

UNITED NATIONS  
GENERAL  
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED  
A/C.1/PV.982  
12 November 1958  
ENGLISH



Thirteenth Session  
FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,  
on Wednesday, 12 November 1958, at 10.30 a.m.

Chairman:

Mr. URQUIA

(El Salvador)

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

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

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record, will appear in mimeographed form under the symbol A/C.1/SR.982. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

NR/dk

## 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 will today proceed with the general debate on the question of the peaceful use of outer space. I would point out that, with regard to part (a) of this item, a draft resolution has been submitted by the delegation of the Soviet Union in document A/C.1/L.219.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The rapid development of science and technology during the past few decades, especially in the post-war period, and the remarkable scientific discoveries and inventions that have been made -- especially as regards the utilization of the atom, the development of rocket and missile technology and other fields -- have opened for mankind broad prospects of even greater progress in all realms of science and technology. The launching by the Soviet Union in October last year of the first artificial earth satellite has inaugurated a new era in the history of mankind. The scientific and technical task of overcoming gravitation may be regarded as solved. The road to outer space has been opened for mankind.

These remarkable scientific discoveries and extraordinary technical progress bear witness to the power of the human mind. They represent an outstanding victory of human knowledge over the mighty forces of nature.

However, we cannot close our eyes to the situation which now obtains, when relations between States are poisoned with the venom of mistrust and suspicion of each other, when certain States have joined in closed military groupings, when new aggressive blocs of States are being tirelessly devised, while the armaments race so far from petering out is in fact growing apace especially in the field of nuclear armaments.

In these conditions the question of preventing nuclear war arises with unprecedented acuity and urgency. The danger of such war will continue to hang over mankind so long as no agreement is reached on the cessation of the armaments race, the prohibition of the nuclear weapons and the channelling of the latest achievements of science and technology into the path of the peaceful utilization of these achievements for the well-being of mankind.

Unfortunately, however, we have witnessed how progress in the decisive fields of science and technology, including the field of the control of the cosmos, is being shifted into military channels. The unbridled armaments race which has spread the weapons of mass destruction, such as atomic and hydrogen bombs, has already been shifted to the creation and perfecting of rockets and missiles that are using the cosmos space in their trajectories.

In recent times the atomic and rocket armaments race has taken a particularly broad swing in the United States and in certain Western Powers. Appropriations for constructing and producing rockets and atomic and hydrogen warheads with which these rockets are to be equipped are being increased apace. Vast sums -- tens of billions of dollars -- are being expended by the United States to that end. In February of 1958 the Defense Department of the United States published a list of thirty-four types of rockets which American military organizations were working on. However, as the Press pointed out, in reality research and development are being carried out with regard to a larger number of rockets than indicated in the list. Atlases, Titans, Polaris, Minute Men, et cetera have the remarkable capacity of devouring hundreds of millions of American tax money. The Navajo Rocket Project alone, which was subsequently abandoned as hopeless cost \$700 million.

In one of the October issues of Newsweek, the General Electric Company reported that in 1958 the United States was spending for military research and development alone the sum of \$5,600,000,000. In order to maintain military expenditures at this pitch, the ruling circles of the United States have been artificially encouraging a war psychosis and hysteria. They are busily scaring the population with visions of cosmos warfare et cetera.

The Press and the Radio of certain Western Powers, specially the United States are publicizing intensively plans for attacking the Soviet Union and other peaceloving States through cosmos space. American statesmen and military men are making statements with increasing frequency about setting up American control over the moon, over cosmos space in general, and the like. Even some American senators have fallen victim to this type of propaganda. Mr. Lyndon Johnson, who, I think, will participate in our debate, called upon the United States Government, earlier this year, to take measures for the conquest of outer space. He said in January:

"Control over cosmos space means control over the whole world; more reliable and complete control than any domination which has heretofore been achieved or could be achieved by force of arms, armies or occupation. From cosmos space the masters of the boundless space can control the weather on the globe, give rise to drought or floods, change tides, raise the level of sea waters, divert the Gulf Stream and change moderate climates and weather to cold climates."

I must say, however, that the American Press was rather critical about these promises of Mr. Johnson. The New York Times had this to say about the statement:

"In his analysis of the national defense problem, there is virtually no mention of almost anything other than military problems and the problems of conquering inter-stellar space. The impression arises that he, Mr. Johnson, has fallen victim to that same thickening of the colours which he himself used to condemn."

Nevertheless, Mr. Johnson has found his disciples.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

General Boushey, who is Deputy Director of the American Air Force Research and Development Division, came out with nightmarish plans about setting up American military bases on the moon in order to deal a massive blow to the cities of the Soviet Union from that lunar base, and the head of the Air Force Staff, General White, repeated the same ideas and considered that the United States must assume control over outer space. The head of the Army Ballistic Missiles Administration, General Medaris, is also pining for the cosmos. He is pursued by the seductive idea that the next war must necessarily be waged in cosmic space.

It would be ill advised to discount these statements by American leaders as a mere nightmare or fantasy. They are a reflection of a specific political line of the ruling circles of the United States, a line which contemplates the utilization of cosmic space for military purposes.

Headlong progress in the development of intercontinental multi-stage ballistic rockets has in fact considerably altered the conceptions of warfare which have prevailed hitherto. At the present time, the aggressor, if he launches a war, will never and nowhere remain in safety. A retaliatory lightning crushing blow will find him in the most remote corner of the globe.

The Soviet Union consistently fights for peace and against war. Throughout the post-war years, the Soviet Union has bent every effort to put an end to the armaments race, which keeps the world under the menace of a destructive atomic war. The Soviet Union has sought to bring about a banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons and the destruction of all stockpiles of such weapons. My Government has adhered firmly to the position that nothing but the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons can remove the danger of atomic war which looms over mankind. It goes without saying that the conclusion of such an agreement would automatically dispose of the question of the peaceful use of outer space since the actual danger does not consist of the rockets themselves, but of the nuclear warheads which these rockets are designed to deliver to their objectives.

We must, however, bear in mind that such an agreement has not so far been forthcoming. The Governments of the Western Powers, especially those of the United States and the United Kingdom, will not even listen to any talk today about the prohibition of atomic and hydrogen weapons. On the contrary, they base all their plans on the utilization of such weapons. Right now, the United States has

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

nuclear weapons on the ready at all its military bases situated on foreign territory -- in Europe, North Africa, the Near and Middle East, Asia and the Far East. The United States is engaged in atomic sabre rattling, threatening to launch such weapons from its bases against the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic, the People's Democratic Republic of Korea and other Socialist countries. The Arab countries, which have risen in the struggle for independence and national emancipation, are also being threatened with atomic bombs. Naturally such conditions are not likely to contribute to the solution of the question of the peaceful use of outer space. Nevertheless, the question is one which clamours for a solution.

In what direction can we move to ensure the exclusively peaceful utilization of outer space without subjecting the security of any country to danger? The way out is indicated in the proposals of the Soviet Union put forward as early as 15 March of last year calling for the prohibition of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the liquidation of foreign military bases on the territory of other countries and the establishment of international co-operation in the field of the study of cosmic space. In these proposals, as is the case with the draft resolution presented by the Soviet delegation on 7 November of this year (A/C.1/L.219), the USSR proposes the conclusion of a broad international agreement which would include the following basic provisions:

"1. A ban on the use of cosmic space for military purposes and an undertaking by States to launch rockets into cosmic space only under an agreed international programme.

"2. The elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other States, primarily in Europe, the Near and Middle East and North Africa.

"3. The establishment within the framework of the United Nations of appropriate international control over the implementation of the obligations set forth above.

"4. The establishment of a United Nations agency for international co-operation in the study of cosmic space ...." (A/C.1/L.219, pages 1 and 2)

In other words, the Soviet Government has put forward a proposal for the prohibition of the military use of cosmic space.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

It may well be asked why the Soviet Union ties in the question of the prohibition of the military use of cosmic space with the question of the liquidation of foreign military bases on the territory of other countries. If you weigh this problem carefully with a view to its solution, you will find it essential to take into account equally the security of the United States and the security of the Soviet Union and other countries. If no military strategic advantages are to be sought for either side, then the natural and universally acceptable solution is bound to be the prohibition of the military use of outer space with the simultaneous elimination of foreign bases on the territory of other countries. It goes without saying that suitable control within the framework of the United Nations must be established in order to ensure observance of these measures. Only this type of solution of the question can make sure that peace will reign not only in outer space, but also on earth, which is, of course, even more important.

Some Western leaders and Press organs have come out against the Soviet proposal on the ground that the question of the peaceful use of outer space and the question of the elimination of military bases are nonequivalent or incommensurable and that they cannot be lumped together. However, it is fairly easy to realise the motivation of these arguments and to see what purposes they serve. They are designed to cover up the attempt of American ruling circles also to secure strategic advantages for the United States.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

In the message to the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, from the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union, Nikita Sergeyeovich Khrushchev, dated 22 April 1958, it is stated that the Soviet Union is prepared to conclude an agreement which would call for the prohibition of the military uses of cosmic space and which would permit the launching of cosmic rockets only in accordance with a co-ordinated and agreed-upon international scientific research programme. At the same time Mr. Khrushchev's message indicates that we cannot disregard the fact that atomic and hydrogen weapons can be delivered to their objectives not only by the use of intercontinental rockets but also by the use of medium- and short-range missiles and rockets; likewise by the use of conventional bomber aircraft, which are stationed in large numbers at numerous American military bases situated in areas adjacent to the Soviet Union.

The Western Powers, and especially the United States, in rejecting the simultaneous solution of the questions of the prohibition of military uses of cosmic space and of the elimination of foreign military bases on the territories of other States, have revealed to the whole world the fact that in the matter of the peaceful use of outer space they are not guided by concern for peace throughout the world, that they are not at all interested in reducing the danger of atomic war which looms over the world, but that in fact all that they seek is to secure military advantages for their own side at the expense of, and to the detriment of, the military potential and defensive might of the Soviet Union. Surely it is an open secret that right after the war the United States proceeded feverishly to build numerous military bases on foreign territories as close as possible to the frontiers of the Soviet Union and of other peace-loving States. At present bomber aircraft carrying medium- and short-range rockets designed to deliver nuclear warheads and weapons to their objectives are situated at these bases. It is no longer being concealed, and in fact it is clear from various statements by American and other Western military and political leaders that these bases are designed to deal a nuclear blow at the Soviet Union and countries friendly to it. The question of the further intensification of the nuclear and rocket armaments race and of the emplacement of such weapons all over the world was, as the press reported, the main object of the recent talks



(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

in Washington between the Defence Secretaries of the United States and the United Kingdom. The United States is already shipping rockets with nuclear warheads across the seas and placing them in military bases in Europe -- in Great Britain, in West Germany, in Italy, and likewise in western Turkey. Of course, intercontinental rockets with nuclear warheads -- which, by the way, the Soviet Union also possesses -- are offensive weapons; but can the American missiles such as the Thor and the Jupiter, and other rockets of medium or short range which can be launched against the Soviet Union from American bases situated in foreign territories, be regarded as less dangerous weapons? And after all, a hydrogen bomb dropped from an airplane would be no less destructive than a hydrogen warhead attached to one of these missiles.

The military preparations of the United States and of its NATO allies constitute a serious danger to the security of the Soviet Union and of peace-loving countries friendly to it. Why is it then that the United States in its proposals so far presses for the establishment of control over intercontinental ballistic rockets while at the same time passing over in silence the question of the liquidation of its military bases in other countries' territories, even though these bases pose a real threat as to the security of the Soviet Union and a number of other States? Is it not clear that atomic and hydrogen weapons remain a frightful means of mass extermination of human beings regardless of whether they are delivered to their objectives through propulsion by intercontinental ballistic missiles or whether they are dropped from conventional aircraft which have taken off from American bases situated somewhere in Europe or in the Middle East or the Far East?

The interdependence of these questions is broadly recognized in the Western countries as well. A striking example of thinking in this respect is offered in the arguments of the Christian Science Monitor of 9 September 1958 to the effect that so long as the United States has no intercontinental ballistic missiles it relies on its medium-range rockets -- "medium-range" being defined as being about 1,500 miles -- and strategic air forces. The Christian Science Monitor says in effect as follows:

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

"Draw on your map semi-circles with a 1,500-mile radius, the semi-circles being drawn on Soviet territory, with their centres located on the proposed American rocket bases in Europe, Turkey, Pakistan, and so forth, and you will find that you have covered almost all of the Soviet Union's territory. This means that these rockets, with a smaller range but stationed on overseas bases, could adequately counterbalance Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles so long as American intercontinental ballistic missiles have not yet been fully developed."

Now, the American proposals which were published up to the beginning of the current session of the General Assembly called only for the prohibition of intercontinental missiles, leaving aside the question of bases and other important aspects of this problem. The proposal of the United States on international co-operation in the field of outer space which was presented to the present session of the General Assembly places the question on the same level. It is proposed that the question of the utilization of cosmic space for peaceful ends should be separated from the question of disarmament, and that measures should be taken to ensure the utilization of cosmic space for peaceful ends only, and that this, in turn, should not be linked with the disarmament question. It is imperative to realize that the true meaning of this American proposal is this: that the use of intercontinental ballistic missiles should be prohibited or controlled even though they could be used for purposes of retaliation -- and only for purposes of retaliation -- against objectives on United States territory, while at the same time the United States would make sure to keep its military bases on foreign territories far beyond the borders of the United States and near to the borders of the Soviet Union, bases openly designed to launch rockets which the United States possesses and to provide bases for American bomber aircraft to continue jeopardizing the security of the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States.

It goes without saying that the Soviet Union cannot agree to this approach to the solution of the question; it is an approach which would simply disregard the interests of the security of the Soviet Union and other friendly States. It is essential to devise a solution of the question which, on an equal footing, would ensure the security of the United States, the Soviet Union and other countries.

The Soviet Union is engaged in large-scale constructive work. It does not propose to attack anyone. It is committed to a profoundly peace-loving policy. That being so, the Soviet Union is prepared immediately to conclude an agreement calling for the prohibition of the military utilization of cosmic space and the launching of rockets into outer space only in accordance with a co-ordinated and agreed international programme of scientific research. Such an agreement must, at the same time, provide for the liquidation of foreign military bases situated on the territory of other States -- and, in the first place, of States of Europe, the Near and Middle East and North Africa. It goes without saying that the conclusion of such an agreement would be entirely in keeping with the interests of the security of both the United States and the Soviet Union. It would not give to either side any military advantages which could be used against the other side. Quite the contrary: such measures would only enhance the security of all countries involved. There can be no doubt that the States on whose territory United States military bases are now situated would be the first to gain from such a solution of the question, since the liquidation of foreign bases would remove a deadly danger which, in the event of war, could threaten the population of these States. Therefore, the solution proposed by the Soviet Union would be entirely in keeping with the interests of the national security of such States.

The development of intercontinental ballistic rockets is a vast achievement of scientific and technological progress. This progress is inevitably continuing its forward march. It has already, so to speak, placed on the agenda the development of even more powerful cosmic rockets which, in the not too distant future, will be able to span the vast distances separating the earth from other planets. This process cannot be stopped; in fact, it would not be in the interests of mankind to stop it. The task of the statesman is

not to set up obstacles on the path to scientific and technological progress, but to channel such progress into peaceful lines, to harness such progress for peaceful purposes, with a view to ensuring that intercontinental or other rockets will not be used for the extermination of human beings but for peaceful research with respect to cosmic space.

The Soviet Union delegation considers that the achievement of an agreement as outlined by us would materially improve the international atmosphere and would contribute to the settlement of other outstanding problems, particularly that of disarmament. Such an agreement would also open the door wide to large-scale international co-operation in the peaceful uses of cosmic space. It would lay the foundation for a joint study by scientists from all countries of the various problems related to the cosmos and interstellar space.

Last year, the United States declared that the question of the prohibition of the military uses of cosmic space must be solved within the framework of a comprehensive disarmament agreement. However, at a plenary meeting of the current session of the General Assembly, the Secretary of State of the United States said that we cannot await an all-embracing disarmament agreement and that measures must be taken forthwith to ensure that the utilization of cosmic space will bring the greatest possible benefit to mankind. In separating the question of the utilization of cosmic space from other disarmament questions, the United States apparently wishes to ensure that it will be able to maintain its bases on foreign territories, with the rocket and bomber launching facilities situated there, while the intercontinental ballistic rockets in the arsenal of the Soviet Union will be banned or placed under control.

As is well known, the Soviet Union proposal calls for international co-operation in the scientific study of cosmic space as part of the general problem of the peaceful uses of cosmic space, inasmuch as the question of co-operation will not alone solve the problem before us. For, after all, international co-operation in the field of the scientific study of cosmic space is already being successfully carried out under the aegis of the International Geophysical Year. The question on the General Assembly's agenda, however, is not merely one of prolonging and continuing cosmic research under the International Geophysical Year programme; the question on the General Assembly's

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

agenda is that of the peaceful uses of outer space in general. This is a far more complex and multifaricus problem than the prolongation of the existing international co-operation of scientists in the study of cosmic space. That is why the Soviet Union proposal charts a programme of measures which take into account the interests of the security of all sides involved, on an equal basis. The implementation of this programme would, in fact, ensure that cosmic space would be used for peaceful purposes only.

It is obvious that the United States proposal does not meet this task in any way. An understanding on international scientific co-operation in questions of the peaceful utilization of cosmic space can in no way supplant the solution of the fundamental question of the prohibition of the utilization of cosmic space for military purposes and the liquidation of military bases on foreign territories. This question remains. It must be solved and, in so doing, one must proceed from the necessity of ensuring the security of all countries, on an equal basis. If the Western countries are guided in this question by the interests of international peace and security and are truly the champions of the exclusively peaceful utilization of cosmic space, they should support the Soviet Union proposal. If the United States is not on any grounds prepared immediately to solve the question of the effective prohibition of the utilization of cosmic space for military purposes and the liquidation of military bases on foreign territories, it would be well advised to say so openly, instead of trying to replace one question by another.

The main task which now confronts the United Nations and which the Soviet Union Government calls upon the United Nations to solve is that of finding an effective and radical solution of the problem of the exclusively peaceful use of outer space and the liquidation of foreign military bases. These two aspects of the problem are linked by unbreakable internal bonds.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

The question of the peaceful uses of cosmic space must be solved with the question of the liquidation of military bases from foreign countries with the institution, within the framework of the United Nations, of suitable international control over the observance by States of obligations assumed under this head. In placing this question before the General Assembly, the Soviet delegation considers that the United Nations should not waste valuable time and that, right here and now, at the current session of the Assembly, it should take a decision which would equally ensure the interests of the security of all States. This task would be solved by deciding to use cosmic space exclusively for peaceful purposes, with the concurrent liquidation of foreign military bases from other countries. At the same time, this approach to the solution would open a broad possibility for fruitful co-operation by the utilization of cosmic space for peaceful purposes only.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In order to exercise his right of reply, the representative of the United States has asked for the floor.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I intend to seek recognition tomorrow to present the United States proposal for the peaceful uses of outer space, but I have asked to speak today under my right of reply because of the very unfortunate fact that, once more, the Soviet Union representative, instead of coming forward with a constructive proposal, has begun this whole discussion with a series of attacks on the United States. He not only has completely misrepresented the position of the United States, but has also misrepresented the facts of the situation in accordance with what I can only describe as a tragic and malignant hallucination, which seems to dominate so much Soviet thinking today and which, we hope, will one day disappear.

It is not possible to take the Soviet remarks about foreign bases at face value. As I shall try to show, these remarks clearly indicate either a true lack of understanding of the real situation or else they are a deliberate attempt to mislead the Committee. I say this because the truth is plain for all to see: it is that these bases are not foreign, they are not foreign at all in the way that the Soviet Union uses the word. They are mutual bases which are to be used

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

mutually for the common defence -- and I stress the word "defence" by common consent -- and I stress the word "consent". The true significance of a base is not whether it is on the soil of this or that State. The true significance depends on how the base is to be used. The Soviet Union knows that no base in which the United States has a part will ever be used for aggression, that aggression under our system of government is simply not possible, and that our whole military establishment is and must be designed entirely for defence. The Soviet Union should also know that we do not think that force is the way which should be used to solve the world's problems, let alone to make the world progress.

The Soviet Union should take to heart our deep conviction that our ideal of improving man's material lot without sacrificing his civil rights will always peacefully win the competition with the Soviet system, which achieves its result at the expense of human freedom. That is what we think in this country; there is not an American who does not think that. Our way of life does not need force in order to succeed. It evolves and it grows because it appeals to something deep-seated in the human spirit.

Our bases are purely defensive because, under our policy, aggression is as impossible as it is unnecessary and as it is inconceivable. I believe that the Soviet Union understands full well that our bases exist only for defence, however much it may pretend that it does not. But there is one thing which the Soviet Union does not understand, and that is that our bases exist only with the freely expressed consent of the countries where they are. We are not in any of these countries in the way that the Soviet Union is in the satellites -- on the basis of master and slave. In every case in which our bases are in another country they are there with the consent of the country, in accordance with our policy of all nations having equal rights. It is this concept of equality which the Soviet Union, with its system of iron domination of the strong over the weak, cannot understand. We will leave these bases whenever we are requested to do so -- and this, let me add, is the precise opposite of the way in which the Soviet Union has behaved in Hungary.

I come back, therefore, to what I said at the beginning, that these observations about foreign bases cannot be taken at face value. They do not mean what they say they mean. They really cloak a very simple and rather obvious

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

Soviet aim, which is to end the existence of the bases so as to destroy the capacity of the non-Soviet world to defend itself. What would happen to the non-Soviet world after it had destroyed its capacity to defend itself can easily be imagined simply by looking at the satellites.

The Charter specifically provides that nations have the right to have collective self-defence. In attacking the collective security arrangements of the non-Soviet world, the Soviet Union is actually attacking the Charter. The Soviet Union, by its charges, is also making an attack on the concept of national sovereignty. Sovereignty includes the right and privilege of any nation to associate itself with other friendly States if it wants to do so for the purpose of protecting its independence, just as it includes the right of a nation to be neutral if it wants to be so. The Soviet Union would like to define the word "independence" to mean isolation, to mean helplessness. The world will never accept that definition. The Soviet Union, in attacking the collective security arrangements entered into by the United States, is in effect directing its attack particularly against the smaller countries of the world, whose limited size and limited resources do not make it possible for them to stand alone in defence of their sovereignty and of their independence.

The Soviet Union has a great stake in its campaign to seduce or frighten the smaller countries into isolating themselves from their neighbours. The Soviet Union wishes to accomplish nothing more or less than to place the small countries of the world at the mercy of Soviet aggression. Nothing could better promote the oft-proclaimed Soviet design of bringing about the triumph of Soviet world communism -- and they admit it themselves -- then to **require each nation to rely exclusively upon its own resources in defending itself against direct and indirect aggression.**

The defensive and peaceful purposes of the collective security arrangements entered into by the United States was emphasized by President Eisenhower after his return from the NATO Meeting in Paris in December 1957. The President said:

"There was one basic purpose implicit in every discussion and debate of the Conference. That was the pursuit of a just peace. Not once during the week did I hear any slightest hint of sabre-rattling or



MW/ihl

A/C.1/PV.982  
24-25

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

aggressive intent. Of course, all of us were concerned with developing the necessary spiritual, economic and military strength of our defensive alliance. We are determined that there must be no war, but we never lost sight of our hope that the men in the Kremlin would themselves come to understand their own need for peace, as well as our sincerity in desiring a just composition of differences between West and East."

No nation has lost or diminished its sovereignty by entering into any arrangement with the United States. No nation has ever been enslaved by the United States. No people have suffered impairment of their liberties because of the presence of United States forces. And this stands in stark contrast to the picture in Eastern Europe, where Soviet forces have produced and perpetuated unbelievable conditions of tyranny and oppression. Most important of all is the fact that United States bases in allied countries have never been used for aggression against others. They have, instead, proved a bulwark of defence for the host country. The outstanding examples of direct and indirect aggression during the last fifteen years -- and look back on them -- have involved countries which did not have the protection of collective security facilities.

There were no American bases in Greece in 1946 and 1947, and look what happened. The attack on Korea in 1950 came after the withdrawal of United States forces -- after the forces had withdrawn. There were no United States bases in Lebanon. There were no United States bases in Hungary. The history of modern aggression demonstrates that the presence of troops does not produce war. On the contrary, warfare is more likely where the means of effective resistance are lacking. The Soviet Communist aggressors do not choose to prey upon those who are strong and united, but rather lurk in the shadows to attack and destroy those who are weak and those who are alone.

The Soviet representative spoke of our expenditures for rockets. Unlike the Soviet Union, we do not conceal what we are doing. Public business in this country is publicly conducted. In the Soviet Union, where forced labour is the norm, no expense is spared to develop rockets. They do not have to think of expense. I think the Soviet representative should admit it frankly, and not seek to create the impression that we have rockets and they have not. We would like nothing better than to cut down our expenses if it were not for the clearly aggressive nature of Soviet Communist imperialism; but, as long as this imperialistic attitude continues, we will go ahead with our rocket programme and everything else that is necessary to the strength of the rest of the world.

Mr. Zorin said that we had rejected a Soviet offer concerning outer space. He is mistaken. We have rejected nothing. We are ready to talk. An agreement to prohibit the use of outer space for military purposes is the goal of the United States. But this must be the conclusive step in a sober, realistic process of negotiation and mutual understanding on the nature of the problem, and of the specific steps required for its solution, including a control system. Let us not have any more talk about these mere paper prohibitions that mean nothing without machinery for enforcement.

The United States agrees with the Soviet representative that the disarmament aspects of outer space are important and urgent. Indeed, the United States **was the first to point this out**, on 14 January 1957, in this assembly. I, myself, called for an early study. At London in August 1957 the United Kingdom, France and Canada joined with the United States in urging the Soviet Union to join in studying the problems involved in bringing about significant control in the field of outer space. This proposal was endorsed by the General Assembly in November 1957.

Again, the concern and urgency we attached to this problem was repeated by President Eisenhower in his letter of 12 January 1957 to Prime Minister Bulganin. This proposal still stands as I made clear in my speech on disarmament here last month. Unfortunately, the Soviet Union still has made no response. A beginning should be made. All that is needed is a green light from the Soviet Union to move toward a solution.

Mr. ZORIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)(interpretation from Russian): I only wish to take a few minutes of the Committee's time in connexion with Mr. Lodge's latest and rather nervous statement. I take it that what he plans to say in his basic speech will, most likely, be more worthy of attention, since, as he put it here, he considers that the Soviet representative has misrepresented the position of the United States, and therefore I take it that the United States will represent its own position accurately, at which time we will have the opportunity to examine that position in detail and appraise it at its full value.

I, therefore, do not find it possible now to enter into an examination of the matter, but I must needs point out that such a response to our statement in connexion with the item on our agenda makes it clear that the United States is aware that its position here is a weak spot. And small wonder that Mr. Lodge devoted just about all of his speech to this weak spot, and this weak spot is the presence of American bases on foreign territories, and that is why Mr. Lodge reacted so nervously. It seems to me that Mr. Lodge's comments have made it clear that the United States has no serious arguments to justify the retention of these bases, because the statement from Mr. Lodge now can surely not be regarded as serious argument.

Suffice it to recall that Mr. Lodge tried consistently to make us believe that these bases are defensive in character. Any citizen living in any country throughout the globe will find that these words carry little conviction, since these bases are situated tens of thousands of kilometres from the United States. Surely Mr. Lodge will not persuade the citizens of the United States that these bases are defensive in character, because the press of the United States makes it clear that this question has been raised time and again: Why have we -- we, the United States -- got these bases thousands of miles removed from our shores, in the Far East, in Africa, in Europe? Why do we maintain troops in those areas? These bases tens of thousands of kilometres removed from our shores -- can they truly be defensive for the United States? To this question no satisfactory answer has been forthcoming from the representative of the United States, and this is the weak spot, owing to which the representative of the United States deemed it fit to react so speedily.

(Mr. Zorin, USSR)

Mr. Lodge said that as soon as they were asked, they would leave these bases. But Mr. Lodge knows full well, and so do the other members of the Committee, that those countries where these bases are situated do not find it easy, to put it mildly, to ask the United States to get out. Mr. Lodge offered some comments on the policy of the Soviet Union in various countries. I think that the countries involved can themselves speak about that policy; there is no need for me to talk about it. But when Mr. Lodge says that the United States will leave as soon as asked, then I am bound to remember the recent epic of the United States troop landings in Lebanon. When Lebanon was occupied, was it in a position to ask the United States to get its troops out?

Everyone knows full well what happened. We spent the whole period of the emergency special session of the General Assembly to disentangle this question, and everyone knows of the plight of the small Arab countries when United States forces poured into Lebanon and United Kingdom forces poured into Jordan. It is clear, in these conditions, that to ask the United States to move out was not exactly the easiest thing for the Lebanese Government to do. When the entire General Assembly unanimously called for the withdrawal of United States troops, even then the United States had to be prodded time and again before it would finally consent to get its forces out of there.

Now think of the plight of the small countries whose territories are riddled by United States and NATO bases. There is no need to dwell on this in any further detail since everyone understands full well that the United States will withdraw its forces from the territories of these countries only when United States finds it desirable to do so, or else when world public opinion, this forum, will compel the United States to get its forces out of these territories. In that event alone will the United States withdraw its troops, which troops do not serve any defensive purposes at all since they are thousands and tens of thousands of miles removed from the shores of the United States.

These are the few brief comments which I found it necessary to make at this stage. I shall patiently and calmly await an accurate and detailed outline of the position of the United States on the question of outer space. After the position of the United States has been set forth, we shall be able to analyse it in detail.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): I merely will say to the Soviet representative, who seems so agitated over what I had previously said, that there are no United States troops in Lebanon. There are none. Here we are two years after the passage of the United Nations resolution on Hungary and they are still sitting all over poor little Hungary. You just cannot avoid those facts. Moreover, the United States resolution, which was adopted unanimously here, was on all four's with the resolution which we supported. The Soviet Union had a resolution which it introduced at that session condemning the United States for what it had done in Lebanon, and when it saw that it could not get the votes, in a humiliating defeat, it withdrew its resolution. Let us keep the record straight.

Mr. de LEQUERICA (Spain) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to say a few words in exercise of the right of reply. I speak here as the representative of a country that has United States bases on its territory, a country which, in the exercise of its free will, came to an agreement with the United States to establish these defensive bases on our territory. When these negotiations took place, I had the honour of being the Ambassador in Washington. The conversations seemed eternal; they lasted for a year or a year and a half. At that time, I compared these negotiations with the drafting of the Panmunjom Armistice, and we used to refer to this as the Panmunjom of Spain.

They were all negotiations that were based on very good ideas, but most incredible foresight had to be used. We had to make sure that there was spiritual freedom and communication in the country where the bases were going to be set up and all these different aspects had to be studied by the two countries in negotiation. I am not making any allusions regarding the military importance of the United States and the comparative importance of Spain at this moment of history. But as a witness, I must say that as far as the Government of Spain was concerned, we went through all the different aspects of independence, of sovereignty, and so on, and the United States Government showed full consideration for a free country before these defensive bases were set up. These bases were set up and we maintain them.

(Mr. de Lequerica, Spain)

If we were interested in doing so, we could very well ask them to leave, and they would leave. They would not object to leaving because they would consider that in the present world situation we were co-operating in the setting up of the bases. By doing so, we were trying to maintain peace as against the aggressive intent of the Soviet Union, an aggressive spirit which was evidenced and made public not only by the heads of the Soviet Government, but by other countries as well. Now they have become more humanitarian in their way of acting or speaking and they hide behind the comedy of the suspension of atomic tests.

My country is one country which is not outside the troubled area. We do not admit a middle-of-the-road position. We are a member of a group that is trying to save the Western world, and in exercise of our full sovereignty we have allowed these bases to be set up in Spain in agreement with the United States, to make sure of our defence. But defence cannot be applied today only on the frontiers of our country. We are not living in the age when a war was carried out at fifty feet. Today we are living in an age of rockets, an age where war can be carried out at a distance of thousands of miles.

Therefore, a free agreement was arrived at between the United States and Spain, in full exercise of the sovereignty of Spain and the United States. We were able at any moment to renounce this agreement if we felt that we should do so. But we do not want to renounce it, because we know that we would leave ourselves open to dreadful dangers. The delegation of the Soviet Union speaks with disdain, which rather reminds one, if we are to believe in the Czarist literature, of the Czarist period when they looked down on all peoples. But today we are all on a level. Today we show our goodwill and our full sovereignty by agreeing on an equal footing with the United States. We have united with those who represent today, we believe, the greatest guaranty and the greatest security for the liberty of peoples.

Mr. PETER (Hungary): I shall be very brief. The Committee may remember that, when we were considering the Korean question and the representative of the United States was not able to give any concrete reply as to how the resolution would reach Pyonyang, he used a weapon of argument, the so-called Hungarian question.

Today again, when the representative of the United States found himself in a difficult situation to defend the position of maintaining military bases in foreign countries, he tried to use the same question.

I must state that the Hungarian people do not need the protection of the United States delegation. It is simply a cynical game in the "cold war" that this question is being raised again and again. The only competent arbiter of the Hungarian question is the Hungarian people, and they will give the necessary answer to this cynical game.

Mr. PINOCHET (Chile) (interpretation from Spanish): In listening to some of the statements which have just been made, I wondered whether we were really considering outer space. I shall try to deal with the question of outer space in my statement.

Up until a few years ago, consideration of the question of the control of outer space in the United Nations might have appeared to some people as being not only premature but even laughable because of other international matters of great urgency. The possibility of man-made satellites penetrating into outer space occupied a handful of scientists. Suddenly, however, the entire picture changed on 4 October 1957, when for the first time in the history of man an artificial satellite entered outer space and remained in orbit. The Soviet Union earned the tribute of having started a new era for mankind, an era that has been called the inter-planetary era.

This example was quickly followed by the United States of America. Today it has been proved that a satellite can be placed in orbit. The United States and the Soviet Union have tried to go one step further by reaching the moon and other planets of the solar system.



(Mr. Pinochet, Chile)

Until a few years ago it was said, and perhaps correctly, that astronautics was not a science but an act of faith. We have gone beyond this and we have now reached the point where we can speak quite naturally of preparations for space travel and we can extend our concern for civilization into fields where only science fiction writers had previously travelled.

Before going into the juridical and political aspects of the question of the peaceful uses of outer space, I think it might be useful to summarize the situation as it now exists. At present a number of man-made satellites are moving in outer space at an approximate speed of 18,000 miles an hour, that is to say the speed necessary to counteract the force of gravity of the earth and remain equidistant from the earth. The spacial zone where these satellites move is known as the exósfera and is situated more than 300 miles from the earth. There are differences of opinion regarding this limit, but it is considered by some to be the limit of terrestrial atmosphere beyond which the last vestiges of air disappear and where outer space or inter-planetary space begins. Instead of giving the rocket a speed of 18,000 miles an hour, a 25,000-mile an hour speed will counteract gravitation and the satellite will enter space to search for areas which at present are limited to the moon alone. This distance is about 240,000 miles from the earth and might be reached by a rocket in about two or three days of spacial navigation. One third of this distance, that is to say 80,000 miles, was reached a few weeks ago by a United States rocket, the Pioneer. This is the man-made instrument which has gone the farthest from our planet. There can be no doubt that in a short time a rocket will be placed in a lunar orbit and will land on the moon.

It is believed that, of the other planets making up the solar system, Mars and Venus will be the next targets in this human adventure. These planets have an atmosphere similar to that of the earth, and this would make it easier for the rockets to land.

I prefer to stop at this point in this summary of possibilities. Many believe that before the year 2,000 these possibilities will become reality. However, I am sure that when future generations find that the solar system is too small for them, they will move on to other systems of our galaxy. After all, astronomers believe that there are at least 40 million stars in the Milky Way.

(Mr. Pinochet, Chile)

Much of this information has been gathered from various studies of unquestionable authorities. I refer to the report presented to President Eisenhower on 26 March 1958 by the Scientific Advisory Committee, which was presided over by Dr. James R. Killian, Jr.

Scientists agree -- scientists such as Dr. Werner von Braun and certain Soviet scientists -- that man is being pushed into space adventures by different motives. First, there is the spirit of adventure which is deeply rooted in man. There are questions of national prestige and scientific curiosity. There can be no doubt that the scientific results obtained will constitute the positive part of all this activity. Man-made satellites are already giving the scientists of the world valuable information on the following important subjects: solar energy, the magnetic field of the earth, electric currents, the gravity of the earth, meteorites and cosmic rays.

(Mr. Pinochet, Chile)

Artificial satellites in outer space can be of great importance in the field of meteorology. We need only consider that with our own observation points we can cover only 10 per cent of our own atmosphere and the phenomena that occur in the atmosphere.

Finally, let us not forget the information that we may gather from the satellites regarding the exact shape and dimensions of our planet and regarding the effects of the lack of gravity on the physiological and psychological functions of the human organism. They will obviously make it much easier to carry out intercontinental communication and, ultimately, television.

If the United States and the Soviet Union have merited the appreciation of humanity for their great achievements in the use of outer space, let us not forget that it was the International Council of Scientific Unions that made it possible to include all this in the programme for the International Geophysical Year and to include also the launching of satellites in that programme.

It is true that scientists lead the way, and events take place every day that were once considered beyond the reach of man. But life is a complex unit, and certain problems have emerged that can be solved only by jurists and statesmen. The first and most important of these problems -- no longer of the future but of the present -- is the question of who owns outer space. By the Paris Convention of 1919 and also by the Chicago Convention of 1944 the sovereignty of each State with respect to the air space over it was recognized. Article 1 of the Chicago Convention reads as follows:

"The contracting States recognize that each State has complete and exclusive sovereignty over the air space above its territory."

Since no limit is set on this air space, it must be taken as extending to the infinite, at least in theory -- for in practice no State could reasonably claim such space. Therefore, the solution would be found in limiting national outer space to a predetermined height. For example, the limit could be set at somewhere between 300 and 600 miles and it could be recognized that outer space is res extra commercium and can be enjoyed by all nations. Accordingly, article 1 of the Chicago Convention would have to be modified, or at least more clearly defined.

(Mr. Pinochet, Chile)

This position with regard to the free use of outer space has recently been ratified by international usage. In point of fact, neither the United States nor the Soviet Union sought authorization to send satellites into outer space, and I know of no claims made by any Government in this connexion.

Now we turn to the second problem. Can outer space be defined in the same way as the high seas? I think not; because of the peculiarities of outer space, it must be considered differently from the high seas. As an indication of this it is only necessary to recall that humanity could not feel secure if spaceships were constantly to weave back and forth over our heads with complete freedom. So we come to the following conclusion, which I should like to stress.

Outer space must be used under international control and only for peaceful purposes.

Some writers on international law tend to the view that the control of outer space should not extend to the infinite but should stop at an intermediate zone, beyond which interplanetary space would be absolutely free. This means, in short, that there would be three zones clearly delineated: the national zone of each State, the common controlled zone, and the absolutely free zone.

The third problem -- one which is not as far-fetched as some members of the First Committee may believe -- is this. Would we also declare the moon and other planets of our solar system to be common property or would they be declared res nullius, that is, capable of being taken over by States? Although this question may today have a purely theoretical importance, this is nevertheless another subject that will require solution soon. Especially will it have to be answered before we have to face the problem of the first arrival on the moon and the ensuing conflict of national supremacy over the moon.

Besides these juridical problems, there are certain political problems intimately related to them, especially referring to the control of outer space. These problems must all be studied concurrently. The solution of some might serve as the basis for the solution of others. A logical step would be to hand over the control of outer space either to a body of the United Nations or to a body linked with the United Nations. International lawyers have given extremely cogent reasons for this type of idea. At first sight it appears that it might

(Mr. Pinochet, Chile)

be sufficient to set up an ad hoc committee on the peaceful use of outer space as has been suggested by some delegations. This ad hoc committee would gather all possible information on all aspects of the problem, some of which present great difficulties, such as the problem of control itself. However, despite the foregoing, I believe that it would be appropriate to hand over, either now or later, the study of the juridical aspects of this question to the International Law Commission. The Commission could contribute to the solution of a considerable number of the problems, with the advice and assistance, of course, of the International Civil Aviation Organization, the World Meteorological Organization, the International Telecommunications Union, the International Council of Scientific Unions and the International Astronautical Federation.

It is very seldom that the international comity of nations represented by the United Nations has had a more interesting question to consider or a matter of greater responsibility than that of the taking up completely and from the very beginning of a matter of the importance of that with which we are dealing today. This must be understood by all, and especially by the two great Powers whose superb efforts have carried the activities of man beyond the limits of our own planet.

(Mr. Pinochet, Chile)

Without the close and friendly co-operation between the United States and the Soviet Union, no understanding on this extremely complex matter can be envisaged. Nor could we advance in any way if this question is stubbornly to be linked to other problems which are as yet unsolved. To judge by the repeated declarations of President Eisenhower and Mr. Khrushchev, there seems to be at least the right atmosphere to come to an agreement on the control of activities in outer space. The scientists of both countries also show themselves willing and ready to co-operate in it.

In the July 1958 issue of the Soviet magazine, USSR, on page 3, we read the following:

"The joint exploration of space on the part of Soviets and North Americans has in the future great possibilities of combining human knowledge and ability in one great united effort. It is the fervent hope of the Soviet scientists that these possibilities will become a reality."

I frankly see no insuperable barriers for this position of the scientists to be extended to the political Heads of States. In the meantime, we trust that outer space will become a means of union and not a new cause for discord between the great Powers.

A person venerated by the entire world, the late Pope Pius XII, said this at the Seventh International Astronautical Congress that was held in Rome in September 1956:

"The most audacious explorations of space can only serve to introduce a new cause of division between men unless concurrently there is a moral and more profound reflection, and a more conscious attitude regarding the higher interests of humanity".

Mr. AMBROSINI (Italy)(interpretation from French): The Italian delegation has asked to take part in the debate on cosmic space because, like other delegations, Italy considers that the problem of its exploration and possible use is of great interest for mankind as a whole. My delegation also considers that the United Nations study of this problem has become an urgent necessity lest this new human

(Mr. Ambrosini, Italy)

activity take a different or arbitrary tack which instead of facilitating, might well hinder the utilization of cosmic space or divert it to dangerous ends.

The Italian delegation is sure that it is the duty of all States to co-operate spontaneously and in close concert in this matter. For its part, it states at the very outset of its contribution that Italy is prepared to furnish such co-operation.

The Italian delegation wishes to outline in an objective and dispassionate manner, as the representative of Spain has already urged us to do, its conception of the problem and of some of the most urgent aspects thereof to the study and solution of these problems that the United Nations can most usefully contribute.

The International Geophysical Year inaugurated the era of the conquest of "cosmic space", "interplanetary space" or "outer space".

Happily, the first attempts to reach and explore such space enlisted the consent of all States. In fact, tacit and unanimous agreement obtained between these States in the sense of allowing, during the geophysical year, the launching and circulation of rockets and artificial satellites which practically overflowed all the territories of various States without any protest being made on the grounds of violation of sovereignty.

The USSR, and, immediately after, the United States obtained happy results in this field. They succeeded in orbiting sputniks and explorers whose radioelectric signals have already supplied fundamental information for the subsequent exploration of cosmic space; especially as regards the thickness of the ionized layer whose radiations could be fatal for human beings who in the near future might fly through it.

Of course, we still find ourselves at an experimental and in fact rudimentary stage -- and I apologize for using this term of this new achievement of human genius. Consequently, it is not yet possible to foretell concretely what may be the practical results, apart from the scientific uses, which man might draw from this. It is not yet possible to foretell whether other celestial bodies, which might be reached, will be more or less suited to the physical nature of man, and whether some of them are populated by thinking beings organized in communities with whom man might have relationships or possible differences.

(Mr. Ambrosini, Italy)

Nevertheless, we do already confront a new kind of technology which, applying the laws of celestial mechanics, enables man to fly about and circulate among the stars, that is, engaged -- to use a fashionable word -- in astronautics.

Here is a science and a practise which is still at an early stage, facing various difficulties, as shown by the various tests, known and unknown, which have failed.

But technology -- there is no doubt -- will make progress and will resolve the innumerable problems posed by astronautics. It will be helped to that end by the future utilization of atomic energy as a propellant.

There is, however, one matter which is of concern and which may hinder or retard subsequent success; and that is the vast financial burden to which this human activity gives rise. The figures cited by the representative of the USSR, who spoke this morning, were in the thousands of millions of dollars or even billions of dollars; and these financial burdens have, it would seem, prevented or discouraged countries which are in the front ranks of technology or science, to emulate Russia and the United States in the launching of artificial satellites.

These are technical and economic difficulties which may for that matter be more easily overcome by close and spontaneous co-operation between all States to the greater benefit of mankind.



(Mr. Ambrosini, Italy)

I have so far given a synthetic survey of the most immediate and arduous problems involved in astronautics and the conquest of cosmic space. But there is still another problem on which we should dwell at somewhat greater length in these precincts and which must be tackled as soon as possible, a problem no less grave than the technical problem and the financial problem, for unless it is tackled and adequately solved it may well hinder or disrupt progress in this new realm of human activity and genius. I am referring to the need to determine the juridical nature of cosmic space and, consequently, the ways, the means, and the possible limits -- I stress the word "limits" -- of its utilization. I am grateful to my colleague from Chile who, in his very able speech, has already referred to this aspect of the question.

Here is a problem which the lawyers have already pre-empted, and for good reason, since in any human activity which is new, interests are created which may give rise to disputes or differences, and they must be equitably and rationally regulated on the juridical plane lest confusion and anarchy arise.

The closest example at hand with which this topic would seem to a certain degree to converge is aviation, which also is the science and practice of human flight. Some have said in this connexion that the juridical rules already enforced for aviation can and must serve to a considerable degree for astronautics, except for accessory norms designed to adapt to the particularities of the latter.

This, however, is an oversimplification because, on the one hand, developments in astronautics are not yet known -- and here is a rule bequeathed to us by Roman wisdom that we should await the data of practical experience before settling a given phenomenon juridically -- and because, on the other hand, the basic problem in this matter, the question of the sovereignty of States, may arise in a profoundly different way for conventional aviation which uses machines that fly only through the air space than for astronautics which uses other kinds of machines which do not need air to travel through space.

(Mr. Ambrosini, Italy)

Unless we accept the opinion of some writers, according to whom, whenever international conventions (Paris, 1919; Chicago, 1944) state that a State has sovereignty in the air space above it, that sovereignty reaches usque ad sidera, to infinity, the problems must be solved in a different way. The representative of Chile, I think, adopted the solution that the sovereignty of States goes on ad infinitum.

This opinion has been quite properly rejected by most jurists because it is clearly at variance with the letter of these conventions, whose authors could not have had in mind anything other than air space, since the flying machines of their age could only sustain themselves and fly about in the atmospheric air which envelops the earth.

Having ruled out this odd interpretation and having noted that at the present stage no norms of international law define the legal nature of extra-atmospheric space, jurists have asked the question: What is or can be the juridical status of these lofty spaces? Can States pretend that their sovereignty projects beyond the air space and consider any part of these cosmic spaces to be part of their territories?

The solutions proposed to this difficult problem are multifarious and we cannot, at this stage of the debate examine all of them. I shall merely confine myself to mentioning the most interesting theories by virtue of the fact that they are based on elements of physical rather than juridical natures.

Some jurists have taken into consideration the gravitation of the earth and other planets. The outstanding American jurist, John Cobb Cooper, referred to gravitation at the outset of his profound study of the question. This is likewise the force invoked by the Argentinian, Carlos Pasini, the author of an original theory which has been endorsed by a colleague from Chile. More recently, this same force of gravitation was referred to by an authoritative Italian scholar, Arturo G. Crocco, and we shall in due course present to the Committee a note which we drafted and which we think is of great scientific interest.

(Mr. Ambrosini, Italy)

All these theories, however, have the grave shortcoming of including within the sovereignty of a State a space which is never fixed or determined and which changes incessantly through the effect of the rotation and revolution of the earth. This space would in fact have a conic form. Its point would be at the center of the earth, and it would rise through the frontiers of a State towards the sky. If we look at the earth in this light, the result will be a series of cones corresponding to various States, but these cones will be constantly changing their position in space following the movement of the earth.

Is it physically or juridically possible to conceive of sovereignty over air space which is never the same and which varies swiftly with the velocity of the earth's rotation? Certainly not, because this would lead to a conclusion which cosmographically and juridically would be absurd. It is for this reason, perhaps, that John Cooper abandoned his original theory and that he states today that the sovereignty of States extends only to the point where conventional air vehicles now in use can support themselves and fly about in air space, adding to this zone of full sovereignty a subsequent space which, following the example of the sea, he calls the "contiguous zone" where limited rights are to be exercised by States.

This theory has not been favoured by jurists, either because it is at variance with the letter of the Chicago Convention of 1944 or because some people simply do not see what useful purpose would be served by this zone, especially if it were to extend to the limit of the atmosphere, if it were to cover all of the air space.

Now I should very briefly like to talk about the theory that has been accepted by the majority of the jurists as the most rational way of considering this question -- that is to say, the theory that would limit sovereignty to air space. May I draw your attention to this. First of all, this theory agrees with the international conventions at present obtaining. But there is more to it. The atmosphere is an integral and constituent part of our planet of such an essential nature that without it men, animals and plants could no longer live.

(Mr. Ambrosini, Italy)

Furthermore, the atmosphere always follows the earth in its movements of rotation and revolution. It is inseparable from the earth. Finally, the atmosphere, the height of which is at present estimated to be approximately a hundred kilometres from the surface of the earth, is always the same in its components. It is logical therefore that air space, or atmospheric space, should be considered by the jurists, as it is at present, as being an integral part of the territory of a State and therefore subject to its sovereignty. Physical as well as juridical considerations fully justify this theory.

After having thus delimited the extension of sovereignty in altitude there still remains to be solved the problem of the juridical nature of extra-atmospheric space. It seems to us that, with justification for any sort of terrestrial sovereignty over these spaces being excluded, there is no other solution except to consider them as res communis omnium, as something belonging in its entirety to the whole world which all the world may freely use, and no part of which anyone may permanently occupy because, by so doing, he would hinder its use by others -- and by "the whole world" we understand all countries of the earth and, conceivably, all other communities of thinking and organized beings living on other planets, if there be such, of course.

In this sense our opinion differs from that which considers outer space as res nullius. We are opposed to this principle, for it would permit States to claim portions of outer space with whatever satellites, such as the Moon, may be found therein, on a basis of permanent title and sovereign powers.

The interests of humanity demand that these spaces be and remain open to all, with the exception of the necessary limitations and controls which must be set up to permit their equitable and co-ordinated use, avoiding abuse and conflict.

The formula which we would wish to see applied in this regard would be "free use of outer space under international control". It seems to me that everyone here is in agreement on this matter.

So far we have spoken of the free use of outer space, and essentially we wish this to refer to free use for non-military and peaceful purposes. But we have no illusions about the fact that, although outer space is described as res communis or, worse still, res nullius, States would nevertheless be able to utilize it in time of war for military purposes, just as is the case with the high seas. And this is where the problem is transformed, changing from a juridical one to a political one, and this change makes the problem much more difficult to solve.

It is fortunate that humanity is aware of the grave danger in this type of use -- danger in the future if not at present -- which must be avoided, and that the United Nations General Assembly should make every effort to declare such use illegal. We feel, in short, that the utilization of outer space for military purposes should be prohibited, and Italy declares itself here and now ready to agree with that point of view.

There is no need, in any case, to go into the military aspects of this difficult question, for they fall within the purview of the problem of disarmament, a problem upon which the Italian delegation has already elsewhere in the course of the discussion of this matter clearly expressed its point of view, and a problem upon which the Assembly has already given its decision. We know furthermore that two conferences are being held in Geneva on this very problem, and we hope that these conferences will be able to arrive at effective decisions. There is no point therefore in going back to those same problems at this time.

The Italian delegation is of the opinion that this Committee is convinced of the extreme importance of the subject we are discussing today and of the reasons which demand an urgent solution to the problem, reasons which have been very clearly stated in the proposal of the United States and in that of the Soviet Union. It seems needless to us to labour this point.

The Italian delegation furthermore feels that the competence of the United Nations to be seized of this problem cannot be doubted, not only because of the military repercussions which are inherent in it, but also because of the already emphasized need to confront this problem on an international basis with the co-operation of all States.

Having said this, the Italian delegation in conclusion would like to indicate the measures which we believe the Assembly should take in order to further the progress of study and experiment in outer space, namely:

1. First of all, to request all States to postpone the termination of the Geophysical Year, which has produced such good results especially in the problem we are now considering, and without occasioning any differences; and that this postponement should last until the Committee mentioned below shall have finished its work and submitted its recommendations to the Assembly;

(Mr. Ambrosini, Italy)

2. To set up, as the delegation of the United States has proposed in its memorandum, an ad hoc committee to undertake the necessary study and recommend special measures that the Assembly might adopt to guarantee that outer space shall be used only for the benefit of all humanity, that is to say, for purely peaceful purposes;

3. To charge this committee with the specific study of the juridical problems that arise regarding the exploration and utilization of outer space;

4. To recommend that this committee work in close co-operation with other organs or specialized agencies directly concerned with the problem such as, more especially, the International Civil Aviation Organization and the International Telecommunications Union.

Together with several other delegations our delegation intends to submit a draft resolution based on the principles and proposals which we have just presented to the Committee, for we are convinced that the decisions which the Assembly might render on the basis of these principles will constitute the most effective measures for a constructive attack on the problem of international co-operation in the peaceful utilization of outer space.

(Mr. Ambrosini, Italy)

Italy is extremely interested in the idea advanced from a number of quarters with respect to the establishment of an international centre for study and experiments related to outer space -- a centre whose task would be not only to gather information and co-ordinate programmes of various States, but also to encourage cosmic culture, as it were; to create a legion of experts, which is already so necessary and which will become even more necessary in the near future in order to prepare and implement these programmes.

In conclusion, I am happy to declare on **behalf** of my Government that Italy will extend all possible co-operation to this end and would be very pleased to welcome to Rome the above-mentioned international centre, if it were created under the auspices of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): There are no names on the list of speakers for this afternoon's meeting; three representatives have inscribed their names on the list of speakers for tomorrow morning's meeting. The Committee must bear in mind that in addition to the present item we still have three questions to debate. In those circumstances, it might be advisable to close the list of speakers on the present item tomorrow at 6 p.m. I am not making a formal declaration as Chairman that the list will be so closed, but am asking the Committee to weigh this possibility as one method of encouraging members to participate in the debate.

Since no one wishes to speak this afternoon, we shall be forced to cancel the afternoon meeting. The next meeting will be held tomorrow at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.