

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

TWENTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records



**FIRST COMMITTEE, 1870th
MEETING**

Friday, 20 October 1972,
at 10.30 a.m.

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

Agenda items 28, 29 and 37 (*continued*):

International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

Preparation of an international treaty concerning the Moon: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

Preparation of an international convention on principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting 1

Chairman: Mr. Radha Krishna RAMPHUL
(Mauritius).

AGENDA ITEMS 28, 29 AND 37 (*continued*)

International co-operation in the peaceful uses of outer space: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (A/8720, A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1, 608 and 610)

Preparation of an international treaty concerning the Moon: report of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (A/8720, A/C.1/L.608 and 610)

Preparation of an international convention on principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting (A/8771, A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1, 607/Rev.1, 609 and 612)

1. The CHAIRMAN: As I indicated yesterday, I hope that the Committee, in accordance with the time-table, will be able to conclude consideration of the three outer space items today. I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Committee to the draft resolution submitted by Saudi Arabia and contained in document A/C.1/L.612. I have been informed by the representative of Saudi Arabia that in view of the submission of that draft resolution, he has withdrawn the amendments [A/C.1/L.607/Rev.1] to draft resolution A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1.

2. I should also like to announce that Czechoslovakia, Romania and Poland have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.608 and that Cuba, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria have become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1.

3. Before I call on the first speaker inscribed on my list I shall call upon the Under-Secretary-General who wishes to make a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General.

4. Mr. KUTAKOV (Under-Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs): In a statement made at the

1864th meeting of the Committee, the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Colin Crowe, addressed a question to the Secretariat on the report of the Secretary-General concerning measures designed to enhance the effectiveness of the Outer Space Affairs Division. He asked when the report would be available, or whether the Secretariat could give some indication of the way the Secretary-General's thoughts are moving. I am pleased to make this statement on behalf of the Secretary-General in reply to that question.

5. The Secretary-General, in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, has taken the following steps to enhance the effectiveness of the Outer Space Affairs Division. He has agreed to the establishment of two sections in the Division, dealing, respectively, with the servicing of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space and its subsidiary organs, and with the implementation of the United Nations programme on space applications. In doing this the Secretary-General will provide additional Professional staff to the Division in order to meet the expanding responsibility of the Division and the increased activity of the Committee.

6. In addition, further steps are being taken through the Working Group on Outer Space of the Administrative Committee on Co-ordination and the Secretariat Panel on Space Applications to co-ordinate the related activities carried out by the specialized agencies concerned and by various Secretariat units in order to avoid unwarranted duplication and thus ensure that the Outer Space Affairs Division shall effectively serve the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space established by the General Assembly to be the "focal point" for international activities in this field.

7. I wish to assure the Committee that the Secretary-General, fully aware of the needs of the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, will do everything within his power to enhance the effectiveness of its secretariat in meeting the increasing responsibility of the United Nations in this field.

8. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): Since it was my delegation that raised this question in the statement of my head of mission, may I just, on behalf of my delegation and I think on behalf of the Committee, too, thank the Under-Secretary-General for his useful statement which I am sure we shall all study and find very useful.

9. The CHAIRMAN: I shall now call on those speakers who wish to make any further comments on the draft resolutions and amendments which are before the Committee.

10. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): It is a privilege for my delegation this morning to refer to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1, sponsored by Australia, Fiji, Iceland, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, the Khmer Republic, Liberia, Madagascar, Malaysia, Mauritius, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand and the United States of America.

11. To facilitate the consideration of the draft resolution I wish to proceed by pointing out the revisions that have been made in the initial draft contained in document A/C.1/L.606.

12. The first revision refers to the sixth preambular paragraph wherein the specific resolution adopted by the General Assembly is mentioned as being resolution 2816 (XXVI) of 14 December 1971, replacing the reference to the measures adopted by the General Assembly.

13. Another change in that preambular paragraph is the addition of the words "and stressing the importance of pre-disaster planning" at the end of the paragraph.

14. The sponsors feel that with these changes that preambular paragraph has been clarified and improved.

15. The second revision is the addition of the last preambular paragraph, which is the seventh preambular paragraph of the revised draft and which reads as follows:

"Noting the work being carried out by the Joint Typhoon Committee of the World Meteorological Organization and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East and the large degree of collaboration between the World Meteorological Organization and other national, regional and international organizations in matters relating to tropical cyclones."

16. The Joint Committee was established with the function of promoting and co-ordinating the planning and implementation of measures required for minimizing typhoon damage in the ECAFE region. That Committee, which in reality is an intergovernmental typhoon committee, has a secretariat now located in the central offices of the Philippine Weather Bureau in Manila.

17. The WMO Tropical Cyclone Project plan of action specifically mentions the large degree of collaboration between WMO and other regional and international organizations in matters relating to tropical cyclones. The sponsors feel that the addition of this preambular paragraph gives due recognition to the efforts being exerted by WMO at all levels in the field of tropical cyclones.

18. The third revision, which is of a purely editorial nature, consists in the insertion in operative paragraph 1 of the word "in" between "(XXV)" and "which", and the addition of the words "the Assembly" before the word "requested".

19. The last revision is in operative paragraph 6 and consists in mentioning also "the United Nations programme for the environment", and adding the elements of "preparedness for" and "detection" of natural disasters to those originally mentioned with respect to the field of United

Nations natural disaster assistance. Operative paragraph 6 now reads as follows:

"Recommends integrated action through increased co-operation and co-ordination between the World Meteorological Organization, the United Nations Development Programme, Office of the Disaster Relief Co-ordinator and the United Nations programme for the environment in the field of United Nations natural disaster assistance, particularly the preparedness for, and the prediction, detection, prevention and control of, natural disasters."

20. These revisions were made after due consultation among the sponsors.

21. Having undertaken all the revisions made in the initial draft resolution, I beg the indulgence of the Committee with respect to a further revision as a result of consultations with some delegations, a revision agreed to by all the sponsors, which I would now like to submit orally.

22. This refers to the sixth preambular paragraph. At beginning insert the word "various" between the words "the" and "recommendations", and delete the subsequent words "of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment". Thus that paragraph as revised in document A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1 and now amended orally would read as follows:

"Bearing in mind the various recommendations in the field of natural disaster prevention and the measures adopted in General Assembly resolution 2816 (XXVI) of 14 December 1971 with a view to improving the co-ordination and effectiveness of international efforts to deal with natural disasters, and stressing the importance of pre-disaster planning."

23. The sponsors believe that the new amendment to this preambular paragraph does not detract from the substance of the draft resolution inasmuch as the recommendations of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment would still be deliberated upon by another Committee of the General Assembly.

24. Furthermore, it should be borne in mind that there is a specific mention in operative paragraph 6 of the United Nations programme for the environment.

25. Having indicated all the changes made, I commend the present 17-Power draft resolution to the Committee for unanimous adoption.

26. Before I conclude may I be allowed to say, on behalf of my delegation, that the modest projects being carried out by the Philippines on the lines suggested in the WMO plan of action are in varying degrees being undertaken also by our neighbouring countries in South-East Asia. Indeed, the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) today has under consideration a plan of somewhat broader scope intended to encompass other forms of natural disasters of which the region is often the victim. The ASEAN plan is being forged in the spirit of mutual assistance and on humanitarian grounds, but its true basis is the recognition that natural disasters are an important factor in retarding economic and social progress in the region.

27. Significantly, however, the ASEAN proposal fits in very closely with the present draft resolution, which requests Member States to undertake or intensify research and operational projects leading to the mitigation of the harmful effects of natural disasters, in conformity with resolution 2733 D (XXV).

28. Similarly, the ASEAN proposal recognizes that the benefits of advanced scientific knowledge in the field of meteorology, specifically in the prevention and control of natural disasters, can be made universally available only through international collaboration.

29. It only remains for me now to put on record the deep gratitude of my delegation and my Government to those delegations who have expressed in the most felicitous manner their support for draft resolution A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1. I also take great pleasure in extending my delegation's gratitude to other delegations for their very warm and gracious words about the Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Philippines, General Carlos P. Romulo, who introduced the draft resolution on 16 October [1863rd meeting]. Their generosity is appreciated by General Romulo and by my delegation more than words can say.

30. Mr. JANKOWITSCH (Austria): First we propose a small amendment to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.608 concerning agenda items 28 and 29. Operative paragraph 24 of that draft resolution should be amended in the following way. Where various specialized agencies are mentioned, including the World Meteorological Organization, International Telecommunication Union and UNESCO, I would like to propose that the Food and Agriculture Organization also be mentioned.

31. I also want to make a statement concerning an amendment proposed yesterday by Austria and Sweden [A/C.1/L.609] to the revised draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1. As the representative of Sweden, who introduced this amendment at the last meeting, pointed out, and as I would like to make clear, the idea of our delegations in proposing that amendment was to reach a consensus on the question which seems to have created a certain amount of division in this Committee. It was exclusively in this spirit and after consultations with a great many delegations which led us to believe that this might be a worth-while effort, that yesterday we proposed that amendment to the revised draft resolution. In the light of further consultations this morning it does not appear to form the basis for a consensus; a basis which would—and this was our primary concern in this matter—spare this Committee a divisive vote on a question which we thought we were ready to tackle with united forces and not from different points of view. It is a matter of great regret to our delegations that this effort to achieve a consensus by proposing an amendment has apparently not been successful and we do not wish to provide further material for a continuation of controversy and divide the Committee further on this. Therefore, with the agreement of the delegation of Sweden, I regretfully withdraw this amendment.

32. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Belgium on a point of order.

33. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): After listening with great interest to the statement

made by the representative of Austria, who announced the withdrawal of the amendments which he submitted yesterday together with the Swedish representative, I should like to announce that Australia, Belgium, Italy, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom have decided to take over the amendments which appear in document A/C.1/L.609. We obviously regret very much that the representatives of Austria and Sweden have withdrawn these amendments, which we think are extremely useful and furthermore reflect the concerns of the First Committee as a whole. That is why we have decided to sponsor the amendments ourselves.

34. The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Canada on a point of order.

35. Mr. WANG (Canada): I should just like to say that Canada should be considered as among the sponsors of the amendments which the representative of Belgium has just introduced.

36. Mr. SIDDIQ (Afghanistan): As this is the first time my delegation has spoken in the First Committee I should like at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your unanimous election as the Chairman of this Committee of the General Assembly. I also take this opportunity to extend the congratulations of my delegation to the other officers of the Committee, the Vice-Chairmen and the Rapporteur.

37. The delegation of Afghanistan has asked to speak in order to state its views on the draft resolutions before the First Committee. With respect to the items so far under consideration, the delegation of Afghanistan fully supports the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Austria and several other delegations and contained in document A/C.1/L.608, as revised this morning by the representative of Austria.

38. Once again, this year we have seen that significant progress has been achieved in the field of the law of outer space by the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. With respect to legal matters, considerable progress has been achieved by the Legal Sub-Committee in connexion with the draft treaty concerning the Moon and the draft convention on the registration of objects launched into space.

39. With respect to the unresolved issues concerning the draft treaty concerning the Moon, my delegation is of the view that it should apply also to other celestial bodies until such time as other specific treaties come into force.

40. Regarding the issue of the natural resources of the Moon, we are of the view that the draft treaty concerning the Moon should also envisage the legal régime concerning its natural resources and that the natural resources of the Moon should form part of the common heritage of mankind.

41. The Afghan delegation fully supports the initiative of the delegations of Canada and France in preparing a draft convention on the registration of objects launched into outer space [see A/AC.105/101, annex II, sect. C]. The Afghan delegation shares the view expressed by many representatives in this Committee that the completion of a

draft convention on this issue is of significant importance for the implementation of the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space [resolution 2345 (XXII), annex], as well as the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects [resolution 2777 (XXVI), annex].

42. In the field of technical and scientific activities and the promotion of international co-operation with respect to the application of space technology, the Afghan delegation welcomes the successes achieved by the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee in making possible the spread of knowledge about space applications. We fully share the view of the Sub-Committee that it should be concerned increasingly with the practical applications of space technology, particularly as regards its applicability to the development of the developing countries. In this respect the convening of panels in different parts of the world and the extension to the developing countries of fellowships and scholarships for study and training in the field of outer space are worthy of mention.

43. The Afghan delegation would like to commend the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for its very timely initiative resulting in the inclusion in the agenda of this session of the General Assembly of the question of the preparation of an international convention on principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting. We support the revised draft resolution submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union, together with the delegations of Iraq and Mongolia, and contained in document A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1. However, we are of the view that the General Assembly should leave it to the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to study this matter in the manner it chooses.

44. The delegation of Afghanistan is well aware of the potentialities of direct television broadcasting by satellites in different fields. Indeed, the use of artificial satellites for direct television broadcasting is a promising method of utilizing the science and technology of outer space for the well-being of mankind, to promote friendly relations among the different nations of the world and to exchange cultural and educational values based on the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

45. In this regard, the sovereign rights of Member States should be taken into consideration. My delegation also fully supports the principle of freedom of the flow of information and ideas in conformity with the principles of international law and friendly relations among States.

46. Finally, my delegation supports the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1, as already revised this morning by the representative of the Philippines. Discussion of ways and means of mitigating the catastrophic effects of storms and typhoons will undoubtedly lead to the alleviation of the human suffering caused by such natural calamities.

47. These are the general comments which the delegation of Afghanistan wishes to make on the draft resolutions before the Committee, and my delegation will vote on the basis of these comments.

48. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): The Soviet delegation would like to express its gratitude to the many delegations which, during a detailed, useful and constructive debate on matters relating to the problem of the use of outer space for peaceful purposes, devoted due attention, and did so constructively, to the proposal introduced by the Soviet Union that the General Assembly decide to ask the Committee on outer space to devote some thought to and to prepare a draft convention which would contain international rules that could be applied to the new and unprecedented phenomenon represented by the possibility that in a very few years there will be direct television broadcasting with the use of artificial earth satellites [A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1]. The problem is new and interesting. It is the result of the extraordinary scientific and technological revolution which we have been witnessing in recent times. This new international phenomenon, which is a very important and useful means of communication among peoples, can be used in two ways. International law and rules can be agreed upon or, on the contrary, can go forward in conditions of international disorder, anarchy and monopoly. This is the watershed between those two diametrically opposed approaches.

49. The Soviet Union and the other sponsors of our draft resolution, as well as many delegations which took part in consideration of the matter, have expressed their view that in this matter it is essential to establish order and legality so as to avoid illegality, disorder, chaos and the monopoly of the strong, who could make use of their scientific and technological advantages to impose their ideas, their way of life, their culture, their morality and many of their own elements which are not necessarily indispensable to the culture, civilization, history, characteristics or moral values of many other peoples of the world.

50. That is what makes it an acute problem, and that is also the key to the understanding of the situation which obtains in the First Committee as a result of a very detailed discussion of the Soviet proposal that the Committee on outer space should, without putting it off indefinitely but in the near future, take up this important problem and prepare a draft international convention which would be acceptable to all States and would then be transmitted to the General Assembly. Every State Member of the United Nations would have an opportunity to express its views on such a draft and the General Assembly could then take a decision to adopt, reject or amend it. A most important part of the problem is the following. Are we going to have an international convention or not? Two approaches have been clearly evident in this Committee: on the one hand, that of the United States and its allies—and let it be said in passing that most of the United States allies are NATO members—and, on the other, that of the Soviet Union and many other countries which consider that in connexion with this new and important international problem it is necessary to establish certain rules of international law which would be complied with and which would protect peoples and States from the threat of chaos, illegality, violence and monopoly in the imposition of alien ideas and ways of life through the use of this very great scientific and technical achievement of our time.

51. That is the way things stand on this problem; that is the meaning of the proposals made by those who adhere to

one or the other of these views and groups. The First Committee and every representative are, therefore, confronted with a choice. Should we choose international law and order to govern this new phenomenon so important for the whole of mankind; or should we leave this untouched and free in the hands of those who have the technical and scientific capability of using this great achievement for their own selfish interests?

52. We have said officially in the General Assembly and in the First Committee that we are in favour of the first approach. It is necessary to establish rules of international law to regulate this very important new means of communication. We want order to be set up, rules to be established, for all problems are of interest to all States, to the whole of mankind, especially in such a new, important and promising field of mass information as direct television broadcasting by means of earth satellites.

53. Several draft resolutions have been submitted on this question. First, I should like to speak on the general draft introduced by the representative of Austria [A/C.1/L.608]. This draft is all-encompassing and we express our gratitude for the very important work done by the Austrian delegation and the representative of Austria, as Chairman of the Committee on outer space, in preparing this draft. We consider that this draft takes care of almost all the main problems which have been debated in the Committee; we consider this draft acceptable, and the Soviet delegation is ready to sponsor, support and vote in favour of it. We want thus to stress our spirit of compromise in our approach to the study of this important new international problem, the use of space in the interest of the whole of mankind and the strengthening of peace and security in the world, and not in the interest of wars, aggression, military conflicts and tension among States.

54. The second draft was introduced by the representative of the Philippines on behalf of its sponsors and deals with natural calamities and efforts to combat them [A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1]. We had intended to act in the same way as regards his draft and that is why we drew the attention of the delegation of the Philippines and the other sponsors to the fact that the Soviet Union could not support the draft because it contained a reference to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, held at Stockholm from 5 to 16 June 1972. The Soviet Union, as all representatives know, did not take part in the work of the Stockholm Conference or in the work of the United Nations Preparatory Committee during its second stage. We took part during the first stage; we did not take part during the second for reasons which are well known. We objected strenuously to the discrimination which, fully in keeping with the tenets of the cold war, is still being practised by some Western Powers against a peace-loving State, a sovereign German State, the German Democratic Republic. This dogmatic cold-war position taken by certain Western Powers is utterly absurd nowadays. It is ludicrous not to allow a State like the German Democratic Republic to take part in international activities, under the aegis of the United Nations, on a most important problem of our day—the protection of the human environment. This is the policy of the absurd; it is simply shutting one's eyes to realities.

55. We all know that the German Democratic Republic is among the 10 most highly developed industrial countries; it

is in the very heartland of Europe; its factories produce if not millions at least hundreds of thousands of units of pollutants—dust, smoke and everything that poisons the atmosphere. Therefore, how can we deprive such a State of the possibility of taking part in the common efforts in the fight for clean air, clean earth, clean space, clean seas, clean oceans and clean rivers? It is strange, even monstrous. It suffices to raise the matter in this light to understand the absurdity of the discriminatory position taken on this matter against a sovereign State in the heart of Europe, one of the 10 most highly industrialized countries of the world. The absurdity of the position of the Western Powers on this is quite clear. They continue the old policy of the cold war, discriminating against the German Democratic Republic. Because of that the Soviet Union did not take part in the Stockholm Conference, in protest against such an absurd approach on the part of some Western countries. Unfortunately, some other countries followed their lead.

56. Operative paragraph 6 of this draft resolution on storms refers to the United Nations programme for the environment. Now, since the Soviet Union did not take part in preparing and adopting that programme, my delegation cannot vote in favour of operative paragraph 6. Therefore, the delegation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics intends to abstain on this paragraph and on the draft resolution as a whole. That is the position with respect to that draft resolution.

57. We consider that draft resolution A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1, introduced by the Soviet delegation, which now has several sponsors—Iraq, Mongolia, Czechoslovakia and Poland, to whom we are grateful for sponsoring it—is the most logical, the most legitimate and the most timely. We draw the attention of the General Assembly and Member States to this important international problem of direct television broadcasting through artificial earth satellites so that an international convention may be prepared in order that this new, remarkable scientific achievement may be used exclusively in the interests of mankind and not be prejudicial to it.

58. We are being accused that this kind of proposal, this kind of regulation, this effort to establish law and order for this new, unprecedented scientific phenomenon is an infringement upon freedom of information. This is absolutely unfounded in truth and we categorically reject such allegations no matter who makes them.

59. On the contrary, we are in favour of wide international communications, wide freedom of information but we are against violent, unilateral imposition of this information. We are in favour of establishing international law and order in the use of this great achievement of science in the interests of the whole of mankind, for the strengthening of peace, security, mutual understanding, friendship among peoples and not for incitements and conflicts. According to today's issue of *The Times* of London, law and order in the field of television is something that has been approved of even by the British Parliament. I should like to draw the attention of the representative of the United Kingdom in particular to this fact. The British Parliament, according to the press, is in favour of having law and order in the field of television. I suppose that the British representative, pursuant to this decision of Parliament, will also come forward in favour of law and order and will support the Soviet

proposal that the Committee on outer space start preparing as soon as possible a draft convention to regulate direct television broadcasting from artificial earth satellites and not delay consideration of this matter until the end of time, because the amendment, of which he is now a sponsor, is aimed at killing this idea of a convention, aimed at delaying matters until the Greek calends, that is to say, indefinitely. I will speak about that again later.

60. I should like to address myself to all the delegations of the General Assembly and the First Committee which hold dear their national culture, the history and the characteristics of their peoples, the moral foundations of the existence over centuries, over thousands of years, of each individual nation and State. I ask them to support our proposal and to ask the Committee on outer space to work out the rules of international law which to a certain extent would regulate the flow of alien information, of alien ideology, of alien morality, of alien moral foundations in the whole world and its environment.

61. Concerning the amendments introduced by the representatives of Austria and Sweden [A/C.1/L.609], we are grateful to them. They came forward as completely neutral representatives, not only because both of them represent neutral countries, but also because both of them have a leading position in the machinery of the outer space Committee. The representative of Austria is the Chairman of the Committee, as we all know. The representative of Sweden is the Chairman of one of the Sub-Committees and one of the Working Groups. Therefore, the best thing for them in this dispute, in these dissensions, in these different views expressed in the First Committee about this important international problem, is to remain neutral. By withdrawing their amendment they have shown a high degree of awareness of their duty as leaders in the Committee on outer space. They have been entrusted with the solution of problems related to the use of outer space for peaceful purposes. As a sign of our deep respect we elected them to those very high responsible positions. We believe that the cause of the peaceful uses of outer space is in reliable hands. They are objective, neutral representatives.

62. But it is very characteristic that those amendments should immediately have been picked up by a group of Western Powers that are very close to the United States which had categorically rejected the Soviet proposal, first, presumably, because it is a Soviet proposal, and secondly, presumably, because the United States prefers to have a monopoly in the field of direct television broadcasting through artificial earth satellites and to spread to the whole world and its environment everything that private American broadcasting companies hold dear, regardless of the national characteristics of each State, regardless of the respect every people has for its culture, for its moral foundations, for its civilization, for its history. Well, this is understandable. This group of Western Powers is a close ally of the United States, and it has decided to support its ally. But we draw a conclusion from that: we were right when we decisively objected to these amendments, although they were submitted by our honoured friends, the representatives of Austria and Sweden. We saw the basic element of these proposals. We saw that they would kill the idea of the necessity of preparing an international convention on direct

television broadcasting through artificial earth satellites, and the formulation of principles would be delayed indefinitely, in other words, there would be a repetition of what happened, unfortunately, in the matter of the definition of aggression. For about 20 years the United Nations has been dealing with the definition of aggression, but it is still unable to do anything about it for well-known reasons on which I shall not expound.

63. We have the sorry experience of the preparation of a draft convention on freedom of information. That has also been going on for about 20 years. Our friend and colleague, the representative of Saudi Arabia, refreshed our minds about this problem. Therefore, these amendments, because of their contents and regardless of the sincere intentions of our colleagues, the representatives of Austria and Sweden, to find a compromise, were in fact aimed at killing the idea of the preparation of a convention and delaying the formulation of principles indefinitely. That is why we objected to those amendments when they were introduced by the representatives of Austria and Sweden, and we object even more categorically to the amendments now introduced by a group of Western countries. The fact that a group of Western Powers picked up the amendments in mid-air, so to speak, and now introduces them on its own behalf, strengthens our conviction that we were right from the very beginning when we objected to those proposals. Such is our attitude towards these amendments. We shall vote against them and, should they, contrary to our expectations, be included in our draft, I think that we shall be compelled to vote against that draft. That is what we think of these amendments. In our view they reflect a position directly opposite to ours and therefore incompatible with it.

64. To conclude—and I apologize for having spoken at some length—I should like to say that as concerns the draft of my friend, the representative of Saudi Arabia, I reserve my right to speak on it somewhat later.

65. The CHAIRMAN: I wish to inform the Committee that Japan has become a sponsor of the amendments contained in document A/C.1/L.609.

66. Mr. CUDJOE (Ghana): As Ghana was one of the delegations that in the course of the general debate on the items on outer space made specific mention in its statement of the active role that the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations is playing in the promotion of international co-operation in the practical applications of space technology, my delegation wishes to support the proposal of the representative of Austria that FAO be added to the number of specialized agencies mentioned in operative paragraph 24 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.608.

67. Mr. VAN USSEL (Belgium) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to comment briefly on the amendments we have just submitted [A/C.1/L.613]. I should not like to pass over in silence certain sometimes unfair comments which the representative of the Soviet Union has addressed to the sponsors of these amendments. I should like to say, first of all, that it should be very clear to the Committee as a whole that the purpose of these amendments is certainly not to combat the initiative taken by the Soviet Union—I repeat, this is certainly not the purpose of

the sponsors of the amendments. What prompted us is our desire to achieve a draft resolution which will make it possible to reach unanimity and which calls for action by the world community on a problem which concerns all States.

68. In this connexion I should like to remind members that it was our practice in this Committee—as, indeed, it was in the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space—to settle our problems by consensus. Moreover, last year, when the Soviet delegation proposed the inclusion on the agenda of the question of drafting a treaty concerning the Moon, it took the trouble—and we congratulated it—to consult various delegations of the First Committee and we came up with a joint draft sponsored by socialist, Western, African and Asian countries. We regret quite sincerely that, in so important a matter which should not lend itself to controversy, the Soviet Union this year has not followed the course it initiated last year.

69. With respect to the amendments, I think they are self-explanatory. The first amendment is designed to replace the fifth preambular paragraph by another text, and it is, I think, in accordance with the concerns of the majority of the members who have spoken in the course of the debate since Monday. Obviously, all delegations here want a balance between the need for certain regulations, on the one hand, and protection of the principle of freedom of information and the free flow of information, on the other. I think that on the first amendment there can be no possible controversy.

70. With respect to the second amendment dealing with the two operative paragraphs, I should merely like to explain that the concern of the sponsors was not to prejudge at this juncture the legal form that a future set of principles governing the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting should take. I think it is logical that we must first of all work out the principles and then, in terms of those principles, take a decision on the international instrument we should prepare.

71. It may well be that, after having worked out the principles, the Committee might recommend the conclusion of a convention. It may well be also that the Committee might recommend the conclusion of several conventions—for example, regional conventions and bilateral treaties. But in my opinion, what is most important is to take decision on the need for a convention. Furthermore I might venture to draw a slight analogy with the Committee on the sea-bed and the ocean floor where the Committee had decided that it would be necessary to have a régime to be established by one or more conventions. Thus when this problem was considered, the Committee on the sea-bed and ocean floor did not wish immediately to confront the Assembly with a fait accompli.

72. I think that the amendment concerning operative paragraph 2 also reflects the concern expressed here in the First Committee. I have a feeling that the Committee shares the desire expressed in the course of our debates that we should strengthen and revitalize the role of the outer space Committee whose work has been guided with so much authority and dynamism by its competent Chairman, the representative of Austria. I think that it would be a good

thing if the important question raised by the Soviet delegation could be referred first to the Committee; the latter would consider it and then decide whether to refer the matter for further consideration either to the Legal Sub-Committee or to the Working Group on Direct Television Broadcast Satellites, or perhaps to both Sub-Committees, the Scientific and Technical Sub-Committee and the Legal Sub-Committee so that they could look at the problem and make recommendations. What I am trying to say is that at this time it is still much too soon to take a decision about the direct referral of this matter to a sub-committee.

73. With respect to certain comments that were made by the representative of the Soviet Union I should like to affirm here that our amendments are not in any way designed to stifle the idea of a convention. What we want is for the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space to have its hands free so that it can determine and appraise what legal formula should be used to settle the problems that may arise in connexion with the use by States of artificial earth satellites for direct television broadcasting.

74. My second point is in response to the unfair comments made by Mr. Malik. I should like to assert here that the sponsors of the amendments are by no means United States satellites. We are all representatives of free and independent countries who are proud to be able to build their societies on the basis of the principles of freedom.

75. I hope that these few comments on the amendments that we had the honour of introducing this morning will enable the Committee unanimously to support a revised and completed text.

76. The CHAIRMAN: I am sure that the Committee would wish to note the fact that Australia, Belgium, Canada, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom are not satellites of the United States.

77. Mr. DE SOUZA E SILVA (Brazil): I should like to address myself to the draft resolution already revised by the Soviet Union and other sponsors [*A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1*] and to the amendments which were introduced yesterday by the delegation of Sweden and reintroduced today by the delegation of Belgium [*A/C.1/L.613*]. Before doing so, I should like to refer to the lively exchange of views that occurred at the last meeting, in which the statement made by my delegation was subject to quotations and interpretations, and I should like to state very clearly the position of my delegation for the record.

78. I should like to say that it is very easy to sum up the position we have taken on this issue. We are in favour of a convention on direct broadcasts from satellites and we hope that it will be based on two very clear principles. One is the free flow of information and the second is that this free flow of information should be based on strict respect for the sovereign rights of States. On the basis of those principles, we have said in our statement that in principle we support the Soviet draft of a convention on direct broadcast satellites [*see A/8771*]. As for the text itself we think that it could and should be improved in certain ways. Mainly, we note that it lacks the first principle, which is a clear statement of the acceptance of the principle of the

free flow of information. In that respect although we welcome the amendment proposed by Belgium and other delegations to the fifth preambular paragraph, nevertheless that paragraph does cause us some difficulty and I think that it could also be improved. The amendment mentions “the need to balance legitimate sovereign interests”. In the first place we consider that the sovereign interests of States are always legitimate interests, and I do not think that this qualification of legitimacy should be stressed here. It becomes a superfluous word, which should not be introduced in this context.

79. In the second place, reference is made to sovereign interests and I think that it would be more appropriate to speak of rights rather than interests.

80. In the third place, it strikes a sort of balance between sovereign rights or interests and the importance of the free flow of information. We do not consider that sovereignty should be put in a balance but that it should stand by itself. With these considerations I should like to present an amendment to the wording of the last part of this preambular paragraph. The wording that we propose is as follows: “. . . connected with the need to ensure the free flow of communications on a basis of strict respect for the sovereign rights of States”. The wording I have just submitted to the Committee I think could meet not only the concerns expressed by the delegation of Belgium, but could also meet the concerns expressed by the author of the Soviet draft resolution himself. I think if I clearly understood his statement, he said that he should not be accused of being against the free flow of information and he also said that the sovereign rights of States should be properly preserved.

81. So I strongly recommend the inclusion of those amendments and the acceptance by the sponsors of both the initial and revised Soviet draft resolution of the amendments proposed by Belgium.

82. Concerning the operative paragraphs presented by the Belgian delegation, my delegation would not be in a position to support either of them. We think that the Belgian representative should agree that since we are dealing with a convention or agreement, those matters should be related and referred to the Legal Sub-Committee; they should not be left to be decided by the Committee itself, because the Committee works on the basis of a consensus and past experience has shown that when guidelines are not given to the Committee some questions remain unresolved for years, as was the case with the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects. For this reason we prefer the wording of the Soviet proposal for operative paragraph 2.

83. I would now just refer to the draft resolution introduced by the representative of the Philippines [*A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1*] and say that my delegation will be happy to give it its full support.

84. The CHAIRMAN: I would like to announce that Ghana and Hungary are now sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document *A/C.1/L.608*.

85. Mr. JAMIESON (United Kingdom): I think it is always a good rule in any forum of the United Nations to try to

stress what unites us rather than what divides us, and I think this is all the more necessary in the present case—and I am dealing now with the question of direct broadcast satellites—because in fact what divides us here is minimal. I must share the regret of my colleague from Belgium at what I can only call the cold-war reaction of the Soviet Union to the amendments that have been proposed.

86. I want to assure the representative of the Soviet Union and all members of the Committee that the motives of my delegation—and, I believe, of the other delegations concerned—in taking over the parentage of the orphaned amendments are precisely the same as the motives of the delegations of Austria and Sweden in originally putting them forward.

87. Now let us see where the area of agreement lies. I believe that we all agree that the exciting possibilities of direct television broadcasting by satellite pose the problem of balancing up and reconciling two concepts: the need to ensure the free flow of communications and the need to preserve strict respect for the sovereign rights of nations. I was interested and gratified to hear that the representative of the Soviet Union follows closely what goes on in a parliamentary democracy. This question of balance between the free flow of information and other requirements, including the requirements of social sense and taste, political issues and so on, is a matter which affects us in connexion with our national television. It is also quite clearly a matter which is of importance internationally.

88. The second thing on which I think we are all agreed is that this is a problem that the outer space Committee must get down to considering.

89. The third matter on which I believe we are all agreed is that some form of mutual understanding on this matter, international understanding, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and in conformity with the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, is absolutely essential.

90. I believe that the Soviet draft resolution [*A/C.1/L.605/Rev.1*]—albeit my delegation would perhaps have drafted some of the preambular paragraphs in a slightly different way if we had been the authors of it—with the amendments which my delegation and others have sponsored [*A/C.1/L.609*]—fully reflects those three points on which we are all, I believe, in agreement. I would go further and say that contrary to what Mr. Malik said many delegations, and certainly my own, by no means exclude the possibility that an international convention may turn out to be the right way to set about achieving mutual international understanding on this matter. The representative of my country made it very clear in his statement in this Committee a few days ago [*1864th meeting*] that we certainly do not exclude that possibility, and he said specifically that it is one of the possibilities that we should bear constantly in mind.

91. It seems to me that acceptance of the amendments which we have co-sponsored does not compromise anyone's position on the desirability of a convention. There is no

question, as was suggested by Mr. Malik, of our trying to kill the idea of a convention. Still less is there any question of our wanting to impose an indefinite delay in achieving agreed principles to govern this serious, complicated and difficult matter.

92. I conclude therefore by saying that there is no stark division between the delegations on this matter. There is no great cleavage of opinion. On the contrary, I believe that the possibility exists of a very wide, perhaps even unanimous, measure of agreement in this matter.

93. The CHAIRMAN: I should like to correct a slip of the tongue I made a moment ago when I said that the Committee would take note that Australia, Belgium, Canada, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom were not satellites of the United States. What I meant to say of course was "according to the statement of the representative of Belgium", and so on. I hope there will be no misunderstanding about this.

94. I call on the representative of the Soviet Union, who wishes to exercise his right of reply.

95. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): In connexion with the remarks of the representative of Belgium, I should like to be quite clear. He alleged that I had said that the intention of the sponsors of the Western amendment was to kill the initiative of the USSR. No, that is not so; I did not say that. No one can kill the initiative. It is there. It has been discussed and debated. What I said was that the objective of the amendment was to kill the idea of concluding an international convention on direct television broadcasting by earth satellite. I confirm again that the objective of that amendment is to kill the idea of the need to conclude such a convention and to delay consideration of the principles indefinitely. That is my formulation. Therefore we consider that this amendment is unacceptable.

96. The representative of Belgium referred to the consensus in the Committee. I fully agree with him. We are happy that on matters concerning the Moon we succeeded in reaching a consensus in the Committee. But after the decisions of the General Assembly, when we started talking about working out a draft on the question, we met with an obstacle which, between the twenty-sixth and the twenty-seventh sessions of the General Assembly, we were not able to overcome because of the position of certain Western Powers, especially the United States. In the outer space Committee there was agreement I think on 21 articles and the preamble. But there is now an obstacle and the Committee has been unable to transmit a draft convention to the General Assembly.

97. In the light of this dire experience, we would like there to be no such obstacle here, and we would like the General Assembly, in considering this new important problem of direct television broadcasting through the use of artificial earth satellites, to express a firm view and to take a decision that it is necessary to conclude a convention, rather than delay matters as has happened in the examples I have already given: definition of aggression, a convention on freedom of information, and a treaty on the Moon, the preparation of which has been blocked despite the fact that

there is a consensus on the preamble and on 21 articles. This is the way things are in fact.

98. Further, the representative of Belgium spoke of the free flow of information. But a question arises, whose flow? A clean flow, a creative flow, in the interests of peace and all mankind? Or is it to be polluted by sex, confrontation, propaganda, twisting of facts to the detriment of certain States, interference in international affairs, against the culture and civilization of every single nation? This is what we are talking about. Does the Belgian representative think that we are not interested in these problems? Who is going to be at the source of this free flow of information, responsible government organs or irresponsible private firms and companies which are ready to stoop to anything for profit? We do not intend to call that kind of flow "free flow of information". Where will it be directed? If that dirty flow of information is directed at the country itself, fine. Go ahead. Nobody is going to interfere. This is your own internal affair. If you like that kind of information, go ahead, take it. But nobody has the right to direct these polluted flows at other countries, to instil them in the minds of other peoples to whom these new "ethical values" are completely alien. What for? Freedom of information for what?

99. Many questions arise. I fully agree with the representative of Brazil who was quite right in saying that freedom of information must also entail respect for the sovereignty of States. We fully agree with this principle. Therefore, if these problems do not interest the sponsors of the amendment of the Western countries, we can only express our regret.

100. I accept the amendment of our distinguished Chairman. I do not know what caused his remark about satellites. I did not use the word "satellite" in my statement when speaking of the sponsors of the amendments. I never had any such idea in mind to call the sponsors of the amendments "satellites" of the United States. If somebody claims that I said that, I categorically reject it. I said the "allies" of the United States who wanted to help the United States, and that is what I said and that is what I repeat—allies. Nobody is going to deny that. But allies are not always satellites. That is also quite obvious. Therefore, let us be quite clear about that.

101. Finally, on the Philippine draft concerning natural disasters, I should like to address an appeal to the representative of the Philippines. If he would delete from operative paragraph 6 of draft resolution A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1 the words "United Nations programme for the environment in the field of the United Nations . . .", etc., and replace that with the words "future environmental programmes of the United Nations"—those which are to be worked out with the participation of all States, then we could vote in favour of the Philippine draft.

102. Now, two words to the representative of the United Kingdom. If you do not intend to kill the idea of the conclusion of a convention, vote in favour of operative paragraph 1 of our draft and we will find a basis for a compromise and mutual understanding. But, in my first statement, I stressed that the idea of the amendment was to kill this idea of concluding a convention. I repeat that. If I

understood the interpretation correctly, you do not intend to kill the idea of a convention. Well, then, vote in favour of the Soviet draft resolution. Or, rather, it is not now the Soviet draft but the draft of the several sponsors. Vote in favour of this idea that a convention is necessary, and I think that this is where we will find a consensus. However, I note again that the consensus is mandatory in the Committee on outer space, but not in the First Committee. It is sometimes difficult to reach a consensus among 132 delegations. Consensus caused the death of the League of Nations, and I would not wish our idea which is so widely supported—the conclusion of an international convention on this important and promising question—to be killed just as the League of Nations was killed by consensus.

103. Mr. VALLARTA (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Forgive me for speaking at this late hour, but my delegation would like to support the amendment of the representative of Brazil. My delegation had some doubts about the preambular paragraph introduced by Belgium and other States in document A/C.1/L.613. We had the following doubts. Some delegations, and the text itself, submitted by Belgium and other States, claim that there are two contradictory principles in international law: the sovereignty of States, and the free flow of information. This is not the opinion of my delegation. We consider that there is one basic, fundamental, elemental principle—that of the sovereignty of States. The free flow of information is not a principle which can be opposed to that of the sovereignty of States. It is merely a matter of convenience for the international community, which must respect the sovereignty of States.

104. I should like to draw the attention of this Committee to the relevant nature of the Brazilian amendment which sets things in their proper place when it says “connected with the need to ensure the free flow of communications on a basis of strict respect for the sovereign rights of States”. I would like to thank the representative of Brazil for having made things quite clear.

105. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): Due to the lateness of the hour, I will be very brief. The purpose of my statement at this time is to refer to the amendment just proposed by the representative of the Soviet Union when he referred to operative paragraph 6 of our draft resolution. If I understood him correctly, his proposal is to amend that paragraph to read as follows:

“*Recommends* integrated action through increased co-operation and co-ordination between the World Meteorological Organization, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Disaster Relief Co-ordinator in the future environmental programmes of the United Nations, with the participation of all States, particularly the preparedness for, and the prediction, detection, prevention and control of natural disasters”.

106. If this is the proposed amendment, on behalf of my delegation I should like to say that we will accept it. We have consulted with a number of the sponsors and they say that they also will be able to go along with this amendment; with regard to those with whom we have not been able to consult at this late hour, we hope that they also can accept this proposed amendment of the Soviet Union.

107. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Philippines who has spoken on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/L.606/Rev.1, of which Mauritius is also a sponsor.

108. Mr. PANYARACHUN (Thailand): I am sorry to take the floor now, but it is just for further clarification. As I understood it, the representative of the Soviet Union did make a proposal for amending operative paragraph 6 and, as I recall, he did read out the words “future environmental programmes of the United Nations”. But when the representative of the Philippines read out the amendment, I understood that a few more words were added to the amendment, to the effect that the expression “. . . future environmental programmes of the United Nations, with the participation of all States . . .” would replace the existing phrase in operative paragraph 6. I am not sure as to which is the correct amendment proposed by the Soviet Union, so I should like to ask for clarification on this point.

109. The CHAIRMAN: Is the delegation of the Philippines ready to clarify the position?

110. Mr. YANGO (Philippines): I am now informed that the correct amendment proposed by the Soviet Union does not refer to the participation of all States, in other words, the amendment merely refers to “future environmental programmes of the United Nations” without—I repeat, without—the words “with the participation of all States”.

111. The CHAIRMAN: I thank the representative of the Philippines. Do I take it that the representative of Thailand is satisfied with this clarification? It appears that he is.

112. Mr. MALIK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (*translation from Russian*): I should like to make the following remarks. Of course the Soviet Union would not object if those words “with the participation of all States” were added. We do not insist on that in this specific case, but generally speaking of course we want the environmental programmes of the United Nations to have the participation of all States without any exception or discrimination. This is our firm position, and I declare it. But it is not in this draft resolution that we are going to settle that matter.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.