

UNITED NATIONS

GENERAL ASSEMBLY



LIMITED

A/C.1/PV.995
24 November 1958

ENGLISH

Thirteenth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND NINETY-FIFTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 24 November 1958, at 3 p.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.995. 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): The Committee has before it a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.224) submitted jointly by the delegations of Burma, India and the United Arab Republic. Regarding this draft resolution, I should like to ask the sponsors whether the text is correct in beginning with "The General Assembly", since, in the operative paragraph, the United States and the Soviet Union are asked to report "to this Committee". The words "to this Committee", as well as the general sense of the draft resolution, lead us to believe that this is a draft resolution which could be adopted by this Committee itself and not by the General Assembly. The Committee could adopt it as part of the work being done in this body on the question of the peaceful uses of outer space. Therefore, if this is a procedural draft resolution which could be adopted by the Committee, there is no need for it to go to the Assembly, and in that case it should begin by saying "The First Committee" instead of "The General Assembly". If I am mistaken in my interpretation, possibly the operative part, instead of saying "to report to this Committee" should read: "...and to report to the First Committee of the General Assembly...".

I would appreciate it if one of the sponsors of the draft resolution would clarify my understanding of the document.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I think that your interpretation is correct, Mr. Chairman, and we regret the mistake in putting the words "The General Assembly". It ought to be: "This Committee" or "The First Committee of the General Assembly".

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In view of the correction just made by the representative of India, I would appreciate it if representatives on the Committee would note the fact that this draft resolution (A/C.1/L.224) should begin with the words: "The First Committee, Considering the urgent need, etc.".

Does anyone wish to speak on the three draft resolutions before the Committee?

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): At this morning's meeting we heard a statement from the representative of the United States concerning the course of the negotiations which took place between the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union on the question of the elaboration of a joint draft resolution regarding the peaceful uses of outer space. We also heard statements from a number of other delegations expressing regret at the fact that these negotiations had not led to favourable results. Some of those who spoke this morning mentioned the point that the lengthy negotiations which they thought had taken place, had ended in failure owing to the disagreement of the Soviet Union with the proposals of the United States and other countries which co-sponsored the twenty-Power draft resolution.

As regards the membership of the preparatory committee referred to in the two draft resolutions, since the representative of the United States, in his speech, touched upon the position of the Soviet Union during the negotiations and, in our opinion, set out this position not altogether dispassionately, the Soviet Union delegation feels in duty bound to inform the Committee as to the true course of these talks and the positions taken by the parties in those talks.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

At the outset, I must say that the Soviet Union delegation is somewhat surprised at the odd way in which the United States delegation has conducted these negotiations. I should like to recall some basic facts which may be helpful in enabling us to understand how these negotiations took place.

This is the first fact. On 18 November, the Soviet Union delegation took an important step in the direction of a compromise by submitting a revised text of its draft resolution. Surely, it was the consensus in this Committee that this revised text offered a real basis for an acceptable common agreement on an important political question. The revision effected a substantial alteration of position by deferring consideration of the military aspect of the problem -- in fact, dropping this military aspect from consideration at the present stage. This was done because the military aspect of the problem was precisely the aspect which had given rise to some sharp differences of opinion and had become an obstacle to the achievement of unanimous agreement.

Thus, on 18 November, our side took a tangible political step designed to effect agreement.

I come now to the second fact. On 20 November, the United States delegation handed to the Soviet Union delegation a proposed joint draft resolution which incorporated all the points of the twenty-Power draft resolution and some of the points of the revised Soviet Union draft resolution. On meeting Mr. Lodge on 20 November, we offered a number of preliminary comments on the text which had been handed to us. Mr. Lodge acknowledged that these comments were reasonable. We added that we should have to study carefully the draft that had been given to us and that we should make our final views available upon the completion of our study. We asked Mr. Lodge a number of questions and ascertained that the United States delegation had some objections to the membership of the preparatory group as set forth in our text of 18 November. We outlined to Mr. Lodge the considerations which had guided us in proposing this membership for the preparatory group, and Mr. Lodge found these considerations to be worthy of attention; at least, he promised to ponder them.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Here is the third fact. The next day, 21 November, we again met Mr. Lodge and, for the first time, proceeded to an actual examination of the proposals for the membership of the preparatory committee. For we were at one in realizing that, since this was the main controversial issue, it would be advisable to start with it, even though from the outset of our talks the Soviet Union delegation had declared that it had a number of comments on and amendments to the text of the draft resolution which had been handed to us. Thus, we started discussing the proposed membership of the preparatory committee.

In the course of that discussion, the United States proposed a list of thirteen members. The list included four great Powers, to which we had no objection. It contained three Asian-African countries, of which Mr. Lodge mentioned specifically India and the United Arab Republic; we also had no objections on this score. It included two Latin American countries, on one of which we had no differences, since Argentina was mentioned in our list, also. It proposed two countries of the British Commonwealth of Nations: Australia and Canada. It contained one country of Western Europe, to which there was no objection, since Sweden also appeared on our list; we agreed that if the Swedish Government itself had no objection, there should obviously be no difficulty about that country's sitting on the committee. Then, Mr. Lodge named one country from Eastern Europe. Our draft, as representatives will remember, included three countries from Eastern Europe.

That was the list proposed by the United States delegation at our meeting on 21 November. Our list of eleven countries was originally presented, as the Committee knows, on 18 November. After we had talked over both lists, the Soviet Union delegation, with a view to reaching agreement and taking account of the views and desires of the United States delegation, proposed that the list of eleven suggested by the Soviet Union should be increased to twelve, adding a Latin American country. We mentioned Mexico, a country with which the Soviet Union has diplomatic relations -- a fact which obviously cannot fail to facilitate co-operation within the proposed committee.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Therefore, the Soviet delegation surely made a tangible step toward the bringing of the positions closer together and finding common grounds on the group of Latin American countries. We expected the delegation of the United States to take some steps to meet us half way. No such steps, regrettably, were forthcoming. Differences remained concerning two groups of countries: first, concerning the countries from the British Commonwealth, and, secondly, concerning the countries from Eastern Europe. As far as the second group was concerned, we said that, without their participation in the committee, we could discern no real basis for fruitful co-operation.

So, on four out of six categories of countries, almost complete agreement was, in fact, reached. Differences remained on two of those groups. We understood that we would ponder the situation as it obtained, and that if any one of us had any new thoughts on the matter, we would advise the other side.

Fact No. 4: On 21 November our Committee met, and the delegation of the United States had nothing to say on the substance of the negotiations. On a motion from the delegate of India, the Committee interrupted its deliberations so as to give another chance for the completion of the negotiations.

On the basis of the practice and experience in normal diplomatic negotiations, one might well have expected the talks to be continued with a view to reaching the agreement which was expected of us.

Late in the evening of 21 November the delegation of the United States, without talking over the matter with the Soviet delegation at all -- even though it was engaged in negotiations with the Soviet Union delegation, and even though it had agreed to advise the Soviet Union delegation if it had something new on the matter -- the delegation of the United States, I say, submitted a revised draft resolution, incorporating in it an eighteen-country list of Members for the proposed committee instead of the thirteen or eleven which had been talked about previously. This could only be held to bespeak unwillingness by the United States delegation to engage in any further negotiations; in fact, as an interruption on United States initiative of these negotiations, even though the Soviet Union delegation had made clear its earnest intention to persevere in these negotiations to the end, and even though the Soviet Union delegation surely had taken genuine steps to facilitate the achievement of the agreement both on the substance of the draft resolution and on the membership of the committee.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The Soviet Union delegation takes it that this is no way to conduct serious negotiations. Even in the business world, serious firms inform their partners or counterparts as to the reasons for the severance of negotiations. We regarded the United States as a solid and a serious partner in these talks, and the question arises in our minds, were we not in error.

In his speech, Mr. Lodge said that our approach to the compiling of the list of countries as members was an incorrect and unacceptable one, whereas the principles animating the United States in its approach to the compiling of that list were in keeping with the principles of the United Nations, which, therefore, ought to be acceptable.

I must dwell on these points of Mr. Lodge. What principles did Mr. Lodge advance? If I understood him aright, from the simultaneous interpretation, he had two main points. To begin with, the membership of the Committee should comprise countries which have a definite interest, some basis of achievement in the field which the committee is to be set up to deal with; and, secondly, the composition of the committee should be representative of the membership of the United Nations.

With these two principles in mind, let me take a glance at the membership proposed by the Soviet delegation. Does our eleven or twelve-country list -- because twelve countries are what we proposed during the negotiations -- meet these two criteria? I submit that the two principles or criteria are duly reflected in our twelve-country list. There are the two countries directly engaged now in the conquest of outer space, two countries which have had marked successes in this field, and have the basis for continuing along this path. There are the other great Powers in our list which also have the wherewithal for co-operative action and progress in this field. There are the representatives here of all the main areas of the globe. There are the representatives of various political systems represented in the United Nations; and there is a number of neutral countries, which are not members of any groups, and whose participation in this committee could contribute to fruitful co-operation in the interest of the solution of the problems that will have to be dealt with.

In the membership of the Committee as proposed by us, we fail to see the vices or defects which would suggest that our proposal was at variance with the principles advocated by Mr. Lodge. We fail to understand therefore why the United States delegation has found it impossible to discuss the question on the basis of the membership we have proposed, with a view to achieving an agreed solution acceptable to both sides.

On the other hand, Mr. Lodge contended that our approach could not be acceptable to the United States and in fact to the United Nations as a whole, and he criticized us for picking or hand-picking countries which he found unacceptable. In that case may I ask Mr. Lodge a question. How about you? In your list of members did you not hand-pick the members which you would regard as most acceptable? Do take a look at the membership proposed by you. Can there be any doubt that you have made a deliberate selection, a selection based on a principle which is not in keeping with the principles of the United Nations?

In your eighteen-country list you have included twelve, no less, which are members of military blocs and which are linked with you in such blocs. You have included three countries of the socialist camp and three neutral countries. Is this in keeping with the principles of the United Nations? Does this create the basis for co-operation in such a committee? I do not think that there can be two answers to this question. The committee as proposed by the United States is based on principles which are not in keeping with the principles of the United Nations and cannot serve as a basis for genuine fruitful co-operation.

I must say that in the membership as proposed by you, you did take something into account. You did proceed in some way on the basis of the principle which you criticized us for advocating or following. You did not include in your proposal a representative of the Chiang kai-Shek group which is still, so far, represented in the General Assembly. You did not include them. Why have you not done that? After all, there is your close ally, there is a group which you defend wherever the opportunity offers. It would have appeared that it too should be incorporated in this important committee.

Nevertheless, Mr. Lodge, you refrained from doing that. Why? Because you were fully alive to the fact that neither the Soviet Union nor many of the countries which you had earmarked for membership in this committee would be willing to co-operate with the representatives of that group, and if you had included a representative of that group, everyone would have understood that you were unwilling to have any committee at all. In other words, you are cognizant of the fact that the countries which you have proposed for membership in the committee cannot be expected to co-operate fruitfully with just any country or any group, or anybody.

It seems to me that this is a fairly reasonable approach. But why is it that you do not carry this reasonable approach to the end? Why should you include in the membership of this committee countries with which it would be difficult for other members of the committee to co-operate, countries, for example, which have no diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union or with other countries, or countries which have made a record by themselves through their hostility towards the Soviet Union, and the like?

I do not wish to enter into any consideration of the question as to substance now. I merely wish to point out that the principle which guided you in failing to include the representative of the Chiang kai-Shek group into this proposed committee is one which you yourselves should carry to the end. Do not try to include in this committee representatives with whom it would be difficult to co-operate. At this stage, in this Committee and in present circumstances, it seems to me that any realistic approach to this question will reveal that there is nothing unreasonable in this position. On the other hand, you said that in your membership list you have endeavoured to reflect the balance of forces as it now prevails in the General Assembly, and you professed to be surprised at the Soviet Union's unwillingness to accept this membership list.

To begin with, I must say that the membership which you now propose Mr. Lodge, was never proposed by you in the course of the negotiations. This was never mentioned. You proposed the thirteen countries which I mentioned a moment ago, and out of these thirteen countries, you and we agreed on about two-thirds. There remained two groups of countries on which we were to reach agreement.

But you were unwilling to do so. You say that the membership in the list now proposed -- without any negotiations with us, may I add -- reflects the general composition of the General Assembly. I must say that during the consideration of the question of outer space an absolute majority of the delegations which took the floor emphasized the apt thought that in this new endeavour it was particularly important to take the organizational steps which would secure genuine forward movement along these new paths, basing ourselves on the experience, the record, the achievements, in this field of the various countries.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

If this consideration is to guide the membership of the Committee, then surely nobody will dispute the point that the list should reflect the actual situation in the field of the study of outer space by various countries. If the United States interrupted the negotiations and introduced a separate draft resolution in order to exert pressure on the Soviet delegation and on delegations of other countries, then this is an utterly vain approach. This sort of step is not based on a realistic evaluation of the true situation in this field. The actual situation is this. The Soviet Union and the United States are apparently equally interested in the establishment of a permanent organ for co-operation in the study and exploitation of outer space for peaceful purposes. We proceed from this premise. If this premise itself is inaccurate, then we are very regretful. In other words, if the United States is not interested in this, then let it say so for everyone to hear.

Scientific co-operation in this field is now in progress and will continue within the framework of the prolonged International Geophysical Year and the Scientific Committee for the Study of Outer Space, which has already been set up at the October conference of the League of Scientific Societies. This co-operation in the scientific field does not depend on decisions adopted in the United Nations. In other words, this scientific co-operation will continue, and we hope will continue successfully, regardless of the decisions that may be adopted here.

The issue before us now is another one altogether. It is the question of the establishment of an inter-governmental committee within the framework of the United Nations on the question of outer space. It seems to me that no one will dispute the fact that the establishment of such an inter-governmental body can only emerge from the voluntary agreement of States Members of the United Nations and, first of all, of the countries principally involved and interested in this question, the countries which are now engaged in the main work in exploring and exploiting outer space, namely, the United States and the Soviet Union. A number of representatives have made this point in the course of the general debate and at this morning's meeting.

We feel, therefore, that no decisions adopted by this Committee or by the General Assembly without the agreement of the States concerned, and especially without the agreement of the Soviet Union and the United States, can have any

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

genuine weight. Any such decisions will remain a dead letter. I must say that when I set out these points to Mr. Lodge when we met, he acknowledged them to be reasonable. At least he did not voice any objections. Nevertheless, the United States has now chosen the way which is actually conducive to the collapse of the negotiations and to frustrating the whole endeavour to establish an international committee for the study of outer space for peaceful purposes.

How can it be contended that the one-sided United States draft resolution with its one-sided list of members of the proposed committee can play any sort of a positive role in the achievement of a mutually acceptable agreement? Is this not a step that will actually drive the question into a tight deadlock and frustrate the achievement of any sort of agreement? Or does Mr. Lodge think that if he puts this draft resolution to the vote and if he garners a majority of votes in favour of it that it will then solve the question before us?

All soberly thinking political men, of whom I know there are quite a few in this Committee, will not be deluded on this score. No amount of voting in the General Assembly can compel any State to co-operate in or with any committee, unless an understanding is achieved in advance with the State involved concerning the basis of such co-operation. Or perhaps Mr. Lodge likes the kind of co-operation which prevails between cats and dogs. That is not the kind of co-operation that we like. We want genuinely fruitful co-operation, and this is only possible on the basis of the agreement of the States that are to be members of that committee. If this applies to any State, it applies all the more to a State like the Soviet Union, and especially in connexion with a question like the one of the study, exploration and exploitation of outer space.

The United States and other countries are likely to be fairly well informed about the successes scored by the Soviet Union along this line of endeavour.

I can tell you, Mr. Lodge, that of course you can collect a majority of votes in this Committee; you are free to do so. You are free to do so in the General Assembly as well. But the point is that neither you, Mr. Lodge, nor the United States with all of its partners, has, if I may say so, the majority of votes in outer space.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

In the absence of that majority, all of his manoeuvres as regards the voting on one-sided draft resolutions in the General Assembly on the question of outer space are quite unjustifiable. They can only harm the cause of international co-operation in this field, and it is international co-operation that all mankind pines for. That is why it seems to me that the breakdown of negotiations on this question, on the initiative of the United States, is an erroneous step. Voting on the one-sided United States draft resolution would be all the more erroneous since under the present conditions that would solve nothing. It would only drive the whole matter into a tight and hopeless deadlock. It would drive into a tighter deadlock and would make less likely any reasonable solution of this question based on the true situation in the world. All those who are committed to genuine co-operation are bound to refuse to travel along this wrong path.

The experience of international relations throughout the post-war period and the experience of the United Nations itself, if only during the past year, should have provided persuasive evidence of the fact that this way will not lead to any favourable results or to the solution of questions in whose solution many countries are interested. It would only destroy something that would have been hopeful and fruitful. Those who will have brought these results about will not be able to shed the onus of responsibility for these results. We do not wish to assume this onus of responsibility, because our position is eminently in harmony with the interests of the matter. Our position provides a genuine basis for the continuation of negotiations and the achievement of a mutually acceptable agreement. Whether the United States wants that depends surely on the United States, and we are prepared to hear its views on the matter.

The CHAIRMAN (intepretation from Spanish): I should like to draw the attention of the Committee to the fact that document A/C.1/L.224/Rev.1 has just been distributed in the various official languages. It takes into account the reply that the representative of India gave to my question, and the words "The General Assembly" have been replaced by the words "The First Committee".

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Mr. Zorin states that the United States broke off the discussions which took place last week between the United States and the Soviet Union. To me the fact is that Mr. Zorin himself said that there was no purpose in discussing the terms of the draft resolution if there was not agreement on the composition of the ad hoc committee. Then Mr. Zorin refused to agree to any composition which did not include four members of what we call here the Soviet bloc. He also insisted on a veto, or he insisted that he be given the chance to express his approval or disapproval of the other countries suggested for the committee. In the course of the meeting which lasted from twelve o'clock to one o'clock and in which I brought the matter up several times, he would not move from either of these positions, and I thought it was recognized by him as well as by me that our efforts to arrive at agreement had come to an end.

At this juncture the United States delegation consulted with the co-sponsors, and it was this group which then made further changes in the twenty-Power draft resolution to incorporate additional points from the Soviet draft. The group also enlarged the composition of the ad hoc committee slate in order to show as much reasonableness as we could on that issue as well. That is the draft resolution that is now before the Committee. We gave the text of it to the Soviet delegation on Friday evening -- just as we gave the text of our original draft resolution to Mr. Zorin before we first submitted it, and then he a day later introduced his.

Mr. Zorin asked me why I had picked the list of nations that is in the twenty-Power draft resolution. The answer can be very simply and quickly given. It is that I did not pick them. I am not the leader of a group of satellites. I do not pick anybody. This list was selected at an extremely democratic and rather vociferous meeting of sponsors and was the subject of debate and the result of open discussion. The draft resolution was then introduced by the sponsors, and anything I may have done was merely as the agent of the sponsors.

Nobody is more anxious than I am to get an agreed position. As I said today, having the Soviet Union on this committee means that a uniquely valuable contribution can be made; there is no doubt about that. I did consult over the weekend with people who were in a position to know and who told me that even

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

without the Soviet Union there is useful work that can be done, but that does not change the fact that if the Soviet Union were a member it would greatly increase the value of this undertaking.

So I have left no stone unturned to try to ascertain in sharp focus exactly what the Soviet viewpoint is. I did so not only last week but as late as early this afternoon, when I was talking with the Soviet delegation. From these talks today, it is clear to me that the Soviet Union still insists on having four members of the Soviet bloc, that is, the Soviet Union and three of the bloc. It is clear to me that the Soviet Union is still opposed to having Australia and Belgium on the committee and that it is still opposed to having on the committee any Latin American country with which it has no diplomatic relations. It is clear to me that not only does the Soviet Union wish to have four members of the Soviet bloc but it wishes to reduce the total size of the committee as well. I think I understand that accurately.

These are all positions which, to the best of my knowledge, are unacceptable to a great majority of the sponsors of this draft resolution, and I have tried very hard to find out what they think.

In the speech Mr. Zorin has just made, he has said nothing that in any way disproves or denies what I have just said.

Under these circumstances, it is clear to me that it would do more harm than good to put the United States and the Soviet Union together in one room and try to work something out. I grant that the draft resolution that has been introduced by Burma, India and the United Arab Republic has a certain superficial appeal and I know that the authors of it are all profoundly sincere men who are putting this in with the very best motives but I think that, when we have had prolonged private talks and when certain facts have emerged as being unchangeable positions -- and I am not passing now on the relative merits of the two positions, but when it has emerged that these unchangeable positions do exist -- then I think that clearly it does more harm than good to try to compel further conversations and that to do so might very well defeat its own purpose and aggravate the tension rather than allaying it.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

Also, I do not think that it is for the Soviet Union and the United States to determine what it is that the Committee should vote for. I do not think this is that kind of a body. It seems to me that this is a type of thing that the Committee ought to decide; so I really believe that the philosophy behind this draft resolution is not completely logical and sound. We think that our draft resolution is conciliatory and that it meets the Soviet position more than halfway. And let me tell you why we think that. The Soviet Union asked for four members of the Soviet group. Our draft resolution provides three. The Soviet Union specified Sweden as a member. Sweden is a member in our draft resolution. The Soviet Union specified Argentina. Argentina is a member. The Soviet Union specified Mexico. Mexico is a member. And these are in addition to the points of substance which are practically all covered in our draft resolution.

I should like to say that to pass this draft resolution is not the last word. It is not the irrevocable closing of the door at all. It is another door through which we can go. It opens the way to further deliberations. It is the best way, I think, for us to make progress at this time.

Now, at the end of this morning's meeting, Mr. Zorin asked for clarification regarding the twenty-Power draft resolutions(A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1). He asked whether the appropriate international body referred to in the next to the last paragraph of the preamble is the same as or different from the Ad Hoc Committee provided for in the first operative paragraph of the draft resolution. I should like to comment on the meaning of the revised twenty-Power draft resolution so as to remove any possible doubt on this point.

The two bodies are not the same. The Ad Hoc Committee which the draft resolution would establish is charged with making a study of international resources, activities and problems in the field of the peaceful uses of outer space. It is also charged with making recommendations to the General Assembly on a future organization, within the framework of the United Nations, to facilitate international co-operation. In making these recommendations the Ad Hoc Committee will have to consider the form which such arrangements should take, including the composition and structure of a continuing international body. Until the study by the Ad Hoc Committee is completed, it will be impossible to know what form

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

such a body should have. The selection of an ad hoc study committee now, does not in any way prejudice the composition and the structure of a continuing United Nations body to deal with outer space.

U THANT (Burma): In my brief statement this morning, I mentioned the fact that my delegation had endeavoured to propose that the contemplated preparatory group or committee should be composed of only two countries: the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. I also mentioned in the course of my statement, after informal consultations with some delegations concerned, we had to drop this proposal as, in our opinion, it was not likely to be endorsed by those directly concerned.

However, the proceedings in this Committee this morning, and this afternoon, revealed one fact, and that is that a deadlock has been reached, and if no sincere and concerted efforts are made by those who are not directly involved in the matter, then no worthwhile step could be taken by this Committee in the direction of the peaceful utilization of outer space.

By now the issues are pretty clear. The general consensus of opinion in this Committee is definitely in favour of the proposal to use outer space for peaceful purposes only. And there is also general agreement that the present conflicts and rivalries on our little planet should not be extended into this new field. Everyone of us is also agreed that a group or a committee or whatever one might call it, should be formed to recommend an agreed and practical programme of international co-operation in this field. It is really encouraging to note that almost everyone of us in this Committee is in agreement with both draft resolutions before us, that is, document A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1 and document A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1 minus the respective operative paragraphs relating to the composition of the proposed Ad Hoc Committee. So, the difference is not on substance but on procedure only.

Let us ponder over this matter with cool heads. Let us assume that one of these draft resolutions is passed by this Committee, and even by the General Assembly, against the wish of one of the great Powers which is recognized as one of the most, if not the most, technically advanced in conducting scientific research in outer space. What will happen? The United Nations organ thus formed will carry out our mandate, of course, but without the benefit of the accumulated

(U Thant, Burma)

knowledge and experience so far acquired by that country in that particular field. My delegation feels rather strongly that in such a huge undertaking as the peaceful utilization of outer space for the enhancement of human knowledge and of human happiness, the pooling of all the experience and resources of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is essential. It is a sphere which should be beyond the reach of clashing ideologies and above the clamour of political conflicts. The subject we are discussing today is one which can provide an outlet for the fulfilment of man's longing to engage in creative works of peace and progress. And it may not be too much to hope that in co-operative, constructive work above the reach of conflicts, the tensions which plague us today might recede and be forgotten in the joyous task of working together for the good of humanity.

There is still another aspect of the problem which I want to stress with all emphasis at my command. It is no other than the fact that since the inception of the United Nations nothing worthwhile could be done without the joint concurrence of the United States and the USSR. Let us all start anew in the true spirit of co-operative endeavour in the exploration and peaceful utilization of outer space, without introducing elements of dissension.

The joint draft resolution tabled just now by my delegation, along with India and the United Arab Republic, seeks not only to break the deadlock but also to pave the way to the goal of peaceful and harmonious co-operation in a field which is entirely new.

The draft resolution has just one preamble and one operative paragraph. Let me read this in full, Mr. Chairman, with your permission:

"The First Committee,

Considering the urgent need to take positive and constructive steps in the field of the peaceful uses of outer space,

Requests the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to consider this matter and to report to this Committee of the General Assembly on an urgent basis on an agreed and practical approach to this problem."

This draft resolution does not seek to replace the two draft resolutions already before this Committee. It is simply an attempt to break the deadlock and to give fresh impetus to the negotiations which have been going on for some time.

(U Thant, Burma)

We do not seek to empower the United States and the USSR with functions other than to consider this matter and to report back to this Committee on an urgent basis on an agreed and practical approach to this problem. It is the hope of the co-sponsors of this draft resolution that the two great Powers will be able to meet and negotiate so that an agreed formula may be devised once again.

(U Thant, Burma)

The passage of this resolution will once again open the door to the formulation of an agreed basis, and the draft resolution is just an attempt to adjourn the discussion of this item in this Committee so that the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will proceed with their negotiations on an urgent basis before the conclusion of this present session of the General Assembly. It does not preclude -- let me repeat, it does not preclude -- the further consideration of other resolutions on this subject by this Committee. I hope it will receive the unanimous endorsement of this Committee.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): To exercise his right of reply the representative of China has asked for the floor.

Mr. WEI (China): Mr. Chairman, I have asked for the floor to lodge my strong protest against the irrelevant and insulting remarks made by the representative of the Soviet Union against my Government. I can call names too, but this is beneath the dignity of this august body. I agree, this is not a cold-war item. Evidently everybody knows, the Soviet proposal is based on its unreasonable demand for parity. The representative of the Soviet Union simply has no argument. Now he is trying to inject some cheap propaganda. It must be rejected outright.

China is a Member of the United Nations. The Government I have the honour to represent is a Member of the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council and many other committees. We co-operate with all Members of the United Nations, including the aggressor, the Soviet Union. We were elected to the Security Council. Our membership on all these Committees was elected by the majority -- and sometimes a two-thirds majority -- of the Assembly.

We thank you for your help, and we are co-operating with everybody and the majority of the Members of the United Nations are co-operating with us.

Whenever we feel it is our duty to participate we campaign, we ask to be a candidate, and in most cases we get the support of all others. In this case we have not been a candidate. At the time this organization is finally established we may decide to be a candidate and we will then ask for support. We do not feel that there is discrimination against us because the Russians hope that their Communist satellites will be in every case not only on a basis of parity, but the majority of the Committee; but that is not the principle of the United Nations.

Mr. JORDAAN (Union of South Africa): I said this morning that my delegation does not regard the twenty-Power draft resolution as an exercise in the Cold War. We were really endeavouring to accomplish something positive. For that purpose all we wanted was a group to study the problems that will face us in the use of outer space.

What is the deadlock we are faced with now? In the final analysis it boils down to this: Who should study the problems? The Soviet group virtually say that for every Western Power there should be a Communist Power, assisted, as it were, by a neutral Power. The sponsors of the twenty-Power draft resolution say in effect, Seeing that we have a problem let us get the best brains to solve it. These will obviously be the people who have had previous experience with the problem or who have shown an interest in it. But the people who have conducted experiments in outer space do not necessarily have a monopoly on brain-power; therefore let us enlist the brain-power of other nations.

But for every nation to serve on the study group is obviously impracticable, and therefore, taking the political realities as they are and taking them into account, let us take a cross-section of the nations represented in the United Nations and put them on the committee.

To this the Soviet group objects. To what purpose? The study group will do nothing more than what is stated in the twenty-Power draft resolution. It is a preparatory study group which will report to the General Assembly next year, and all Members of the United Nations will be able to express their views on whatever recommendations may be forthcoming. If the study group recommends the establishment of a permanent organ for the control of the use of outer space and they so report to the Assembly next year, that will be the time to consider who should be represented on the control organ. For the present all we are concerned with is the preliminary study of the problems with which we will be faced in the peaceful use of outer space. Nobody -- I really do think nobody -- in his right mind will understand it if the Soviet Union makes this provisional study of outer space an exercise in the Cold War and if they refuse to sit down at the table and talk matters over with other people who are not ideologically like-minded.

I said this morning and I repeat that we need the co-operation of the Soviet Union. I should almost say that it is essential that we should have it. But I simply cannot understand their reasoning when they want to have a

(Mr. Jordaan, South Africa)

representation on this study group on a basis of **parity**. Basically, what we want to do is really to get the best brains going on this matter; and let us get recommendations on which next year we can then formulate the basis on which a control organ can eventually be established. We have heard from one of the sides, shall I say, the United States of America, that there will be no use in putting the Soviet Union and the United States together in a room on the basis of the resolution introduced by Burma, India and the United Arab Republic. So, I do hope that second thoughts will prevail and that we can, in the final analysis, rely on the co-operation of the Soviet Union.

Mr. BUDO (Albania) (interpretation from French): My delegation has already made known its point of view on the draft resolutions before the Committee on studies of the peaceful use of outer space. At that time we expressed the hope that the Political Committee would unanimously adopt the revised draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union because of the spirit of compromise that inspired the Soviet delegation and also in view of the content of the draft resolution, which took very much into account the content of the twenty-Power draft. But today, instead of seeing this unanimity achieved on the Soviet draft resolution, or at least on some new compromise draft, the Committee has had submitted to it a new draft resolution of the twenty Powers which not only does not comply with the compromise that we sought and which does not meet the Soviet Union in its compromise, as Mr. Zorin has told us concretely a few moments ago, but on the contrary, goes farther away from it.

(Mr. Rudo. Albania)

The main difference of opinion lies in the composition of the preparatory group. Whereas the Soviet Union draft takes into account the different political tendencies and the geographical representation to be respected in this preparatory group, as well as the need to set up the necessary balance in such group as will ensure its proper functioning, the United States draft resolution takes no account whatever of these basic requirements, but, on the contrary, against what Mr. Lodge said today, takes up a position of intransigence which is incompatible with the interests of the other parties concerned. In point of fact, the new United States draft shows that the Socialist countries would be represented by only three of their number, while the Western Powers would have four times that number -- and it is these latter which are members of the Western blocs.

Certain delegations have complained of the cold war; but how could we not see in this another proof of the existence of the cold war, particularly in view of the attitude adopted by the United States in submitting the revised draft resolution to the Committee, since it is unilateral and incompatible with the rights and interests of the other parties?

As the representative of the Soviet Union has told the Committee, the Soviet delegation made certain concessions regarding the two groups -- in the first place, the Socialist countries, and, in the second place, the Western group of countries. In these circumstances, and in view of the importance of the subject which we are discussing, we feel that negotiations should be continued between the United States and the Soviet Union, and that the United States should try to show the same good will as that shown by the Soviet Union in this matter.

The preparatory committee must be based upon true and equitable distribution such as to allow truthful co-operation in the fulfilment of its tasks. If fruitful co-operation is sought, then all Governments participating in the work of the committee, especially the Governments of the United States and the Soviet Union, must work to this end. Any other stand must be understood as nugatory and leading to another stalemate in this very important question.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): I have the privilege of supporting the draft resolution proposed by the representative of Burma. It is not without significance that this draft resolution, which more or less asks people to look at a middle way, comes from the representative of Burma, whose background warrants this kind of approach.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

Before I trespass into this subject, I think that it is relevant for us in this Committee to be aware of the various modulations and changes that take place in this debate. It is not without significance that we heard two speeches this afternoon: the first from the representative from the Soviet Union, and the other from the representative from the United States. I feel sure that they and the Committee would agree that these two speeches were of a different character from what we usually hear from those benches. They were less adjectival and less thermal; there was less heat. We hope this means that there is less irritation, and perhaps a disposition to look at each other's points of view, which may lend some colour to what we have put before you.

The representative of the United States, in the last two or three years has played a very important part in the difficult negotiations in which parties with diametrically opposite points of view have been involved, and we have had some long distance acquaintance -- and I plead all modesty -- with the many hurdles which had to be crossed.

This Committee has, I believe, the right to look to these great Powers not only to make use of their great economic power, not only to make use of their great political influence or their strength in the assertion of their opinions, but to expect from the great Powers of the world some methods of agreement where agreement is not in sight. We cannot accept from them the view: "We cannot do that; this is our position." For my part, I have not had the opportunity to consult across the benches, but I feel sure that the view of my two co-sponsors will be that they would not be parties to pushing forward any draft resolution for a group or a committee or a conversation where one of the parties, definitely, in the last analysis and without reservation, says: "No." The essence of all this is at least a willingness to look at facts; so I do not know how to interpret the observations of Mr. Lodge. I can understand his feeling of depression, perhaps of pessimism. I can understand perhaps being weighted down by the difficulties of previous negotiations, but if it means that certain situations have been reached, and if the observations which he makes -- even without Soviet co-operation something can be achieved -- mean that there are other ways of solving the problem, then, of course, the interpretation of that attitude is: whatever the General Assembly decides, nothing is going to come out of it, and so the proposal is stillborn.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

My delegation and, I am sure, my co-sponsors, do not take the view that because a proposal has been made, because there are co-sponsors, because we have said certain things, therefore we must necessarily put things to the vote. The idea is before the Committee and I do hope that, before the end of the afternoon, both the United States and the Soviet Union will feel that, in view of the great issues involved, in view of the fact that there has been a large measure of agreement and that the subject which we are going to agree upon is so small, they will agree to drop, as I said this morning, the main part of the original ideas. Therefore, a further effort will be made in this direction.

I deliberately decline to enter into the merits of the names proposed or of the two versions of private negotiations that have gone on. It is not for me to say whether, in the different versions given of them, there does not lie some possibility of overcoming difficulties. It may be that something said may be regarded as an expression of an attitude, which it really is not.

There are two or three matters to which the representative of the United States referred on which I would like to make some observation so that there should be no misunderstandings. He said that this draft resolution had some superficial merits. Obviously, merits must be on the surface in this Committee because, otherwise, nobody will look at anything. It is only from the surface that we can go to the centre of them. Whether it has anything more than superficial merits will depend on the contribution which the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union propose to make to the kind of platform that is sought to be created in this matter.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

If, however, Mr. Lodge means, when he says that this draft resolution has superficial merit, that it is of an immature character, that it has been produced by minds not capable of dealing with the question, I would say this: There may be some truth in that proposition, but, then, that is the world: one has to put up with mediocre people like us. That is precisely why we ask you to contribute your non-superficial knowledge and to produce some solution.

There was, however, another observation which was far more distressing and which I am sure was not meant in the way it was said. The representative of Burma, whose initiative is responsible for the birth of this draft resolution -- which we warmly support and with which we are identified -- has not at any time suggested that the Soviet Union and the United States should come here and tell the Committee: "Take this or leave it". We have been told that this is not that kind of Committee. I shall not dwell on this, but I should like to ask: What kind of Committee is it? It is the kind of Committee that will not reject a proposal which has behind it the agreement of the United States and the Soviet Union. I think that there is sufficient commonsense here to realize that, irrespective of whether one country may want to get on or get out, if these two great Powers were to come to an agreement in private and to say to us here, "We are agreed on this matter", there would be no possibility of rejection by the First Committee. Thus, if Mr. Lodge is going to throw at us the statement that this is not that kind of Committee, we shall return the compliment and say that we know what kind of Committee it is.

There can be no question, therefore, that this draft resolution tries to ask the First Committee to abdicate its functions. What does the draft resolution say? It says that the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should talk to each other, should "consider this matter" and "report to this Committee of the General Assembly on an urgent basis on an agreed and practical approach to this problem". All that the draft resolution seeks is the agreement and approach of the United States and the Soviet Union. Therefore, let this Committee not be under the impression that in the appeal which the co-authors of the draft resolution are making they are in any way disregarding either the status or the dignity of this Committee, or the attitude which the Committee will adopt to any agreed solutions.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

Surely, that is the way we work here all the time. If that were not so, there would be no room for negotiations. All we would have to do would be to raise a problem, let everyone talk, and then have everyone put up his hand afterwards. But that is not the situation now.

We do not have a categorical statement as yet from the Soviet Union as to whether or not it will participate in such a discussion or consideration. But from the United States representative we have -- I would not say a categorical refusal -- but very much doubt expressed about agreeing to this, in view of past experience. If we are to adopt that kind of attitude, then we must give up the ghost altogether and say that international co-operation is impossible because we have had so many failures in the past.

I hope that before the end of this debate we shall have some indication from the two countries involved in this matter that they are willing at least to make another attempt and report again to this Committee. Then we shall know why co-operation is not forthcoming.

For the very reason that we anticipate that these two countries will indicate that they are willing to make this attempt and that the Committee will adopt the present draft resolution, I deliberately refrain from going into the merits of the question. I think one of the impediments to settlement is the addition of parties to words without a similar addition to the content of those words. I think we must try to get over this difficulty of such words as "parity", and so forth, and find out whether there is a group of countries that will be agreeable to both sides.

Among other matters which he raised which were not so relevant, the representative of the Union of South Africa made one relevant observation, which I welcomed. He said that it was not only desirable but in fact essential to get the co-operation of both sides. Well, if that is essential, we must make an effort to achieve it. That does not mean that any country which seems to have superiority, economically, scientifically, politically, or any other way, can dictate to the United Nations the terms on which it will co-operate.

The observation has also been made that all will not be lost if this present solution is not adopted, that scientific co-operation will come about in another way. Of course, efforts in this direction are already under way: there is the International Geophysical Year; there is the statement by the President

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

of the United States inviting the co-operation of countries in this particular matter; all that machinery and all those ideas are in existence. In this debate, however, the General Assembly was trying to take a step further. It is therefore no argument to say, "This can be done some other way". If that were so, there would have been no need for us to consider this question as an item on the agenda of this Assembly session.

I regret that the representative of the Union of South Africa has sought in a rather tendentious way to inform the Committee about the composition of the proposed committee. We are referred to here as one of the neutrals. We have never accepted this label ourselves, for neutrality is a conception that comes into existence only when there is belligerency -- and we do not recognize either the United States or the Soviet Union as a belligerent in relation to us. Therefore, there can be no neutrality. To use phrases like "the Communist countries, with the support of this, that or the other" is to question the whole position of neutrality. But coming, as this does, from the Union of South Africa, we do not feel particularly distressed, because they live in a world of their own, isolated from the realities.

I commend this draft resolution to the First Committee. I feel sure that the co-sponsors, like us, would not want to push the draft resolution to the vote if either the United States or the Soviet Union said, "This is a harmful resolution; this is likely to impede progress rather than help it".

We think that, even if its name is mentioned, every sovereign country has the right to participate or not participate. If only two countries are involved and one will not participate, there will obviously be no meeting; there will be a monologue.

The United States representative has said that other developments are possible. There may be bilateral agreements and other methods of co-operation in this field. But that does not mean that we should not try to avoid the position that, after all these days and weeks of discussion of this important subject, after we have jettisoned the substance -- that is, the elimination of the use of outer space as a medium of war -- we cannot achieve any agreement on the matter.

(Mr. Krishna Menon, India)

All that this draft resolution asks for is conversations between these two countries so that an agreement may be reached. Of course, the corollary is that if an agreement is not reached the countries will report to this Committee, on an urgent basis, as we say in the draft resolution. There is therefore no question of seeking postponement, of raising an item that must go to a plenary meeting. This is purely a procedural motion. If it is not irrelevant to do so at the present time, I submit that, if the parties concerned do not raise any objection, this procedural motion should have priority in the vote.

It is our earnest hope that, in spite of all that has happened, it will still be possible to reach agreement on a group that will work together. As regards my own country, I have at present no instructions -- as I said this morning -- either to serve on the committee or not to serve on it. But I believe that I can anticipate my Government's sanction when I say that, if it would help the matter to move forward, we are prepared to state publicly, here and now, that we should not have the slightest objection or be in the least irked if India's name were taken off the list. I am sure that that will be the position of any self-respecting country, any country wishing to promote the purposes of peace. I am sure that such a country would say, "Let there not be a fight over our body". The fact that the Soviet Union has put up some names and the twenty Powers have put up some other names should not come in the way. These sponsors of the draft resolutions should not have to say to themselves: "We have put up these names publicly; how can we now tell these people that we are taking them out?".

The proposed committee can function only with the co-operation of the United States and the Soviet Union. Two years ago, we pleaded with the United States not to use its considerable influence to push forward a disarmament resolution which, in the event, was adopted by a large majority -- largely as a result of the pressure, both public and private, of the representative of France. Now, what happened? The resolution remained a dead letter. Let us not repeat that experience. Let us not tighten deadlocks. Let us not make negotiations difficult. We are told, "Let us adopt this resolution and show the power of the Assembly; we can negotiate afterwards". That is the philosophy of negotiation from strength.

Now something has been said about the philosophy behind the resolution. I suppose that was the main title of the talk of the Delegate of the Union of South Africa -- the philosophical aspects of it. He referred to tradition, or something of the kind, but there is no particular philosophy in this draft resolution, except to find a procedural method of continuing negotiations and not terminating them. I think that the Soviet Union has made a serious statement, claiming that the United States broke off negotiations, and the representative of the United States is equally serious in saying that the Soviet Union broke them off. If that is so, then this can be put to the test; that is to say, one party is still continuing to say "We did not stop talking; the other did." Let us try that, because this is the draft resolution that we put out. Even though it is only superficial, let us put it out, in the hope and in all sincerity, in the desire and in the faith that something will come of it. And, therefore, I appeal to both of those delegations sitting opposite us to try and help the Committee at least to go forward in this way.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I intend to call on two other speakers who have asked for the floor, and then I shall outline the procedure that we are going to follow regarding the draft resolutions before us.

Mr. ARAUJO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): The Colombian delegation did not take part in the general debate on the question of the peaceful uses of outer space, but we have listened with great care and attention to the brilliant statements made by other members of the Committee on this subject. Of the draft resolutions -- upon which the Committee is going to be called upon to decide as to my vote -- we understand, without any doubt, that there is basically no difference as far as the substance of the draft resolutions is concerned. This, furthermore, has been accepted and recognized by the spokesmen for the group of sponsors and the single sponsor of the other draft resolution. It is true that, except for the paragraph containing the names of the countries proposing the ad hoc committee, I think, the members of the committee are placed in a very invidious position, but as far as the other paragraphs are concerned, it is easy to vote since, in their essence, in their forms, and we might almost say in their drafting, they are almost identical.

(Mr. Araujo, Colombia)

In view of the circumstances, the representative of India announced this morning that a procedural draft resolution would be submitted, and a few hours later this draft resolution was submitted to the Committee, jointly sponsored by India, Burma and the United Arab Republic. The Colombian delegation is happy to note that this draft resolution is, basically speaking, nothing but a pleasant echo and a constructive and very warm reflection of a suggestion that was made by the representative of Mexico in the course of the disarmament debate, that this Committee set up a Sub-Committee of four Powers which, under the chairmanship of the representative of El Salvador and with the assistance of the Secretary-General, should try to find an adequate solution to the procedures that might be followed in the United Nations on the question of disarmament. This joint draft resolution is an application to this question of that idea. The majority of the delegations of the Committee, quite justifiably supported that Mexican idea.

Today, in a reduced number, no longer for four but merely for the two Powers who are the leaders in the questions about outer space, this is the same idea, with the suppression of what would be efficient help of the Chairman of the Committee and the Secretary-General. This, I say, is the same idea as that earlier expression. I do not see how those of us who were then ready to support the Mexican suggestion can find any obstacle in our way to supporting this same draft resolution today, because, as I said earlier, it is a pleasant echo and a constructive application of the earlier Mexican suggestion.

From the speeches that we have heard this afternoon, especially from the statements made by the representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union, we have gathered the impression, which, in due course, was stressed by the representative of India, that a zone of common ground can be found, which will make more constructive, which will make more efficient, which will make more possible the correct ending of our debate. For these reasons, the delegation of Colombia wishes to support the request of these three co-sponsors of the procedural draft resolution. And we also wish to appeal to you, Sir, to give priority in the vote to this procedural draft resolution, which, if voted on after the other draft resolutions, would lack, all meaning.

Mr. KENAWI (United Arab Republic): As the co-sponsor of the draft resolution A/C.1/L.224/Rev.1, tabled this afternoon, my delegation would like to join the representatives of Burma and India in recommending this draft resolution to the Committee. All we want to do is to keep the door open for further negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States. Everybody here realizes the importance of having the agreement of both of them. My delegation believes that what matters is that resolutions adopted by the General Assembly should be carried out. As a matter of fact, it is not in furtherance of the prestige or interests of the United Nations to have resolutions adopted in circumstances which would not conduce to their implementation. We, therefore, together with the representatives of India and Burma, appeal to all concerned to accept the further invitation for negotiations.

May I take this opportunity to thank the representative of Colombia for the support he has given to this three-Power draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I should now like to outline the parliamentary situation obtaining at the moment. Besides the two draft resolutions on the substance of the question, contained in documents A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1 and A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1, the Committee also has before it a procedural draft resolution (A/C.1/L.224) submitted by the delegations of Burma, India and the United Arab Republic. Since this last draft resolution is a purely procedural one and is merely an effort to see whether an agreement can be arrived at between the two countries mentioned, which may lead to a solution of the question dealt with in the two main draft resolutions, we believe that the debate on the draft resolutions will have to be kept open and, following the suggestion of the representative of Colombia, that we should hold a vote first on the procedural three-Power draft resolution.

That vote will have to be taken first, because if this draft resolution is adopted, then we would have to hold in abeyance the consideration of and vote on the other two draft resolutions. Were the procedural draft resolutions to fail of adoption, then we would wind up the debate on the substantive draft resolutions and go on to vote on them.

I should like to know whether there are any objections to this procedure.

Mr. PAZHWAK (Afghanistan): My delegation has not taken part in the general debate we have not spoken on the draft resolutions in the hope that the situation would develop in a way which would enable us to reach a unanimous vote on one draft resolution. I should just like to make one observation about the procedural draft resolution upon which the Committee is going to vote at this stage, and I will speak about the other draft resolutions at a later stage.

As we understand it, and knowing the background of the sponsors of the draft resolution presented by Burma, India and the United Arab Republic, we believe that it has emanated from the good intentions which have always been demonstrated by these delegations. The purpose of this draft resolution, as we understand it, is to continue the negotiations. This was the spirit in which it was presented to the Committee by the authors of the draft resolution. Therefore, the idea is completely acceptable to our delegation.

(Mr. Pazhwak, Afghanistan)

But we would like to make one suggestion to the sponsors of the draft resolution, because we are confronted with a matter of principle when we vote upon this draft resolution. The suggestion is whether it would be possible for them to address this draft resolution not only to two countries, but to the sponsors of the draft resolutions and to those who participated jointly in the negotiations, because we consider that this is a continuance of the same negotiations toward reaching an agreement. If the sponsors of the draft resolution were to find this suggestion acceptable, we would be able wholeheartedly to support the draft resolution.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): We have heard your proposals, Mr. Chairman, as to the order of voting and on our part there are no objections to the procedure you have outlined; in other words, to vote first on the procedural three-Power draft resolution submitted by Burma, India and the United Arab Republic, and, depending on the results of the vote on that draft resolution, decide then on the vote as to the other two draft resolutions. If the three-Power draft resolution is adopted, it is obvious that some time will be required for the effort at finding agreed solutions, and it therefore would obviously be pointless to vote on the two main draft resolutions.

Since I have this opportunity, and in order to avoid any loss of time thereafter, I should like to state our position on the three-Power draft resolution. As I said earlier today, the Soviet delegation feels that it is necessary to find an agreed solution. For its part, the Soviet delegation made every effort at finding such a solution. As I already explained in my speech this afternoon, we hoped that it would be possible to find such an agreed solution. If this has not proved possible, it is not our fault.

However, I do not wish to complicate the question by introducing recriminations, even though the Soviet delegation would have a number of comments to offer, especially in connexion with Mr. Lodge's last statement. I do not think that the interests of the matter would be served by resumption of exchanges on this question and I think that the most correct decision would be to make renewed efforts at finding an agreed solution.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

I am inclined in that direction by one observation in Mr. Lodge's speech when he said inter alia that the draft resolution of the twenty Powers is not the last word. On that basis, I take it that there are certain possibilities for achieving solutions that would be agreeable to both parties. My delegation will therefore vote in favour of the draft resolution submitted by Burma, India and the United Arab Republic.

The Soviet Union will take part in the joint consideration of this question, in negotiations with the United States, in the event that this three-Power draft resolution is adopted by the Committee. I would like, in passing, to add some words with regard to the observation of the representative of Afghanistan. I think that it would not be advisable to complicate the situation by proposing to the Soviet Union that it engage in negotiations with twenty countries. It seems to me that this would merely complicate the question and it would yield no helpful results, all the more so as in practice this is fairly impossible. It would really render the whole procedure of negotiations exceedingly clumsy.

I think that the proposal before us is an appropriate one from the point of view of the desirable character of the negotiations which the Committee surely wants to see expedited and encouraged. I would therefore suggest to the representative of Afghanistan, if I may, that he should not press his proposal, and I take it that the sponsors of the draft resolution will agree with this view.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Let me just state the position of the United States on this three-Power draft resolution. We intend to vote against it because we are convinced, from all the many conversations that we have had with the Soviet delegation, that they still insist on having four members of the Soviet group on the ad hoc committee and that they want the ad hoc committee to be even smaller it is. We are convinced that they object to Australia being on it, to Belgium being on it, and to any Latin American country with which they do not have diplomatic relations being on it. We have that impression from conversations which are as recent as today.

Obviously, in these circumstances, you tend to make matters worse if you compel people to talk when the positions are as rigid as that.

I said that the twenty-Power draft resolution was not the last word. Of course it is not the last word. But the best thing to do to advance this whole subject is to pass the twenty-Power draft resolution. It opens a new door -- it opens a door to action, to study, to fruitful endeavour and it is a much more promising avenue for us to follow than to spend any more of the valuable time of the First Committee in a sterile discussion as to what nations should or should not be members of the ad hoc committee. Believe me, Mr. Chairman, we have been over that very thoroughly as recently as a few hours ago, and there is not any give at all in the Soviet position on the matters that I have just stated.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I regret that I have been constrained to speak again, but I simply have to do so in connexion with the last statement by Mr. Lodge.

I must express astonishment at Mr. Lodge's reiterated account of some sort of negotiations which are said by him to have taken place today. I must say right away here in this Committee that I did not engage in any negotiations with Mr. Lodge today. This is mere evidence of the fact that Mr. Lodge abuses private conversations that may have taken place at a luncheon or reception and relates them as being some sort of official negotiations, which are precisely what the United States has been unwilling to engage in. I am surprised at this misinforming of the Committee about the negotiations.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

In my statement today, I made it perfectly clear that we have had certain misgivings as to whether we were engaged in negotiations with a sound and reliable partner, and I think Mr. Lodge has gone out of his way to confirm the unsoundness and unreliability of his position. In these circumstances, any further negotiations as to substance are made difficult.

However, I should like to emphasize that as far as the Soviet delegation is concerned, there has been and there continues to be a desire to engage in conversations and negotiations on a footing of equality with the United States despite its incorrect position and its inaccurate informing of the Committee as to the course of negotiations so far.

Mr. Lodge said today that the draft resolution now proposed opens the door to the solution of this question. This is an attempt to impose on the Soviet Union and other countries a decision which the United States wants. Mr. Lodge knows full well that the Soviet Union has never accepted any such imposition and never will do so. Any decision of this kind will only complicate matters and drive them into a deadlock. The result will simply be that for one year nothing will be done towards a solution of this question. If that is what the United States wants, let it vote on its draft resolution.

Mr. Lodge tried to represent our position as being rigid. Surely the whole Committee is aware of our position. We made concessions in the course of the negotiations which took place and the negotiations on the substance took exactly one hour. In one hour you want to reach agreement on a question on which you propose to work for one year. This is just about preposterous for any serious conduct of negotiations. In the course of this hour we made a concession as to the composition of the committee, and prior to that we made a serious concession on a political issue. And you speak of the rigidity and unaccommodating attitude of the Soviet Union. The whole world sees now what sort of position the United States takes.

The United States does not want to engage in negotiations of any kind. It simply wishes to impose its will on the other side. This will not do any good. The Soviet Union will not accept any sort of diktat, and it will not take part in this kind of a committee.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Mr. Zorin seems somewhat agitated at the fact that I assumed that when a member of the Soviet delegation says something in a conversation, it is the same thing as what he would say in a negotiation. It seems to me that is a reasonable thing to assume.

When a member of this Committee asks me a question in a hotel dining room or the delegates lounge or in the corridor or here, he always gets the same answer from me. I do not have one answer that I give in a conversation and another answer that I give in a negotiation. Our policy is the same to everybody at all times.

I think I was perfectly justified in assuming, after I asked this question about Soviet insistence on having four members on the ad hoc committee and having received the reply, yes, they still did insist on that, that they still insist on it. I must say I listened very carefully to everything Mr. Zorin said and there was not a single inkling or indication that he was willing to give up his claim to have the Soviet Union and three members of the Soviet bloc on the ad hoc committee. It would simply be very easy for him to say it, if he intended to say it.

No, it is we who have gone more than half way to meet the Soviet Union. They wanted to have four votes, and we offered three. That is not a bad arrangement from the Soviet point of view. They specifically mentioned Sweden, and Sweden is included; they specifically mentioned Argentina, and Argentina is included; they specifically mentioned Mexico, and Mexico is included.

I think we have shown good faith and a reasonable attitude. When I have been told just a few hours ago that they still insist on four members and want to reduce the size of the ad hoc committee, I think I am justified in believing that that is the Soviet position, particularly when Mr. Zorin does not say anything to deny it.

Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to express my warm appreciation to the representative of Colombia for his very kind reference to the efforts made by the delegation of Mexico to achieve an agreement of a procedural nature between the Powers directly concerned when we were discussing the question of disarmament. It is true that the reasons underlying the three-Power draft resolution are similar to those which impelled my delegation earlier. We would not be consistent with our original stand if we were not to vote in favour of a new effort at understanding which perhaps this time might lead to the result we are craving.

However, there is another point. If this procedural draft resolution were to be rejected, we should still have one more resource open to us. We could still continue those efforts before going to the General Assembly in plenary meeting. The essential and urgent part is not to destroy the possibility of continuing negotiations while there is a glimmer of hope left.

Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): I see no objection to the proposal that we should first vote on the draft resolution just introduced by Burma, India and the United Arab Republic, even though to my mind it is not solely of a procedural character, since it does raise certain questions of substance, into which, however, at this late hour I need not go.

What I feel we should be clear about is what we mean if we, as we would do under this draft resolution, request the United States and the Soviet Union to consider this matter, that is, "the urgent need to take positive and constructive steps in the field of the peaceful uses of outer space" and to report to this Committee "on an urgent basis on an agreed and practical approach to this problem".

Many days have been spent in negotiations on differences between the draft of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the original draft sponsored by twenty nations, on whose behalf and its own the United States conducted negotiations with the Soviet Union. Much was agreed. Many concessions agreed by the sponsors were introduced into a revised draft. The conceptions which should guide a sub-committee and the more precise tasks with which it would be charged, as they appear in the revised draft of the twenty Powers, reflect the measure of agreement reached after these negotiations. It was an excellent exercise in co-operation.

(Sir Pierson Dixon, United Kingdom)

Then before lunch there was a request by Mr. Zorin for a clarification as to the future organizational arrangements in this field within the framework of the United Nations, and it seemed to me that the clarification given a little earlier this afternoon by the representative of the United States should have helped to clear up this point.

Thus a great deal of progress was made in the negotiations between the Soviet Union and the United States on behalf of the sponsors. Only on the question of the composition of the committee was there no agreement. I do not need to repeat what I said earlier on this subject except that I am convinced that the great majority of the world will agree that the Soviet demands were unreasonable and that the expansion that we in the twenty-Power draft have made represents a reasonable and fair composition for the committee. It would seem that the difference on this point is fundamental.

If the Soviet Union maintains its claim for parity and the right to pick and choose representatives from other parts of the world, how can there be a meeting of minds? For we believe in something completely different, in completely different principles -- the principles of fairness and equity. Those are the principles which led the sponsors to offer a committee constituted as described in the revised draft resolution.

I therefore am bound to admit to some serious doubts as to the usefulness of further discussion on the composition of the ad hoc committee. However much we respect the motives which have led the delegations of Burma, India and the United Arab Republic to make this proposal, I think we are bound in all conscience to question whether it can lead to practical results. I wish I could take another view, but, in view of everything that has happened and everything that has been said, that seems to me to be the only realistic attitude to adopt.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We are not now declaring closed the debate on the draft resolutions. As I said earlier, it would not be appropriate to declare that debate closed, because later perhaps we may have to hear some speakers, depending upon the result of the vote on the draft resolution submitted by Burma, India and the United Arab Republic.

However, without closing the debate, and having heard no objections to the procedure suggested by the Chair, I intended to put to the vote the three-Power draft resolution.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): Sir, I have no objection to the procedures you have proposed but I should like to remind you and the Committee that, on behalf of our co-sponsors and ourselves, we have said that this draft resolution calls for co-consideration by two countries. It is not for us to ask, and we have not asked, how any country would vote for our draft resolution, and it is open to them to do so in open meeting. However, just as I said this morning that there was no purpose in adopting a resolution which would not be operative, there is no point in setting up a committee which would not function. If we passed a resolution by a majority, as probably we would -- and I am grateful to the many delegations that have expressed their favourable view of the attempt we made, and I am equally grateful to the United Kingdom and to the United States for endorsement of the motives behind it, even if they do not agree with the substance of it -- we feel that there is no point in our requesting the Committee to adopt a draft resolution asking the United States and the Soviet Union to consider this matter together when we have been categorically told that this would lead to trouble, that it would make more difficulties, that no progress can be made, that the door is shut in this matter. Therefore, in accordance with the general approach to these problems that we have followed in this Assembly, and with the supreme desire of not making the situation worse, so far as our co-sponsors and ourselves are concerned we shall not ask for priority for this draft resolution.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In view of what the representative of India has just said, I believe that we should consider the possibility of closing the debate on the draft resolutions so that we may proceed to vote on the two substantive draft resolutions in accordance with the rules of procedure. However, before that, I shall give the floor to any delegation that wishes to speak in the debate on the draft resolutions.

Mr. de MARCHENA (Dominican Republic) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to have some clarification, in view of the two proposals submitted to the Chair. The representative of Colombia made one proposal requesting priority for the procedural three-Power draft resolution. The representative of India said that he was withdrawing the priority for the draft resolution, but it is not for him to withdraw that priority.

(Mr. de Marchena, Dominican Republic)

What the delegate of India could do is to withdraw his draft resolution or his proposal, and then the delegate of Colombia would withdraw his, because we felt that the request for priority by Colombia had been tabled.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Let me explain something to the representative of the Dominican Republic. I had proposed, as procedure, that we begin the vote by voting on the three-Power draft resolution. I had not heard any objection to that. However, the representative of India, one of the co-sponsors of the draft resolution, said that the co-sponsors are not interested in this draft resolution being voted on first. This does not mean that if a delegation, and in this case that of Colombia, asked for priority, that we cannot consider such priority. In this case I think the representative of the Dominican Republic is right; but I recognize the representative of India.

Mr. Krishna MENON (India): It was an omission on my part. I was trying to intervene before the representative of the Dominican Republic spoke. We are aware of the rules of procedure that once a resolution is introduced or once the Chairman has spoken about priority or procedure, it is a matter for the Committee. But all I said was that my delegation and our co-sponsors are not willing to support a position where the Committee is asked to make a decision which would be innocuous or harmful. The draft resolution is still before the Committee; and even though we are the sponsors of it, we shall not vote for it, either for priority or, if it came up, for the reason that we do not want to press proposals which will add to difficulties or do not provide solutions. We cannot support resolutions asking two people to confer, when one of them, or two of them, say they do not want to do so; because we have no compulsory powers, and even if we had we would not be a party to advising them. Therefore, with great respect to the representative of the Dominican Republic, I agree with what he has said. It is the property of the Committee; we have no right to withdraw it. We have no right to refuse priority or to take it. All we stated was our position. So, if you put the draft resolution for priority, my delegation will abstain.

Mr. ARAUJO (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): With all due respect I still press the point of view that I expressed earlier in my speech, and that is, that this procedural draft resolution should be voted upon first, because there would be no reason to put it to the vote after the other draft resolutions have been voted upon by the Committee, since the others refer to the substance of the question. Therefore, may I beg you, Mr. Chairman, to bear in mind the motion that I put before you, and stick to the order of voting that you yourself put before the Committee and suggested to the Committee on the procedure to follow.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): Before calling on the next speaker I wish to say that I felt that the suggestion made by the representative of Colombia was so appropriate and so prudent and so right that I did not really feel that I needed to put to the vote the question of priority, but merely asked the Committee if there was any objection to such priority. So far there has been no objection; for what the representative of India has said is not an objection to priority, but he expressed his own point of view on the part of the sponsors of the draft resolution. Therefore, in accordance with the representative of Colombia has said, I will stick to the procedure I outlined to the Committee.

Mr. THORS (Iceland): We have not participated in this debate, but allow me, as a representative of a small country, to say a few words in all sincerity and calm necessary before we proceed to the vote.

My delegation is very much in favour of the question of the peaceful uses of outer space being investigated and examined and prepared by the United Nations. We know that this United Nations investigation cannot take place without the co-operation in the Committee by the United States and by the USSR. Those are the two countries most advanced in this field, and they have, if they want to, to place their knowledge before the United Nations.

If we set up a committee which bars the co-operation of those two leading Powers, it is crystal clear that the matter is out of the hands of the United Nations. We can have this matter considered by the opposed groups in the world; there can be a NATO consideration of the matter; there can be a Warsaw Pact

(Mr. Thors, Iceland)

consideration of the matter, or a SEATO consideration, or whatever you want. But if we want a United Nations consideration, it has to be with the assistance and co-operation of the United States and the USSR. That is a clear fact.

Now, we are only discussing here the composition of a preparatory committee. The crux of the matter will be done by the permanent body which we may or may not establish at the next session. How can the composition of this ad hoc preparatory commission be of such great importance that it closes the door of co-operation between those Powers who themselves have the power to lead mankind forward in this field. I venture to suggest to both sides that we take a little more time to ponder over this matter. There is always hope so long as there is life.

We are, therefore, in favour of the three-Power proposal that we do not decide here and now, but leave the door open just for a couple of days more. We have had ample experience in the United Nations in the uselessness of forcing decisions where one of the leading parties will not co-operate. We saw what came out of the Disarmament Commission that we set up two years ago: nothing. Are we now to establish one such committee from which we cannot expect anything inside the United Nations? That does not mean that consideration of this matter, investigation and further steps will be taken by the leading Powers and other nations, but inside the United Nations we must have agreement for co-operation between those two leading Powers.

Therefore, I suggest that we support the proposal by Colombia to give priority to this. I urge on you to go slowly in this matter and to take a few more days to ponder so vital a question for the future of mankind.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I think that the time is now ripe for a vote. Besides what has already been said, I should like to add the following. According to rule 132 of the rules of procedure:

"If two or more proposals relate to the same question, a committee shall, unless it decides otherwise, vote on the proposals in the order in which they have been submitted."

Generally speaking we might think that the Burma, India and United Arab Republic draft resolution (A/C.1/L.224) should be the last to be voted upon, unless the Committee decides otherwise regarding priority. But we must always bear in

AP/en

A/C.1/PV.995
74-75

(The Chairman)

mind the fact that there are two proposals on the subject itself -- substantive proposals -- and there is one proposal that is not a substantive one but has primarily a procedural character, and as such should be voted upon first.

As the representative of Colombia quite justifiably stated, there would be no reason, if one of the other two were to be approved by the Committee, for us to go on and vote on the procedural draft resolution since something would have already been done that would be against the reason and the content of the procedural draft resolution. Therefore, since there has been no objection to granting priority to the procedural draft resolution, I shall put it to the vote first. I refer to document A/C.1/L.224/Rev.1, the joint resolution of Burma, India and the United Arab Republic.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Ghana, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman was called upon to vote first.

In favour:

Ghana, Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republic, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Czechoslovakia

Against:

Guatemala, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic, France

Abstentions:

Greece, Honduras, India, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Morocco, Nepal, Norway, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Sweden, Tunisia, United Arab Republic, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Federation of Malaya, Finland,

The draft resolution was rejected by 25 votes to 14, with 42 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Chair feels that the time has now come to close the debate on the draft resolutions and go on and vote on the draft resolutions before the Committee. They are the following: The revised draft resolution of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1; and the twenty-Power draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1.

According to rule 132 we have to vote first on the draft resolution first submitted to the Committee, the Soviet draft resolution, and then on the twenty-Power draft resolution.

The representative of the United States of America has asked for the floor.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): It seems to me that the twenty-Power draft resolution is more comprehensive than the Soviet draft resolution; and since it has been our custom here to vote first on the more comprehensive one, therefore, in accordance with rule 132, I move that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1 be voted on first, ahead of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/L.219/Rev.1.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The representative of the United States, as you have heard has made a motion that priority in the vote be given the twenty-Power draft resolution, document A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1.

The representative of the Soviet Union has asked for the floor.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): Mr. Lodge's last statement is an attempt to push the draft resolution advocated by the United States into the foreground on the alleged ground that this draft resolution is the more comprehensive one and that it can therefore constitute a basis for a first vote. I can offer some consolation to Mr. Lodge. His efforts are really not necessary. The Soviet Union submitted its proposal as a basis for a unanimous decision, and if no unanimous decision is in the offing, the Soviet Union does not intend to put its proposal to a vote. We will leave it

to the United States to impose its draft resolution by a majority of this Committee. We work on the basis of the necessity of having co-operation in the solution of questions like this. We don't want to dictate to anyone the conditions for the adoption of any decisions. We proceeded from an eagerness to find common grounds for agreement, and if no such agreement has been forthcoming then it is abundantly clear that by now this is the fault of the United States, which has thwarted the adoption of a unanimous decision and has clearly displayed its unwillingness to engage in negotiation. It wants to foist its will on the General Assembly and on various delegations. Such a policy bodes no good and, as experience has shown, it will lead to a collapse of United States policies.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Last year, it will be remembered, the United States also tried to foist on the General Assembly a decision as to the composition of the Disarmament Commission. This has been mentioned here repeatedly, and the United States did in fact foist that decision on the Assembly. As a result, for a whole year the Commission did not operate, and at this year's session all delegations expressed regret at the fact that a whole year had been wasted. It was wasted owing to the policy of dictat of the United States.

Now a similar attempt is being made to foist on us a decision on another question. This is being done by means of wanton procedural quibbles and through motions for priority for its own draft resolution.

All right; with regard to this sort of strategem we leave a free field to the United States. In this we do not wish to engage in games with the United States. The Soviet Union will not press its draft resolution to a vote because it feels that a draft resolution on so important an issue should be adopted unanimously. We did everything in our power to obtain such a unanimous decision. The United States wants to secure a majority for its own draft resolution. But why? It has got its majority in its pocket. Go ahead and vote your majority; nothing will come out of it. There will be no progress; no headway will be made in this question.

Therefore, we wish to advise the Committee that we shall not press our own draft resolution to the vote, and as far as the United States draft resolution is concerned, we shall, of course, vote against it because it is based not on co-operation, but on dictation.

Mr. LODGE (United States): I need scarcely say that the United States is not foisting its will upon anybody. Mr. Zorin cannot understand a free relationship between equals. He sees the world in terms of master and servant and nothing that I can say, or that anybody can say here, can cause him to depart from that way of looking at life.. Everybody is free to vote any way they want to, as far as the United States is concerned.

Also, I rather think that if a Soviet draft resolution were to receive a good big vote, if it were to get a vote of 50 to 9, for example, the Soviet Union would think that that was all right; I do not believe that it would complain a bit. I do not think that it would be heard talking about foisting its will upon anybody. It just depends on whose ox is gored.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

Four times this afternoon I provided a very definite opportunity for the Soviet representative to show whether there was any give at all in his position concerning the composition of the ad hoc committee. I brought up various points -- I shall not tire the Committee with repeating them, because I did it four times, and, while there were all kinds of denunciations about how awful I was, never was there any sign of any give, any flexibility, in the Soviet position. We have gone more than half way to meet that position, so if this thing breaks down it is the fault of the Soviet Union and not that of the United States.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I wish to exercise the right of reply to the last observations of Mr. Lodge concerning "give" by the Soviet Union, and I should like to tell him: you begin negotiations and then we shall see who will give, and we shall ask you to give as well, which does not mean that we are unwilling or unable to give. But in order for the parties to give, there have to be negotiations instead of engaging in dictat.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In view of the statement by the representative of the Soviet Union that his delegation would not press its draft resolution to a vote, I believe that it is not necessary to proceed with the motion for priority of the representative of the United States and no need to discuss it. Therefore, if there is no objection, we shall proceed to vote on the twenty-Power draft resolution.

Mr. BOUZA (Uruguay) (interpretation from Spanish): I request a roll-call vote.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): A point of order. I request a separate vote on paragraph 1 which concerns the composition of the proposed committee, and then a vote on the remainder of the draft.

Mr. KHOURI (Lebanon): Would it be possible to put to a vote first the first paragraph of the preamble, beginning with "Recognizing the common interest of mankind, etc."?

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): If there is no objection, we shall follow the suggestion of the representative of Lebanon and take a separate vote on the first preambular paragraph.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): A point of order. I first made my proposal for a separate vote on paragraph 1 of the operative part. As far as the Soviet delegation is concerned, this is a matter of principle inasmuch as the result of the vote on this paragraph will determine the attitude towards the whole draft resolution. We feel that if there is not a membership for the committee, there is no point in talking about its tasks. Therefore, it is necessary to vote first on paragraph 1 of the operative part, as far as separate votes are concerned, after which the other parts of the draft resolution may be voted upon. This is the proposal which I made and, since I made it first, I would request that the vote should begin with that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): We shall apply the procedure requested by the representative of the Soviet Union. Therefore, a roll-call vote will be taken on paragraph 1.

A vote was taken by roll call.

Iceland, having been drawn by lot by the Chairman, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Iceland, Iran, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Laos, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Federation of Malaya, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras.

Against: Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary.

Abstaining: India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, United Arab Republic, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Austria, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, Ethiopia, Finland, Ghana.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 51 votes to 9, with 21 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In accordance with the request of the representative of Lebanon, the Committee will now take a separate vote on the first paragraph of the preamble, beginning with the words "Recognizing the common interest of mankind".

The first paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 67 votes to 9, with 2 abstentions.

The draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 54 votes to 9, with 18 abstentions.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): A number of representatives wish to explain their vote. I know that the hour is late, but, if there is no objection, I think it might be wise to finish our discussion of the present item at this time so that tomorrow morning we may begin our consideration of the next item on the agenda: the Cyprus question.

As there is no objection, I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes.

Mr. McDONAGH (Ireland): As the hour is late, I shall be very brief.

My delegation was among the sponsors of the twenty-Power draft resolution. We supported the draft resolution on the ground that it could represent an important step, not only towards peace in outer space, but towards what is still more important: peace on this planet. Like other delegations, we deeply regret that this draft resolution, in its present form, has not proved acceptable to the Soviet Union, a pioneer in the exploration of outer space. We still hope, however, that by the time this matter comes before the Assembly in plenary meeting it may be possible to secure an agreement which will open the way to the Soviet Union's participation in the work of the ad hoc committee on outer space. That participation is obviously eminently desirable, both for technical reasons and from the point of view of peace.

(Mr. McDonagh, Ireland)

We appreciate and we share the general ideas which led the delegates of Burma, India and the United Arab Republic, in the interest of peaceful co-operation in this matter, to table their draft resolution, requesting the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to consider this matter and report to the Committee. We were not convinced, after listening to the debate, that the passage of a formal resolution on this matter at the present stage would achieve the desired purpose. We hope that the consultations envisaged will, in fact, take place, whether formally or not, and that the principal parties will be able to lay an agreed proposal before the Plenary Session.

Mr. NOSEK (Czechoslovakia): The Czechoslovakian delegation voted against the draft resolution of twenty Powers for reasons which I had the pleasure to explain already this morning. There is no reason for me, therefore, to repeat the reasons for this attitude, but I should like to state that because of the one-sided composition of the ad hoc committee that should be established under the provision of the draft resolution of twenty Powers, that, to our opinion, cannot and will not bring the desires we are looking for, Czechoslovakia will not take part in the deliberations of this Committee.

Mr. ZCRIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Soviet delegation has explained its position on the substance of this question in some detail this afternoon, and there is no good reason for us to repeat what has already been said. What we do wish to clarify is this: Even though the draft resolution contains a number of paragraphs taken from the Soviet Union draft resolution, and even though a number of paragraphs gave rise to no objections on our part, nevertheless, taking into account that the whole draft resolution depended on imposing on the Assembly and on various delegations a membership list for the committee, which would yield no possible basis for fruitful co-operation, the Soviet Union delegation voted against the paragraph which called for this incorrect membership of the committee, and, consequently, against all other paragraphs of the draft resolution. The Soviet Union delegation had already stated at the beginning of this discussion that the attempt to impose any membership list and compulsory participation in any committee or in any list

was unacceptable to the Soviet Union. Consequently my delegation is directed to state that the Soviet Union will not take part in this ~~cc~~committee, whose membership will not secure any sort of fruitful co-operation within it.

Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): I shall limit myself to explaining the vote of my delegation regarding the procedural draft resolution of the three Powers (document A/C.1/L.224/Rev.1). In view of the categorical negation on the part of the parties concerned, and in view of the stand taken by the co-sponsors of that draft resolution, which I interpreted as meaning that they did not want to press their draft resolution to a vote, I modified the affirmative position that I had intended taking, and abstained. I am still, however, of opinion that one last great effort should be made to arrive at a compromise text before we carry this matter to the Plenary Session.

Mr. PAZHWAQ (Afghanistan): My delegation did not take any part in the general debate, and we hope that a draft resolution which will be voted upon unanimously will come to the Committee. We regret that the Committee did not succeed, with all the efforts it made, in achieving this purpose. In voting on this draft resolution, we voted for the first paragraph of the preamble, and in voting in favour of this paragraph, we were led to do so by our deep conviction that the fact of the common interest of mankind in outer space should be recognized, and also that it is the common aim of mankind that it should be used for peaceful purposes only. We abstained on paragraph 1 of the operative part, which remained a controversial matter between the parties concerned, in spite of all the efforts which were made in reaching a compromise agreement on the question of the composition of the ad hoc committee. When we voted on the draft resolution as a whole, we were compelled, by the maintenance of this controversial part in the whole draft resolution which was adopted, to vote against the continuation of the deadlock on the controversial matter of the composition of the ad hoc committee.

We still do hope that a compromise on this matter is not impossible. It is essential. We do not intend to lose hope at any stage that such a compromise, which would bring about a unanimous agreement on the part of the General Assembly on this significant question, will be reached before a final vote is taken by the General Assembly on this issue. When we say this, we also think that we would have preferred this draft resolution, even in the matter of voting, if a separate

(Mr. Pazhwak, Afghanistan)

vote had been taken on the words in paragraph 1 of the operative part, beginning with "consisting"; that is to say a separate vote on the words "consisting of the representatives of", then the names of the countries listed. That would have left us with the last part of the paragraph reading: "establishes an ad hoc committee on the peaceful uses of outer space, and requests it to report to the Fourteenth General Assembly on the following...". If this had been done, then we could have taken part of the draft resolution submitted by the three Powers, Burma, India and the United Arab Republic, and added to the draft resolution the part saying that "the General Assembly requests the parties concerned to consider the matter of the composition of the ad hoc committee on an urgent basis, on an agreed and practical approach to this problem."

This would have established the fact of the difference of views which existed to have been **in the** matter of the committee; as we have seen the only difference of views was on the names of the countries, not even on the composition of an ad hoc committee; and that would have been a compromise to give the co-sponsors or the parties directly concerned a chance to reach an agreement on the names of the countries which would form the members of the ad hoc committee.

In saying this, we had one purpose in mind: to point out that there is still time before a final vote is taken on this question in the General Assembly for some effort possibly to be made by the parties concerned to reach a solution on the name, and if this solution is not achieved, then, at least, this will be an expression of the views of the General Assembly that there is a necessity for such study to be made and such co-operation to exist, but that at the present time the co-sponsors and the parties directly concerned were not able to agree on the composition of the committee. This would leave room for the compromise we hope for continually.

Mr. VIDIC (Yugoslavia): According to what we know of the situation which prevailed when the Committee postponed its work on Friday last, it seemed that direct negotiations between the sponsors of the draft resolutions which were before us would produce a satisfactory solution. I note with regret the failure of the negotiations on the matter of presenting a joint solution of the problem, the more so as there were no particular difficulties concerning the text of the draft resolution, that is, on the substance of the matter. Moreover, an indispensable rapprochement of views, as we all know, has in this respect almost been brought about.

We are about to organize international co-operation in this new field and a necessary condition for the achievement of broad and effective co-operation is the goodwill and understanding of all countries. The absence of agreement over the composition of the Committee -- whose task anyway consists of preliminary studies, which is ad hoc by nature and which takes no definite decisions -- does not offer hopes of good prospect, and this is to be deeply regretted.

My delegation has already set forth its position with respect to the substance of the problem. We think that the draft resolutions that were before us corresponded in substance to what we needed and were in accord with the possibilities which are open to us in the field of the peaceful uses of outer space. With this in mind, we would have supported the draft resolution of the twenty Powers. We could have done the same as regards the draft resolution submitted by the Soviet Union. But my delegation -- and I must say this with deep regret -- feels that the question of the composition of the ad hoc committee has become a controversial cold-war issue.

In this situation my delegation did not consider it useful to support the position of either of the two sides. However, we would still like to hope that before the plenary meeting of the General Assembly, new attempts would be made to achieve a satisfactory solution to this question of utmost importance to all of us.

Mr. THORS (Iceland): As my delegation stated in its short intervention just before we proceeded to the vote, we would have greatly preferred having a few days elapse to make a last effort to reach an agreement on the composition of the ad hoc committee. But that having failed, we felt that we had no other alternative but to vote for the committee as it now stands in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the resolution.

We were happy to vote for the draft resolution as a whole, as it now stands, because we feel that it contains many noble ideas and essential factors which we wholeheartedly support. I want particularly to refer to the first paragraph of the preamble which states that the General Assembly recognizes:

"...the common interest of mankind in outer space and that it is the common aim that it should be used for peaceful purposes only,"

We feel that endeavours should yet be made to try to reach an agreement on the composition of the preparatory committee and that the time between the present meeting and the convening of the General Assembly should be used for that purpose. We think that it would be of great advantage if we were to leave this outer space of unknown disagreement and try to come down to the solid ground of international co-operation and investigation.

Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): I also wish to explain very briefly the vote of the Ukrainian delegation on the resolution moved by the United States and several other countries, and just adopted by the Committee. Our vote was in the negative because we could not agree to paragraph 1 of the resolution concerning the membership of the ad hoc committee on the study of outer space for peaceful purposes. Not that my delegation is opposed to a broadly representative character for this committee, not at all. But it is perfectly obvious to everyone here that the committee was deliberately set up with such a membership that from birth it was doomed to utter inability to rise into the boundless reaches of outer space.

(Mr. Palamarchuk, Ukrainian SSR)

The archives of the United Nations will be enriched with another committee and with more verbatim or other records. Will international co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space gain from that? I think it is perfectly obvious that it will not. It will lose because it is obvious that without the Soviet Union the co-operation merely of the United States with its co-sponsors cannot be regarded as international co-operation in the United Nations sense of the term.

The United States likes to co-operate with States that are members of its bloc and that follow its egotistic interest. We are inclined to believe that this is so. When I looked at this morning's record, I noted words spoken by Mr. Lodge which confirmed what I said. He said that if the Soviet Union did not take part in the proceedings of the committee, this should not constitute any reason for hesitation or a halting of its work.

Only one conclusion can be drawn from this. In other words, the United States and other sponsors of the resolution are in favour of international co-operation in words. They did not stir any words on that score. But in reality they set up the ad hoc committee for one purpose only: If not fully to bury, at least seriously to undermine co-operation within the framework of the United Nations. After the clear statement of the representative of the Soviet Union to the effect that co-operation in the ad hoc committee would be possible on the basis of the agreement of all those States which would take part in the work of preparing the report for the fourteenth session of the General Assembly, in view of all that, what are the prospects? What will this part of the resolution yield? What sort of fruit will it yield?

In this connexion, may I draw attention to the paragraph of the preamble which reads:

"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,"

(Mr. Palamarchuk, Ukrainian SSR)

About what does this paragraph speak? How are we to construe it? Here we read about international co-operation within the framework of the United Nations. We were prepared to vote for this paragraph. We were, in fact, prepared to vote for the whole draft resolution provided the ad hoc committee, as I said before, were set up on a footing of equality. Seeing that international co-operation is to take place within the framework of the United Nations, then obviously paragraph one is out of keeping with that paragraph. Operative paragraph 1 has other purposes. The representative of the Union of South Africa -- who unfortunately is absent at the moment -- perhaps unwittingly let the cat out of the bag when he said that if the Soviet Union perchance did not agree with the membership of the committee as proposed here, it could be pilloried before world public opinion. This statement, I think, gives grounds for vigilance.

Now what am I trying to say? The point is that one should not disregard world public opinion, and sometimes powerful propaganda can delude world public opinion. However, you cannot delude world public opinion forever. World public opinion is not static. It has learned a good deal and it is continuing to learn. Recently, owing to the policies and actions which are being imposed on the United Nations and which are out of harmony with the interests of international co-operation, world public opinion has become wiser.

The Soviet delegation gave some important clarifications here some time ago. The delegations of Burma, India and the United Arab Republic submitted a conciliatory proposal. In view of that, the subsequent actions of the United States were sinister indeed. The very idea of an agreed practical approach to the search for an acceptable membership of the ad hoc committee was rejected out of hand. Public opinion will surely properly appraise the responsibilities and to whom they should be assigned. Who is it that frustrated international co-operation in the peaceful use of outer space? Who is it that drove this international co-operation into a dark corner? The guilty party is the United States, which did its best to dig a deep hole, stick this important problem into that hole, pour a good deal of earth, rock and stone upon it, and then put a stone on top of it in the form of document A/C.1/L.220/Rev.1.

Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The Byelorussian SSR delegation has already had the opportunity of speaking in the general debate and outlining its views on the question under consideration. I shall therefore be brief.

Our delegation voted against the draft resolution co-sponsored by the United States and nineteen other delegations. Our negative vote was directed in particular against operative paragraph 1 dealing with the membership of the ad hoc committee. We did so because we are alive to the fact that the United States and its representative, Mr. Lodge, are committed in this Committee to a policy of diktat, and not to a policy of compromise or agreement, to a policy of imposing their will on other States, and especially on the Soviet Union.

Before I came to this meeting of the First Committee, I looked at some United States newspapers and I noted that they foretold the categorical objections of the United States to the Soviet proposal, and this proved to be true. However, the political atmosphere on the eve of the voting in the First Committee was such that it was obvious that everyone desired a unanimous decision. A compromise should have come about. Everyone was expecting a compromise, but there was none. I am reminded of a tunnel which has to be dug from two sides. The Soviet Union, for its part, kept digging and kept making progress on its side of the river in an effort to meet the other side so as to reach a common agreement with the United States. The Soviet Union made important political concessions. It dropped the political question of the liquidation of United States military bases on foreign territory. There was a desire for international co-operation in the study and exploration of outer space for peaceful purposes. This desire was very strong in the Committee. But the United States, speaking through Mr. Lodge, instead of digging to the other side of the tunnel and instead of trying to meet the Soviet Union, said, "You keep digging your hole and we shall sit on our haunches and not move one finger". It is the same policy -- "Let the other side make all the concessions; we are not going to make any concessions at all." The United States would not co-operate even in so important a scientific question as that of the peaceful study and use of outer space.

This utter unwillingness to meet the Soviet Union half way and to co-operate was perfectly clear. The United States did not want to co-operate. All the members of the Committee must realize deep in their hearts that the United States

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

simply did not want to co-operate. The United States deliberately wrecked agreement on this question. The United States did not want agreement and it has launched the "cold war" from the earth into outer space. Outer space, which is not yet harnessed to the needs of humanity, is already filled with the "cold war".

This is a very undesirable and sad state of affairs which bodes no good. This unwillingness to engage in international co-operation for peaceful purposes makes it clear that in the future the United States must do its share to meet the other side half way. The accusation against the Soviet Union of having wrecked the agreement on this question is sewn out of whole cloth. It is intended to delude world public opinion. However, the record is clear and the resolutions are clear. Every literate human being who can read a fairly simple text will realize that the Soviet Union was entirely correct. It tried to meet the United States position half way, but the policy of diktat of the United States was displayed in full bloom today. This policy will accomplish no good and it will not lead to agreement, even though agreement is what the Soviet Union dearly wants in this question.

Mr. ENCKELL (Finland) (interpretation from French): My delegation abstained from voting on the membership of the ad hoc committee proposed to us today. Faithful to our policy and to the position which we have always adopted here, we consider, like many other delegations, that it is necessary for agreement to be reached on this question. In the absence of such agreement, it is obvious that the committee cannot be expected to carry out its essential task.

My delegation wishes to voice the sincere hope that before this text comes before the General Assembly, the parties concerned will find some solution that will make it possible to set up a viable committee on this question which is of such importance for the whole of mankind. The United Nations cannot rest content with the failure which today's vote constitutes on this question.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): The Committee has now concluded its consideration of this question.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.