rather only among the sponsors of one draft resolution, that they corrected their draft in unilateral anticipation of the wishes of the other side, that they decided what is -- or what should be -- the acceptable solution for the Soviet Union, and that they drew up a list of eighteen countries for the membership of the committee without proper consultation with the parties concerned as to the acceptability of this list.

I have said that this is a deplorable situation because it seemed to us that it is high time to understand that in the field of disarmament generally there is no place for majority decisions and for railroading through any resolution. There is only place for unanimous solutions, for decisions that are accepted by all parties directly concerned. I should like to remind you of a decision of the majority of this Committee at the twelfth session of the General Assembly concerning the establishment of a disarmament commission. If you want the new commission on outer space to be as efficient as that Commission, then of course you may establish it. You are all of course aware that the Disarmament Commission ceased to exist about two weeks ago after a year of existence without a single meeting. I think that from time to time, at least, we should take a lesson from modern history.

This consideration should, in our opinion, be applied particularly to the area of cosmic space, outer space. A majority resolution can launch a lot of paper and a noisy propaganda campaign, but it will not launch a new sputnik. With such a resolution you can reach the headlines but not the moon.

No international commission on outer space can work without the participation of the USSR and the United States. I think that this does not require any explanation. Therefore, if we are confronted with a situation in which there is no agreement either on the text of the resolution or on the composition of the committee, the only reasonable road open to this commission would be to

(Mr. Michalowski, Poland)

postpone a decision until agreement is possible. In this case, we can have only a compromise or nothing -- tertium non datur.

Unfortunately, however, the sponsors of the draft resolution, as we heard today, chose another road which is non-existent in political logic, and they are pressing for a vote on their draft resolution without agreement with the USSR.

My delegation does not want at this stage of the debate to go into the details of the differences dividing the two drafts of the USSR and the twenty-Powers. I think that they are sufficiently clear to everybody. In our opinion, and I should like to stress this, the proposed committee without the co-operation of the USSR or the United States in the matter of outer space is absurd and doomed to failure at the very outset, regardless of the number of votes cast for it. I therefore listened with great respect to the opinion of the representative of India. Like India, my country is mentioned in both draft resolutions as a candidate for membership in the body provided for the study of the peaceful use of outer space and therefore we are particularly interested in its composition. I should only like to say that if the commission is established in the manner proposed and if it is crippled because of the absence of one of the two big cosmic Powers, it would not be possible for us to take part in it because we would not consider such a commission to be a serious one. I therefore sincerely appeal to the sponsors of the draft resolution to avoid such a possibility and not to treat this solution as a problem of prestige and propaganda. The problem is much too serious and much too great to be treated in that way.

Let us not give up our efforts to find a compromise. Let us postpone the decision and let us continue to search for a solution.

Mr. Ali SASTROAMIDJOJO (Indonesia): I shall be very brief in explaining the position of my delegation on the draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1 and A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1.

These two draft resolutions are very close to one another. Indeed, no essential disagreement exists between the sponsors of the two draft resolutions as to the desirability and even on the manner of setting up international machinery within the framework of the United Nations for the purpose of promoting the peaceful use of outer space.

(Mr. Ali Sastroamidjojo, Indonesia)

The only point on which it has as yet not been possible to achieve agreement is on the composition of a preparatory group, or the ad hoc committee, as it is called in the twenty-Power draft resolution. We regret this very much indeed. We feel that on a matter of such crucial importance to the peoples of the world as the question of the peaceful use of outer space, the composition of the envisaged preparatory group should not be an insurmountable obstacle to unanimity on this Committee. This is all the more so as the proposed group or committee, is, after all, a preparatory one the result of whose work will be submitted to the fourteenth session of the General Assembly for study and consideration.

Thus there is ample insurance that every Member State of the United Nations will have an opportunity to scrutinize carefully and express its views on whatever recommendations the proposed preparatory group or ad hoc committee may report to the next regular session of the General Assembly.

As I stated in my previous intervention on this item, my delegation does not consider unanimity on this matter to be merely an academic question. We believe it to be imperative for constructive and speedy progress in bringing about the use of outer space for peaceful purposes only.

Consequently, we intend to refrain from supporting in any way the division that still exists in this Committee on the two draft resolutions before it. We will, therefore, if, unfortunately, the two draft resolutions are pressed to the vote, abstain from voting on these two draft resolutions contained in documents A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1 and A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1. We continue to hope, however, that all avenues for reaching an agreement will be exhausted on this question until a unanimous vote can be obtained in this Committee.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Mr. Chairman, with your permission I should like to make one or two observations to elicit from the representative of Australia the meaning of his observations. He has referred pointedly to my delegation, and it is therefore necessary that I do so.

When I intervened in the debate a while ago and said that it was an expression of the "cold war" situation, we were not throwing names at anybody. Now what is the "cold war"? The "cold war" refers to the state of great tension that exists in the world, where there are two great blocs, each of them called defensive. But whenever did any nation say that it was either waging or preparing for war except for the purpose of defence since the time of Mussolini? Nobody did.

I should like to ask my colleague from Australia whether he or his delegation has ever sponsored or voted for a resolution in this Committee or anywhere else where they have admitted that it was a "cold war" resolution? So any resolution which he supports is not, by definition, a "cold war" resolution.

I want the Committee, therefore, to take note of this fact and their minds must be seized of the proposition that these draft resolutions, unless there is agreement, are not anything that will diminish the tension in the world, contribute to the exploration of outer space or to its non-use for destructive purposes. I am entitled to make this answer because the answer is a direct negative to the suggestion that there is a "cold war" resolution.

Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa): Like the delegation of Australia, the South African delegation, as a co-sponsor of the draft resolution set out in document A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1, does not regard that proposal as an exercise in the "cold war". No other member of the non-Soviet group who spoke in this debate has exploited the opportunity offered by the discussion of the item we are considering for the purposes of the "cold war".

By the twenty-Power draft resolution we are hoping to achieve something positive. As a first step it does little more than set up a group to study the problems which now confront us in the use of outer space. The military aspects of such use are not mentioned in the draft not because they are not of the utmost importance, but because this is a matter which the Disarmament Commission should consider as a matter of great urgency, as so many representatives have emphasized round this table.

(Mr. Jordaan, Union of South Africa)

It is true that the co-operation of the Soviet Union and the United States on the study of the peaceful uses of outer space is of the utmost importance. The twenty-Power draft resolution includes just about everything which the Soviet draft envisaged should be studied. The only real difference between the two sides is that of the composition of the study group. If the Soviet group insists on parity of representation and makes this a breaking point, then in the light of the debate which we have heard I have not the slightest doubt that the Soviet Union, in world public opinion, would be branded as introducing the "cold war" into an item where nobody else wanted it.

It is my earnest hope that the Soviet Union will ponder this and reconsider its attitude, and give us the co-operation which is so important and which we all so ardently desire.

Mr. MAGHERU (Romania) (interpretation from French): The Romanian delegation has already made its views known on the substance of the question before us, namely the peaceful use of outer space. I shall not deal with the various aspects of the question now, but shall limit myself to the draft resolutions.

In the question of outer space as in the question of atomic energy, the representative of India, as well as a number of other representatives, has correctly said that if the United Nations is to do useful work it must adopt its decisions unanimously.

At present there are two States which have by far made the greatest contribution to the study of outer space, namely the Soviet Union and the United States. The Romanian delegation does not believe that there can be any fruitful activity on the part of an international study group unless the decision taken is agreed to by both the Soviet Union and the United States.

What the United Nations must set up is an instrument for international co-operation for the advancement of science and the benefit of humanity. The revised Soviet draft reflects this idea both as regards setting up a committee and as regards establishing a preparatory working group. It takes into account the scientific and political requirements.

(Mr. Magheru, Romania)

If we want to achieve international co-operation, we shall not achieve it by a majority vote. Such a vote will only hamper co-operation and further divide the world.

One of the main differences between the Soviet draft and the twenty-Power draft is the question of the composition of the working group. In the course of the general debate, some delegations avoided taking a position on the question of the military use of outer space. The Soviet draft takes this reticence into account and proposes co-operation in the study of the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. Basically this represents a rapprochement of the points of view. But why not go further? That is why I believe that the Committee should try to find some common ground which will allow us, both politically and scientifically, to complete the progress which began last week in the conversations which took place between the Powers most directly concerned.

Mr. TARABANOV (Bulgaria) (interpretation from French): When the Soviet Union made its concession the other day in withdrawing its original draft which linked the question of the peaceful use of outer space with the elimination of foreign military bases all over the world, the entire Committee was convinced that this offered considerable assistance in arriving at a favourable solution and that the question would ultimately be settled. Unfortunately, however, we still find before us today two separate draft resolutions.

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

Some representatives have insisted that these two draft resolutions have very much in common. I agree. I have noted this too. But there is one matter upon which agreement has not been achieved, and that is the question of the setting up of the Committee for preparatory group that is to draft the rules and the procedures according to which the study group is to work. This may be a question of detail, but we must agree that on the question of the peaceful uses of outer space we must be extremely careful. We must not stress the differences of opinion too much at the very beginning, particularly because outer space, as we pointed out in our previous statement, is very closely linked, whether we wish it or not, to the question of the possibility of the military use of outer space. It is the self-same scientists and the self-same means that are used for the construction of machines to explore outer space and if necessary to carry the nuclear warheads that may be used to destroy countries or regions. Therefore, we must be very careful not to stress too much the differences at the very beginning of these studies.

Certain countries would like very much to separate these two questions entirely and thus allow us to get to the point where outer space will be explored, where knowledge of outer space will be disseminated, and yet at the same time foreign military bases can be allowed to remain for as long as these countries want. This being the case, it is only to be expected that there might be agreement at certain levels between the parties, or at least there may appear to be agreement. We must not forget that these two matters are intimately related, and they are also closely linked to the military uses of outer space.

Some delegations have contended -- such as that of India -- that we should not adopt a draft resolution that might lead us to go back to the "cold war", but certain delegations feel that these draft resolutions are not taking us back to the "cold war" and that we are going to solve the question through these draft resolutions. To a certain extent this may be true. Perhaps it is the desire of these delegations that the "cold war" should not be reopened. The representative of the Union of South Africa also made known his views and stated that, from what is known of this draft resolution and from past experiences, if the Soviet Union does not go along with this decision and allow a solution to be arrived at, the people of the world will know that it was the Soviet Union that was responsible

(Mr. Tarabanov, Bulgaria)

for the separation. If this is not another name for the "cold war", I do not know what it is.

What is the predominating idea in the presentation of this separate draft resolution? Such a draft resolution as that submitted by the twenty Powers is surely not conducive to finding a happy solution to the question.

Another point that was raised here was one raised by the representative of the United States, who said that there must be democratic representation. This is a very interesting interpretation of the question. When it is a matter of being able to count on a certain number, you count on that number; but when it is a matter of representing the population of the world in a United Nations body, the representative of the United States takes a different view. When dealing with the question of giving China true representation here, nobody mentions the point of view to which the United States refers in connexion with other matters.

With regard to the question of outer space, we must know that entire regions are being overlooked. Certain countries are not even being asked for their assent. But without China we cannot make any headway. So I would stress here that there must be agreement first on this point. There must be adequate representation of all regions of the world in developing the possibilities and the study of this question.

Furthermore, I must say -- as other delegations have also said -- that we should not try to solve this problem from a purely egotistical point of view and only keeping in mind the desires of some who wish to see their views predominate. This is what would happen if this twenty-Power draft resolution is pressed to a vote. If these twenty Powers insist on our voting on this draft resolution, that is what will occur. So I should like to point out to them that the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union also reflects the different points of view expressed in the Committee and offers representation to the different parts of the world and it also stresses and encourages the possibility of fruitful work in the study of outer space.

I should like further thought to be given this matter before a final decision is taken. A majority decision that does not allow of the participation of all the countries concerned cannot solve this question and cannot allow progress to be made on the question.

Mr. KENAWI (United Arab Republic): My delegation would like to express its regret at the failure of the parties concerned to reach an agreement on the constitution of the committee envisaged in both draft resolutions. We regret this fact since it is our firm belief that the co-operation and full participation of both the United States and the Soviet Union are so essential in the work of the Committee that they cannot be ignored by one party or the other.

We support, therefore, the suggestion of Mr. Krishna Menon not to rush to a vote on this question but to give another opportunity to the parties concerned to reconsider their position and come eventually to an agreement. In the meantime it might be useful if we could start discussing the question of Cyprus.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): It is almost one o'clock, and I would point out that a number of delegations have informed the Chair that they intend to submit a new draft resolution in the very near future. That being the case, I think the most prudent course would be to adjourn our meeting now until 3 p.m.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Chairman, before you adjourn the meeting, I should like to clarify some points in connexion with the draft resolutions before us. To that end, I should like to ask a question of the sponsors, who may be in a position to supply an answer even before our luncheon recess.

In the Soviet draft resolution, the character of the international body for co-operation in the study of cosmic space, to be set up as a permanent organ, is clearly set forth.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

In addition to that we speak of the organization of a preparatory group to work out the programme and rules for the proposed standing group. Therefore, we make it clear that there will be two organs: One to be a standing organ to be established later, and on the other hand a preparatory group to be set up right now to prepare for the subsequent permanent committee.

In the twenty-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1), submitted by the United States and nineteen other countries, this question is not made altogether clear. That is why I should like to ask for clarification. The penultimate paragraph of the preamble says:

"Considering that an important contribution can be made by the establishment within the framework of the United Nations of an appropriate international body for co-operation in the study of outer space for peaceful purposes,"

In other words, a permanent organ within the framework of the United Nations is envisaged. But then, the operative part says: "Establishes an Ad Hoc Committee on the peaceful uses of outer space..." In other words, the impression is created that this special or ad hoc committee on the peaceful uses of outer space is the one which is now being established.

Therefore, the question arises, Is this the same committee as the one mentioned in the preamble? Is the body mentioned in the preamble and the one mentioned in paragraph 1 of the operative part, is that the same committee, or is one preparatory for the other? Does the preamble speak of a permanent body for co-operation in the study of outer space for peaceful purposes, while the operative part has in mind some sort of preparatory committee? This may be so. But the word "preparatory" does not appear. Therefore the question arises whether one is preparatory for the other or whether it is the same thing.

This is the question which arose in our mind when examining this proposal. Therefore, if the representative of the United States or any other spokesman for that group of countries would find it convenient to give us an explanation on this particular score, we would be very grateful.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.