



UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY



LIMITED

A/C.1/PV.986

17 November 1958

ENGLISH

Thirteenth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE NINE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-SIXTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 17 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.986. Delegations may submit corrections to the summary record for incorporation in the final version which will appear in a printed volume.

AGENDA ITEM 60

QUESTION OF THE PEACEFUL USE OF OUTER SPACE (continued)

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

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): As members will recall, the list of speakers for today's debate was closed on Friday at 1 p.m. I shall read the names of the representatives on that list who will take part in the general debate on the question of the peaceful uses of outer space. They are the representatives of Romania, the United States of America, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Australia, Brazil, Canada, the Netherlands, Norway, the Union of South Africa, Haiti, Bulgaria, Cuba, Albania, Costa Rica, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Guatemala, Ceylon, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Yugoslavia, Iran, New Zealand, Japan, Hungary, Poland, Venezuela, Austria, Greece, Denmark, the United Arab Republic, Spain, Portugal, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Belgium, Indonesia, Bolivia, the Philippines, El Salvador, Turkey, Nepal, Uruguay and India.

The first speaker on the list for today is the representative of Romania.

Mr. BRUCAN (Romania): Before stating the position of the Romanian delegation on the item on the agenda I feel duty-bound briefly to refer to the statement made on the first day of our debate by Mr. Lodge, the delegate of the United States. It is disappointing indeed that whenever Mr. Lodge is running out of arguments to uphold the American policy -- which appears to be the case ever more often -- he chooses to resort to the same out-of-date rodomontade of the cold war. However, the world is fed up and dead-tired of hearing this ghost-scare type of propaganda. The world realizes how false and outmoded it sounds. And after all, one should not overestimate the ascetic virtues of this Committee's members. I shall therefore restrict myself to those remarks of Mr. Lodge which are within the scope of our debate.

I consider that the proper way to clear up this problem is to set forth the facts and only the facts, and to leave it to the members of the Committee to pass their own judgement upon their significance.

(Mr. Brucan, Romania)

What are the facts with regard to military bases? I shall, of course, refer to Romania, since it was one of the countries mentioned by Mr. Lodge in his statement.

The facts show that the Soviet forces which liberated Romania from fascist occupation are no longer on Romanian territory. There are no Soviet military bases in Romania. How did that happen? Last May, an agreement was concluded in Moscow between the Romanian and Soviet Union Governments, with the consent of the other members of the Warsaw Treaty, concerning the withdrawal from Romania of Soviet forces. By 15 August, this agreement had already been implemented; the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Romania had been completed.

In the light of those facts, what can be said about Mr. Lodge's allegation concerning the nature of the relationship between the socialist countries? How long will the United States representative continue to make statements which are proved to be manifestly divorced from reality? As a matter of fact, we are unable to notice any event of the kind to which I have referred in the dozens of countries where United States military bases are stationed, since the very nature of the inter-State relations within the Western military blocs is completely different. Mr. Lodge stated here that the United States forces are stationed in foreign countries by mutual consent, by freely-expressed consent, and that they will leave those bases whenever they are requested to do so.

In this respect, I should like to recall a single fact: On two occasions -- in December 1956 and January 1958 -- elections held in Okinawa, the largest United States base in the Western Pacific, apparently indicated an expression of the population's demand that United States forces should leave the Island. The entire international Press, including that in the United States, unanimously recorded that request. The New York Times of 19 January 1958, in an editorial, had this to say: "The result was a blow to United States prestige in the Far East, but American officials felt that it had to be accepted". It was indeed accepted, but the United States bases in Okinawa are still there. Those are the facts, the hard facts. There is an old saying in the United States -- and Mr. Lodge should be familiar with it -- to this effect: "What you are doing, Sir, speaks so loudly that I cannot hear what you are saying".

(Mr. Brucan, Romania)

I turn now to the item on the agenda. There is no doubt that the launching of man-made satellites has opened a new and glorious page of history and that the Soviet man has again proved to be the true pioneer of our era. But, like the other great discovery of human genius -- the splitting of the atom -- the exploration of outer space has raised the problem of the end to which this achievement will be used by man: for new and gigantic progress by civilization, or for its destruction; that is, for peaceful or for military aims.

So far as international scientific co-operation for the exploration of outer space is concerned, these activities have already begun and are being fruitfully carried on under the aegis of the International Geophysical Year. Certainly, new methods can be found to promote and broaden this international scientific co-operation. The major problem confronting the United Nations, however, is to release mankind from the nightmare of a nuclear war -- a nightmare to which the mastering of outer space missiles has added a new and paramount dimension. One cannot forget that the main task of the United Nations has been and remains the safeguarding of peace and international security. One cannot, therefore, help but be puzzled by the course followed by some Western delegations with regard to the present item of our agenda.

Sometimes one gets the impression that the First Committee, which is supposed to be the political committee of the General Assembly, has been turned into a philosophical seminar absorbed in speculation about the secrets of the cosmos, or into a juridical forum where passionate opinions concerning the law of outer space are advanced with ever-increasing fervour. One of these representatives even went so far as to say that touching upon the military aspect of outer space would constitute diversion; this aspect, it seems, might disturb the olympic serenity required by these lofty philosophical speculations.

I should not like to be misunderstood. I am not minimizing either the philosophical or the juridical aspect of outer space. For the time being, however, we have a different mandate from our peoples -- namely, to avoid and prevent the catastrophe which might come from or through outer space. That is why we are here in this First Committee.

Anew the magic word "constructive" resounded in this house. In other words, the claim is that whoever shows himself to be concerned with the danger for mankind from the use of outer space for military purposes is not "constructive".

I remember that at the time we were discussing the nuclear tests we were told that to be constructive means to refrain from any decision concerning the cessation of these tests. Now we are told that "constructive" means not even to discuss the banning of the military use of outer space. I am afraid that if we continue to display such "constructive" attitudes, we will reach a point where we all will be destroyed for good. I feel it is fair to recall that the item on our agenda contains the banning of the use of outer space for military purposes, the abolishing of military bases on foreign territories and international co-operation in studying outer space.

We have before us a Soviet Union comprehensive proposal dealing with the whole matter. It indicates concrete and precise ways for its solution in keeping with the interests of peace and security. I consider that its recommendations for international scientific co-operation proceed from the experience obtained in other and similar fields, namely, that a full and sincere co-operation of this kind is made possible only if the danger of using outer space for military purposes is removed.

During the last session, the United States and other Western Powers showed a quite unusual interest for the military aspect of outer space. This interest was clearly expressed in President Eisenhower's letter of 12 January 1957.

What happened in the meantime? Why have the United States and its allies lost interest in this matter? Did anything occur that removed the ground of the concern shown not long ago by the United States leaders and its allies? If such be the case, we would not witness this frantic speed-up in the missiles and rockets race, this feverish haste in research and experiments in outer space, this tremendous increase of expenditures in this field, which causes even to the huge machinery of the American budget severe breathing troubles.

The true and hard fact is that the Western Powers, far from losing interest in the actual military use of outer space, find it impossible to deal with it in disarmament negotiations from their old position of strength. Apparently, this position of strength does not work at all when they get to outer space.

Let us dwell on this point. The United States delegation stated here on 13 November that it maintains the position taken during the London talks in the Disarmament Sub-Committee with regard to outer space. The gist of this position is the detachment from the whole disarmament question of one single item -- the intercontinental ballistic missiles, and to conclude an agreement on its banning. This exception taken by the Western Powers cannot fail to puzzle everybody.

How come that, when they get to outer space, the Western Powers are willing to detach it and to conclude an agreement without any conditions? As is well known, in all disarmament matters, including such a relatively simple one like the **nuclear** tests, these Powers were and are linking the conclusion of an agreement with various conditions. Moreover, when they deal with outer space, the Western Powers are willing to consider the peril the intercontinental ballistic missile might bring upon mankind, whereas, when we come to nuclear weapons, they forget about the humanitarian facet of the problem and maintain that priority should be given to their interests of security.

In his statement concerning outer space, Mr. Lodge said here, and I quote:

"... despite all the things that divide us, we are all men living together on the same planet and are all affected by these newest triumphs of human ingenuity and labour." (A/C.1/PV.983, page 21)

This is, however belated, an important recognition to which we all adhere. Yet I cannot help but ask a question: If when we get to outer space we are all human beings, then, when we get to nuclear weapons what are we? For it is crystal clear that the real and appalling danger for mankind is not the rockets -- no matter if they are travelling through atmosphere or outer space -- but their nuclear warheads, with their monstrous destructive power.

We are touching now the very basic concept of the Western position on armaments. The strategists of the nuclear race contend that these weapons should be maintained, because they act as a deterrent against a new war. Why, then, do they not go further with this theory, and why do they not consider as a deterrent the weapons of outer space? For this conclusion derives from the logic of their entire strategic concept.

While on all disarmament matters the United States and the United Kingdom rely on the theory of the balance of terror, which they say will prevent war; while in all negotiations on disarmament they link each item with other items or conditions, when we get to outer space, all of a sudden they are ready to forget about the balance of terror, and at the same time to consider the problem of outer space independently, free from any other disarmament measure or condition. Where is the logic of this position? It is clear that the strategists of the balance of terror and of the deterrent find themselves entangled in their own nets. The whole Western concept of armaments, built amidst hardships all along the interminable disarmament talks, proved to be precarious and out-moded when the first Sputnik appeared in the sky. It seems that they did not realize the magnitude of this new development until recently. It takes some time to appraise realistically the new dimension added to armament and disarmament by the mastering of outer space missiles.

The only conclusion that should be drawn by the Western Powers is that the policy of force has long ceased to be a good adviser in disarmament matters. It is high time to proceed from an equal regard for the security of all parties, and to renounce tactics which seek to gain advantages for one party to the detriment of the other one. This is the very spirit guiding the Soviet proposal concerning the banning of the use of outer space for military purposes, along with the elimination of military bases on foreign territories, particularly in Europe, the Near and Middle East and North Africa.

These two disarmament aspects are inextricably linked to each other, as has been fully demonstrated here. Indeed, banning intercontinental ballistic missiles only because they pass through outer space, and accepting the use of intermediate-range missiles only because they pass through atmosphere, would secure a military advantage for the American bases encircling the socialist countries.

(Mr. Brucan, Romania)

The United States bases are not only a menace to peace, but they also hinder the solution of important international issues. An extremely abnormal situation has been created. On the one hand, the United States is building military bases and is sending its troops thousands of miles away from their home and close to the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Whenever the question of tension and of military build-up in one area or another is brought up for a settlement, the United States strategists argue that if they were to withdraw their troops back home, they would be too far from the area, while Soviet troops would be too near to it. Suffice it to mention the German question, the Korean question and other international issues upon which a solution cannot be reached for this very reason.

Thus, a peculiar situation has arisen: the Power which maintains its troops within its borders, or very close to them, is always in a disadvantageous position, while the Power which has set up huge war machinery encompassing almost four continents tries to use this encroachment upon all international standards as an asset. It follows that in order to find a solution acceptable to the United States strategists, the Soviet forces would have to leave their own territory for another continent. Thus, the United States military bases have become the main stumbling block preventing the solution of the most acute international issues.

This is one more reason, and a very important one, why the United Nations should take up the banning of the military use of outer space together with the elimination of foreign military bases.

Mr. JOHNSON (United States of America): I am very pleased to be able today to share this great privilege and responsibility with my long-time friend Ambassador Lodge and other members of the United States delegation, especially my trusted and beloved associate, Senator Mansfield, and the very able and patriotic Senator from Iowa, Mr. Hickenlooper.

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

I come today with one purpose. I am here to express to you the essential unity of the American people in their support of the goals of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.220) offered now in their name. This draft resolution is presented, as our system requires, by the representative of the Executive Branch of our Government. I speak here today at its request.

The Executive position in the United States is held by the Republican Party through the mandate of the people. I am here as a member of one House of the Legislative Branch in which the majority position is held -- also at the mandate of the people -- by the Democratic Party, of which I am a member. These are distinctions. They are not, on this draft resolution, differences.

On the goal of dedicating outer space to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind, there are no differences within our government, between our parties, or among our people. The Executive and the Legislative branches of our Government stand together. United we stand.

There need, it seems to me, to be no differences among us here. The very opportunity of the issue before this Assembly is to erase the accumulated differences of our earth's long and troubled history and to write across the vastness of space a proud new chapter of unity and peace. Men have not faced such a moment of opportunity before.

Until now, our strivings toward peace have been heavily burdened by legacies of distrust and fear and ignorance and injury. Those legacies do not exist in space. They will not appear there unless we send them on ahead. To keep space as man has found it and to harvest the yield of peace which it promises, we of the United States see one course, and only one, which the nations of the earth may intelligently pursue. That is the course of full and complete and immediate co-operation to make the exploration of outer space a joint adventure.

There is, I emphasize, no other course. In saying this, I express no personal belief alone, but, rather, I convey to you the conviction of my countrymen and the force of the American decision which has already been established. The American people, through their elected representatives in the Congress, have already spoken their aims and their purposes. The will of the people is now fixed, in our laws and in our policies. The end is peace. The means to that end is international co-operation. This is, and this will remain, the American decision.

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

Eleven months ago, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, of which I am Chairman, submitted to the United States Senate a report on an exhaustive inquiry into the satellite and missile programme of the United States. In that report, the bi-partisan membership of the Subcommittee made this unanimous declaration:

"The immediate objective is to defend ourselves, but the equally important objective is to reach the hearts and minds of men everywhere so that the day will come when the ballistic missile will be merely a dusty relic in the museums of mankind and men everywhere will work together in understanding".

The Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament, under the able leadership of Senator Humphrey, had recommended unanimously that the use of space for military purposes be banned. The Subcommittee has also urged international co-operation for peaceful space exploration and development.

On 29 July of this year, the Congress, in an Act signed by the President, established in the Executive branch an agency under civilian control to guide and direct our national efforts in the exploration of space. By the Act creating this agency, Congress embedded in the permanent law of the United States the following declaration of policy:

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

"The Congress hereby declares that it is the policy of the United States that activities in space should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind."

Further, in the same section of that Act, Congress stated as a firm objective of the national efforts the following:

"Cooperation by the United States with other nations and groups of nations in work done pursuant to this Act and in the peaceful application of the results thereof."

Subsequent to that, the great Majority Leader of the House of Representatives, the Honourable John McCormack, introduced in that body a resolution expressly requesting the President of the United States to submit to the United Nations the question of international co-operation in dedicating outer space to peaceful purposes only.

That resolution received the earnest support of the full membership of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House and it was adopted unanimously by the full membership of the House of Representatives.

In the Senate, the Foreign Relations Committee, under the chairmanship of the Honourable Theodore Green, likewise accorded to the resolution the most serious study and then recommended without dissent that it be adopted. The Senate of the United States -- like the House of Representatives -- gave to the resolution the unanimous support of the Senators of both parties.

Thus, it is a matter of record that the sense of the full membership of the Congress of the United States is that this question should be here on the agenda of the nations of the world. It is also the congressional view that this Organization should assume the responsibility of leadership in promoting international co-operation in the exploration of outer space. This is the American decision, expressed firmly in the resolutions of policy by the elected representatives of the people and established solidly by them in the cornerstone law of our nation's space effort.

The draft resolution before this Assembly now embodies fully the will of the Congress and the will of the people whom the members of the Congress serve. Thus I can -- and I do -- commend it to you for adoption. The record already made assures you the continuing support of the Congress for the co-operative endeavours toward peaceful uses of outer space which this draft resolution contemplates.

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

The full dimensions of the promise of space are now beyond the scope of our knowledge and our imagination. To presume that we have more now than merely a glimpse of those dimensions would be both a vain and, perhaps ultimately, a fatally limiting error. At this moment, the nations of the earth are explorers in space, not colonizers. Hence, it is proper that this Assembly should provide, first, the means for the United Nations to encourage and inspire that exploration. That is contemplated in the form of this draft resolution which would create an exploratory ad hoc Committee of representatives of Member nations to carry out the following tasks:

First, to inventory the activities and resources of the United Nations;

Second, to determine areas of international co-operation and programmes which could be undertaken under auspices of this Organization;

Third, to consider the future form of internal organization in the United Nations which would best facilitate full international co-operation in this field; and,

Finally, to survey the nature of the legal problems which may arise in implementation of this joint adventure among the nations of the earth.

These are essential first steps. Until these explorations are conducted, orderly procedure to the broader horizons beyond will not be possible. Thus, to impede this first step is to impede all progress toward the goals of peace which men of faith believe exist in the realms of space. While these are first steps, they are decisive steps and we cannot be unmindful of the precedents which, if established now, may influence or even control the longer steps ahead.

We of the United States have recognized, and do recognize, as must all men, that the penetration into outer space is the concern of all mankind. All nations and all men -- without regard to their roles on earth -- are affected alike by what is accomplished over their heads in outer space.

If nations proceed unilaterally, then their penetrations into space become only extensions of their national policies on earth. What their policies on earth inspire -- whether trust or fear -- so their accomplishments in outer space will inspire also.

For nations given to aggression and war and tyranny on earth, unilateral success in space technology would only multiply many times over their threat to

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

peace. Thus, it is the interest of nations that are dedicated to peace and freedom that the opportunity of space not be perverted to the end of aggression and control over earth by the aggressors. Recognizing this as true, men of peace will fully recognize the necessity to proceed without delay on the first step which is here proposed.

Today outer space is free. It is unscarred by conflict. No nation holds a concession there. It must remain this way.

We of the United States do not acknowledge that there are landlords of outer space who can presume to bargain with the nations of the earth on the price of access to this new domain. We must not -- and we need not -- corrupt this great opportunity by bringing to it the very antagonisms which we may, by courage, overcome and leave behind forever if we proceed with this joint adventure into this new realm.

What man has done, thus far, has been the result directly of international co-operation on an informal basis by men of science through the years. The success, further, of the formal co-operation undertaken in observance of the International Geophysical Year foretells the high promise offered by enlargement of our goals and intensification of our support and our efforts.

We know the gains of co-operation. We know the losses of failure to co-operate. If we fail now to apply the lessons that we have learned, or even if we delay their application, we know that the advances into space may only mean adding a new dimension to warfare. If, however, we proceed along the orderly course of full co-operation, we shall by the very fact of co-operation make the most substantial contribution toward perfecting peace. Men who have worked closely together to reach the stars are not likely to descend together into the depths of war and desolation.

It is the American vision, I believe, that out of this fresh start for humankind which space affords man, we may, at last, free him of the waste of guarding himself against ignorance of his neighbours. Barriers between us will fall as our sights rise to space. Secrecy will cease to be. Man will come to understand his fellow man -- and himself -- as never he has been able to do. In the infinity of the space adventure, man can find growing richness of mind, of spirit, and of liberty.

BHS/ihl

A/C.1/PV.986
24-25

(Mr. Johnson, United States)

The promise of this moment of opportunity is great.

We of the United States believe that this Assembly will honour the moment and fulfill the opportunity -- and all mankind will be the beneficiary of your courage.

Mr. KISELEV (Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic) (interpretation from Russian): The question of the use of outer space and the elimination of foreign bases on the territories of other countries, which we are now discussing, is one of signal importance for the nations of the world. During the past year, we have witnessed events which may truly be described as historic. Science has made advances and discoveries which place their stamp on the whole era in which we live. The launching of artificial earth satellites, first achieved in the Soviet Union, has inaugurated for mankind the century of the harnessing of the cosmos. What previously the best minds of mankind could only dream of has entered into everyday life. Literally with every day that passes, the time is drawing nigh when cosmic space will reveal its secrets to mankind, when flights of interplanetary ships will become as commonplace as the flights of aircraft in our time.

The outstanding achievements of science naturally exert their influence on all aspects of social and political life in countries throughout the world -- and this includes the military and strategic aspects.

The successes of the scientists of many countries, especially of the Soviet Union, in harnessing the cosmos are well known. Let me remind you that at the present time the earth is being circled by the third Soviet sputnik, weighing 1,327 kilogrammes, and three United States satellites with a total weight of 29.5 kilogrammes. As is well known, the launching of these satellites was carried out as part of the programme of the International Geophysical Year. We note as a positive fact this international co-operation of scientists from sixty-five countries in carrying out the International Geophysical Year programme. It has now been decided to prolong the International Geophysical Year until 31 December 1959. Six thousand stations and observatories and 200 magnetic observatories, including fifteen in Antarctica and thirty-five in equatorial regions, are taking part in the carrying out of this scientific programme. Large-scale Antarctic exploration is being carried out, with the participation of twelve States.

A vast contribution to the carrying out of the multifarious activities of the IGY programme has been made by Soviet scientists, including Byelorussian scientists. Soviet explorers have made significant discoveries in the Arctic and the Antarctic, in the ocean depths and on the mountain heights covered with eternal ice.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The Soviet and United States artificial earth satellites are helping to solve the most complex problems connected with the harnessing of outer space. As another example, I would refer to the launching in the Soviet Union on 27 August 1958 of a single-stage geophysical rocket which reached a calculated height of 450 kilometres. In this rocket was installed geophysical apparatus for complex investigation of the upper strata of the atmosphere, weighing 1,690 kilogrammes. Moreover, in a specially designed cabin, two dogs were placed in the rocket for experimental purposes. At the end of its flight this rocket came down accurately in the assigned area, and the experimental animals were in good condition after coming down to earth from a height of 450 kilometres.

The spirit of mutual understanding and mutual co-operation between the scientists of various countries participating in the IGY programme constitutes an example that might be followed in the carrying out of joint scientific undertakings in other realms of science, especially in the study of cosmic space. The General Assembly has welcomed the increasing international co-operation of scientists in the study of outer space. However, I must say quite bluntly that this co-operation on the part of scientists from many countries will not yield the desired results and will not be fully effective so long as a solution of the question of the prohibition of the utilization of cosmic space for military purposes acceptable to all countries has not been devised.

The facts make it clear that now, owing to the present international situation, the efforts of many States are being directed mainly in the direction of the utilization of cosmic space for military purposes. Increasing resources are being allocated for the development of new types of rocket weaponry. The New York Times of 14 January of this year had this to say:

"In 1952, two cents out of every dollar of the military budget was allocated for the development of rockets. In 1957 the figure rose to fifteen cents, and in 1958-59 it will rise to twenty-four cents."

To judge from the words of this newspaper, the rocket expenditures for 1959 will cost \$30 for every inhabitant of the United States.

The representative of the United States, Mr. Lodge, speaking in this Committee on 13 November of this year, advocated effective United Nations measures in the field of disarmament to study methods through which outer space would be used for peaceful purposes only.

(Mr. Misselev, Byelorussian SSR)

An agreement on the aspects of outer space relevant to disarmament, said Mr. Lodge, relates to the future. We cannot wait for a comprehensive disarmament agreement. And the representative of the United States sought vigorously to convince the Committee that it was necessary to separate the question of the use of outer space for peaceful purposes from the problem of disarmament.

On 13 November of this year Mr. Lodge submitted to this Committee for its consideration an American draft resolution. And just a few minutes ago we heard a statement from the representative of the United States, Mr. Johnson, who, as I saw it, confirmed the basic thoughts, proposals and ideas to be found in Mr. Lodge's speech and in the draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation and some other delegations. I did not see any shading of difference in this speech. The draft resolution which Mr. Johnson also supports sets out the position of the Government of the United States on the question under consideration. It passes over in silence altogether the military aspects of the problem of cosmic space and has nothing to say on the dismantling of the multifarious American military bases on foreign territories from which attacks can be carried out upon the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and other socialist countries.

What accounts for so one-sided an approach to the solution of the problem of outer space? The ruling circles of the United States, having become convinced that the Soviet Union possesses inter-continental ballistic rockets that the legend of United States rocket superiority and the myth of the invulnerability and the remoteness of the United States have burst like so many soap bubbles, set themselves the task of protecting themselves against the danger of retaliatory blows, and to that end prohibiting the use of inter-continental ballistic rockets in cosmic space for military purposes without liquidating at the same time a single one of their military bases from which rockets -- medium and short range rockets -- can be launched against the Soviet Union and other peace loving States. This is a manifest and patent attempt to place the Soviet Union in an unfavourable strategic situation.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

But if the United States is concerned and alarmed as regards its own security, why not go along the path which would follow the interest of peace and security for the peoples of all countries. It is well known that in itself the inter-continental rocket presents no danger. However, any rocket can in addition to military purposes also serve as a carrier of atomic and hydrogen warheads. By the use of inter-continental rockets, nuclear weapons can be delivered to any point on the globe. But the danger -- let me make this clear -- resides in the rocket's nuclear warhead, not the rocket itself. So if there is any solicitude for the peace and security of the peoples, if there is any desire to make sure that inter-continental rockets should not be used for military purposes, then what has to be done is to prohibit the atomic and hydrogen weapons, eliminate this weapon from the armaments of States and liquidate the stockpiles thereof.

The representatives present here realize full well that the United States, in speaking of the prohibition of the military uses of outer space has in mind first of all the prohibition of the military use of inter-continental ballistic rockets which, in the event of war, can endanger the territory of the United States. However, the United States wants to keep its hands on other types of weapons which it can use to endanger the security of peace-loving States, as it has before. At the current session of the General Assembly the representatives of the United States have not said one word about the liquidation of American military bases on foreign territories where large aviation forces, armed with atomic and hydrogen bombs, are stationed. It is a well known fact that these bases are designed for military action against the Soviet Union, the Chinese People's Republic and other socialist countries. In their military plans the ruling circles of the United States have assigned a signal role to these military bases which are situated hundreds and thousands of miles from American territory.

As the former Assistant to the Defense Secretary of the United States, Mr. Hoopes, writes in Foreign Affairs for October 1958:

"At the present time American forces are stationed in about thirty-five individual countries and territories, apart from other areas. More than one million Americans are engaged in military activity abroad."

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The well known commentator, Joseph Alsop, in an article in the Saturday Evening Post said:

"The American Strategic Air Force has no less than 400 air bases in the NATO countries, plus a large number of bases in other regions of the world. The air bases of the American Strategic Air Force are scattered from Turkey to Okinawa, and from Greenland to Texas."

But American military bases pose a threat not only to the security of the Soviet Union and of other socialist countries, American military bases are so many advanced marshalling points set up for the struggle against the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples for the purpose of subjecting the policies of the countries where the bases are situated to American influence. The military bases play a sui generis role, if I may so call it, of the local gendarmerie in the countries where they are situated.

Rather enlightening in this respect was an American article in the Wall Street Journal of 22 May of this year which said, inter alia:

"American punitive forces, situated in the United States and on hundreds of bases in foreign territories, are at the present time more numerous than in any other peace-time period. The presence of a punitive detachment is convenient in the sense of forestalling any danger to the interest of the United States in the form of violence -- palace coups and 'local' wars."

One could not put it more clearly.

On page 50 of his book, The Great Renunciation, the well known Indian sociologist Harin Shakha, who published this book in New Delhi in 1957, had the following to say:

"Foreign military bases do not enhance the security of the country on whose territory they are situated, but undermine its security because they bring to that country cold war, fear and suspicion."

The Governments of the countries in whose territories American military bases are situated should be aware of the fact that these bases, in our time, so far from helping strengthen peace, achieve the contrary effect of subjecting to retaliatory blows the territories of those countries where they have been set up.

AP/ds

A/C.1/PV.986

34-35

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

There is no doubt that the liquidation of all foreign military bases on the territory of other countries would contribute to the establishment of confidence between States, the relaxation of international tension, and the strengthening of peace and security throughout the world.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

After the launching of the first artificial earth satellite, the Government of the United States made strenuous efforts to locate on the territories of other countries so-called atomic support groups armed with the latest models of rocket missiles with atomic and hydrogen warheads. All of this has been done on the spurious pretext of the restoration of a balance of military force and the creation of a counterweight for the Soviet intercontinental rocket.

Mr. Merten, a member of the Defence Committee of the West German Bundestag, said on 30 April 1958 that the NATO Command plans to set up in the West European member countries of NATO -- Great Britain, France, Italy and a number of other countries -- 1248 rocket launching pads, more than half of them on West German territory. We should pay particular attention to the behaviour of the Government of Italy which has agreed to the establishment of American rocket bases on its own territory on the ground that these bases are essential, as it puts it, for the strengthening of Italy's defence structure. The representative of Italy, Mr. Ambrosini, in his speech in this Committee on 12 November of this year, had a good deal to say about the juridical aspects of outer space. Surely the controversy among jurists throughout the world on the question of the legal status of cosmic space and of celestial bodies therein and on the point that the celestial bodies cannot be appropriated by any State is one that is worthy of our attention. But in our opinion juridical problems are not, after all, the main point with which we are dealing. Mr. Ambrosini also said here that the General Assembly should take all measures to outlaw the military use of outer space. He feels that the military utilization of cosmic space must be prohibited and, as he puts it, "Italy declares itself here and now ready to agree with that point of view."

(A/C.1/PV.982, page 57). In advocating the prohibition of the use of outer space for military purposes, the representative of Italy chose to pass over in silence the fact that the Italian Government has concluded with the United States an agreement for the placement and construction on Italian territory of American bases for the launching of medium-range missiles of the "Jupiter" and "Thor" types. It is surely proper to ask the representative of Italy against whom he proposes to use these rocket bases. The answer is forthcoming from the American press, which candidly states that these bases are directed against the Soviet Union and other Socialist countries.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The placement of rocket bases in so thickly populated a country as Italy is a particularly dangerous sort of thing to do. The ruling circles of Italy have tried to minimize this danger and to set at rest the fear and alarm of the Italian people. More and more references are made to the alleged defensive character of rocket bases. For example, Mr. Cengni, the Defence Minister of Italy, said on 30 September of this year:

"The acquisition of missiles with atomic warheads is essential for the strengthening of Italy's defensive structure."

However, the placement of military missile bases on Italian territory has given rise to vigorous protests on the part of Italian public opinion.

The former Prime Minister of Italy, Ferruccio Parri, wrote at the beginning of this year in the journal Ponte:

"Is it in harmony with our interests, with the interests of Europe and with the interests of the world to adopt the NATO plan for the establishment of missile bases in Europe? No, it is not in harmony; it is at variance with these interests. In the intention to put us forward as the strategic advance lines of the NATO group there is something cowardly, there is something of a delusory character which ought to be condemned. The new NATO plan serves not to defend us against the danger but to subject us to greater danger than ever before."

Here is one of the sound and intelligent voices that express the feelings of the Italian people.

The spuriousness of talk about the necessity of American naval, air and rocket bases for defence is striking. It is well known that the placement of such rocket bases with atomic warheads dooms the territory of such countries as the Federal Republic of Germany, Italy and others where these rocket and missile bases are located, to the role of a natural target for crushing retaliatory blows. Such possible consequences should not be forgotten by the Governments of these countries. This also applies to the representative of Spain, who took over the rather thankless mission in this Committee of justifying the military policy of the United States, even though it has been criticized, and quite properly so, in all parts of the world.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The setting up of military bases in the countries of Western Europe has nothing in common with the interests of the national security of these countries and peoples. It is small wonder, therefore, that the peoples have come out vigorously against the placement of American military bases on the territories of their countries. The General Assembly should issue a warning to all of mankind that the setting up of American military bases is intensifying the alarming situation which besets the world and which is fraught with the danger of catastrophe. The more fully the peoples are alive to this danger, the more difficult it will be to push them down the inclined plane towards catastrophe. This will make more difficult the task of those peoples who continue to play with the destinies and the security of people throughout the world.

The Government of the Soviet Union quite properly has requested that the question of outer space be solved on the basis of the strengthening of universal security, the elimination of threats against the Soviet Union and other peace-loving States. To that end, the delegation of the Soviet Union has submitted its draft resolution of 7 November 1958 calling for the prohibition of the military use of cosmic space; for an obligation to be assumed by States to launch rockets into outer space only in accordance with co-ordinated and agreed international programmes; for the liquidation of foreign bases on the territory of other countries especially in Europe, the Near and Middle East and North Africa; for the establishment of a United Nations organ for international co-operation in the realm of the study of outer space. These proposals are in line with the desire to place the scientific and technical achievements of mankind at the service of the peaceful needs of man and to make a comprehensive contribution to the strengthening of international peace and security.

(Mr. Kiselev, Byelorussian SSR)

The proposals of the delegation of the Soviet Union take into account the proposals set forth in the draft resolution of the delegations of the United States and other countries for the peaceful uses of cosmic space. But the proposals of the delegation of the Soviet Union are more far-reaching; they would provide safeguards for all countries of the world inasmuch as the elimination of foreign military bases is one of the prime requisites for the relaxation of international tension and reduction of the danger of war. These proposals respond to the aspirations and wishes of the peoples of all countries of the world, who consider -- and quite properly so -- that American military bases with their stockpiles of atomic and hydrogen weapons, situated thousands of miles from the shores of the United States, are one of the fundamental causes of international tension.

It should be pointed out that the Soviet proposals envisage close co-operation among all States within the framework of the United Nations. The proposals of the delegation of the Soviet Union are truly in harmony with the long-overdue need to put an end to the armaments race and to remove the danger of war on our planet. The proposals of the Soviet Union open the door to a concerted search for mutually acceptable solutions within the framework of the United Nations. It is the task of the current session of the General Assembly to make a signal contribution to the cause of peace in the solution of this exceptionally important problem of the prohibition of the military use of cosmic space and the elimination of foreign military bases in the territories of other countries. The peace and security of the entire world to a considerable extent hang on the solution of these problems.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): I wish to announce that, besides the observers that I mentioned last Friday, we have with us participating in the general debate on the question of the peaceful uses of outer space an observer from the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Mr. WALKER (Australia): Speaking in the general debate in plenary session, the Australian Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Casey, remarked that when future ages look back on the past year, it may well be that what they will remember will be the Russian and American earth-circling satellites, and not the political quarrels and tensions that loom so large in our minds at the present time.

I suppose that twenty years ago, if we had been invited to bet on the prospects of artificial satellites and moon shots within our lifetime, most of us would have been reluctant to take the bet. But yesterday's flights of imagination are becoming the achievements of today. The successful launching of satellites is a triumph of the human brain and will, and future ages will pay tribute to the men who were the leaders in this spectacular scientific and technological advance. Their achievement is great, measured as an advance on what science and industry has done in the past, but it is even greater as a foundation for future progress. The satellites of today will probably bear the same relation to future space activities as the primitive oxcart does to the most modern forms of transportation.

Our subject today is the peaceful use of outer space; but our very emphasis on the word "peaceful" reflects the unhappy facts that man's space activities can also be directed towards other than peaceful purposes. It would be naive on our part to close our eyes to the scientific and technical realities, for it is well known that man's success in launching peaceful research satellites has utilized knowledge and experience that are also being applied to the development of long-range missiles. It is a sobering, even terrifying, thought that our present capacity to place these artificial satellites in orbit, and possibly to shoot a rocket to the moon, has much in common, from a technical viewpoint, with man's capacity to hurl engines of mass destruction from one country to another. Moreover, if peaceful satellites can be placed in orbit for scientific experimental purposes, it would not seem to be a very great technical step, though it would be a major political and moral one, to develop satellites that can be used for various military purposes, including the nuclear bombardment of other countries as well as intelligence observations.

The scientific advances that have given us the satellites undoubtedly have also greatly complicated the technical aspects of international security and disarmament. They have certainly added new emphasis to the importance of

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

effective measures of control to ensure the observance of such disarmament agreements as may be made. The resulting technical problems must surely figure prominently in the technical discussions that are beginning in Geneva on measures against surprise attack. But the recent advances in space technology cannot be said to have changed the fundamental nature of the political problems of international security and the reduction of armaments by international agreement. We all know from bitter experience how difficult those problems are, and it would be a serious error, in the view of the Australian delegation, to insist that they must be disposed of before we face up to the need for an international approach to the issues arising in the peaceful use of outer space. My observations on the present occasion will be confined to the latter subject.

For this question of outer space is, at least potentially, much more far-reaching than its bearing on the security and disarmament problem. There can be no doubt that the human race stands at the threshold of a new era, vastly different from anything that has gone before. It is conceivable, of course, that our national and ideological rivalries and our failure to solve the problems of living together in peace may prevent mankind from ever passing beyond that threshold. There is a danger that human civilization may perish by man's internecine strife and that such human life as remains on our planet may return to the dark ages rather than advance into the new universe that science has brought within man's reach. It is the reality of this danger that makes the peace preservation work of the United Nations absolutely vital at this stage of human history. But it is also our responsibility to look ahead to the world that is emerging, which will be our world provided our efforts to keep the peace are successful. This new world will bring its own problems, new and unfamiliar problems. In so far as the shape of those problems is already discernible, we must at once give thought to them.

As Mr. Casey said in his speech in the general debate, the artificial satellites of today not only represent a spectacular advance in technology; they also give promise of a great new field of scientific data. Man's powers of observation and study of the world, the space immediately around it, and the remoter regions of the universe will be massively augmented by the carrying of all sorts of instruments, and possibly in due time man himself, to great distances

TL/an

A/C.1/PV.986
44-45

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

from the earth, far beyond the confines of our atmosphere, while still maintaining continuous communications with the human mind here on earth. Not only will existing knowledge in many fields be greatly supplemented and enriched, but entirely new areas of investigation will be opened up. The resulting advances in science will have many practical applications, not only to the further development of satellites, space platforms and eventually, no doubt, space travel, but also to our everyday life here on earth. For man's use of his own capacities is intimately dependent on his knowledge and understanding of his environment, and space research will vastly enlarge man's effective horizon.

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

That is the immediate challenge of space research, which man is bound to take up. Our present discussion arises from the fact that as man responds to this new challenge he is bound to encounter many new problems requiring international consideration.

The first problem is how man's venture into space is to be organized. So far, two great nations have launched satellites. There may be a tendency to think of such activities as being beyond the reach of the rest of the world, because of the vast material and technical resources required. This, however, may well prove to be a premature view. Members of this Committee may have noted a report in the London Times of 10 November about discussions on space research held by the Royal Society in London last week. According to this report, the United Kingdom Government has sought the assistance of the Royal Society in obtaining the views of scientists on the scientific value to be expected from participation in satellite research. While making it clear that such participation would be a matter for Government decisions -- which have not so far been taken -- the Times report went on to indicate that, if it were decided to launch a British satellite, launchings would presumably be from the Woomera range in Australia. It has already been noted, in a recently published staff report of the United States Congressional Select Committee on Astronautics, that the British Black Knight missile, which during recent tests in Australia rose 300 to 400 miles -- not kilometres but miles -- in a single stage, could be used to launch a satellite. Further, the report notes that the Black Knight could be used in conjunction with another recently developed missile to place as much as half a ton in orbit.

If the past history of new devices is any guide, it will be only a matter of time before satellites will be placed in orbit by countries other than the Soviet Union and the United States. Indeed, on radio news reports this morning there were references to discussions in Europe about the possibility of co-operative action in this field. The technical difficulties and financial limitations that would hamper such ventures by countries acting individually will be a powerful stimulus to international co-operation to ensure that space research does not remain the preserve of two or three great Powers.

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

In any case, if the challenge of space is to be met, there must be international co-operation. In this respect, we have listened with the greatest interest and appreciation to the excellent statement made to the First Committee this morning by Senator Johnson, on behalf of the United States, stressing his country's attitude towards international co-operation in this field. Not only in the launching of satellites, but also in all other aspects of space research, the possibilities of rapid advance will be greatly increased if ways are found to draw on the specialized contributions that can be made by various countries, including smaller countries as well as the great industrial and military Powers. The great Powers can no doubt undertake considerable space research on a self-sufficient basis, but the scientific ~~resources~~ of the world can be brought to bear more effectively, and with greater economy of men and money, through co-operative efforts. This has been illustrated in the course of the International Geophysical Year programmes as well as other international programmes.

While great industrial Powers are able to concentrate scientific resources on a massive scale unequalled in smaller countries, experience shows that they have no monopoly of scientific or inventive ability. Smaller countries, by specializing in particular fields of science, have often had the privilege of making extremely important contributions to the world's knowledge. A striking example of this is the work of the Australian scientists in the field of radio astronomy, where, for many years, Australia led the world.

Another reason why there must be international co-operation is that geographical position on the face of the globe is going to be a highly relevant factor in the development of space research. The greatest industrial nations are situated in the Northern Hemisphere; if space research were to be confined to the Northern Hemisphere, it would labour under great disabilities. Even in the field of general astronomy, that part of the universe that is visible only from the Southern Hemisphere had not been systematically observed until quite recent times in the history of science. Australian observatories have been in a favoured position to play a leading part in this work owing to their situation and the excellent viewing conditions offered by our cloud-free skies. This has

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

given astronomical studies a great impetus and sound tradition in Australia, and most scientists are, I think, familiar with the work of our observatories at Mount Stromlo, which is one of the large astronomical institutions of the world; at Sydney, which recently celebrated its centenary; and at Perth in Western Australia; as well as the famous Sydney Radiophysics Laboratory and the Solar Group of the Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization, also at Sydney. International co-operation is highly developed in these fields. In addition to wide exchanges through the International Geophysical Year and the International Scientific Unions, two countries -- Sweden and the United States -- maintain permanent observing stations at Mount Stromlo. This international co-operation transcends ideological as well as national frontiers. Four Australian delegates, including the Director of Mount Stromlo and the Director of our Solar Group, attended the International Astronomical Union meeting in Moscow this August, and there is a regular exchange of material with Russian astronomers.

One consequence of Australia's past work in various fields of astronomy was that when the first satellites were placed in orbit Australia was already in a position to participate actively and effectively in their observation and tracking-- at first at Mount Stromlo, which put out frequent bulletins on Sputniks I and II, and subsequently at various other stations in Australia. At Woomera, the Australian rocket range, the minitrack radio tracking system has recorded every passage of all United States satellites, ranging from 150 passages in the case of Explorer IV to 384 passages in the case of Vanguard I. A limited record has been made of 124 passages of Sputnik III, which is still transmitting. Since April, we have been operating a Baker Nunn Camera, which is recording passages of Explorers I, III and IV and Sputnik III. Observations are also made by Kine theodolites at Woomera and Salisbury, particularly of Sputniks II and III.

Australian voluntary "moon watch" groups under the International Geophysical Year have also been particularly successful. The Sydney group was the first in the world to make an optical fix of Sputnik I, while the Adelaide group made the last optical fix before Sputnik I re-entered the earth's atmosphere. The Adelaide group also made the first optical fix in the world of Vanguard I's rocket, which had been up one month and had not been previously seen.

I have already referred to Australian leadership in radio astronomy. This is a field in which new developments are taking place of great importance to space research. A new giant radio telescope has been designed and will soon be built near Sydney; this telescope will be one of the largest in the world and probably the finest of its kind. The main purpose of this new equipment will be to continue Australian research in distant space, but, like the great radio telescope at Jodrell Bank, England, it can also be used for the study of nearer celestial bodies and for the tracking of satellites and space craft. It will be an essential complement to radio telescopes existing or to be established in other parts of the world, for it is only by locating such equipment at various points on the globe that solar interference with observations can be circumvented and continuous reporting maintained.

Knowing the significance for space research of our own work in these specialized fields, Australians are impressed by the great possibilities of international co-operation, in which different countries can make their specialized contributions to integrated programmes of research far beyond the resources of any single country. Our Australian scientists look forward with eager anticipation to the revolutionary changes which the use of satellites and space platforms will bring in branches of science such as radio and cosmic ray studies, in which Australia has been making great efforts through existing methods. Our scientists will be anxious to take advantage of these new developments and may be expected to contribute much to the planning of such research.

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

We also see a probable role for Australia in any international programmes for the launching of space vehicles. So far as we know, Woomera is at present the only rocket range in the southern hemisphere, and possibly the most complete in the world. As a consequence of the work already carried out in Australia over a period of several years by the United Kingdom in association with Australians, there is a variety of scientists in Australia with expert knowledge in the field of launching rocket vehicles, as well as tracking them, and a good deal of experience with solid and liquid fuel motors. This necessity for international co-operation will become even more evident as soon as the stage is reached of bringing back to earth space vehicles, which will, naturally, be necessary if we are to send men into outer space, or even if we are to land unmanned vehicles without destroying them.

To bring a space vehicle down safely in its home country after it has re-entered the atmosphere, it will, presumably, be necessary to establish effective remote control over its flight while it is still thousands of miles away from that country's air space. In other words, the co-operation of distant countries with an extensive land area may be needed to permit the tracking and guidance of the vehicles at a sufficiently early stage in its earthward glide to bring it down safely within its own home territory. Australia's geographical position and size would seem likely to give it a significant role in facilitating the safe return of space vehicles that would be launched in other parts of the world. It is not surprising, therefore, that Australia which has long been an outstandingly air-minded country, should, despite its limited resources as compared with the great Powers, be among the first space-minded countries and a strong supporter of international co-operation in this field.

What form should this international co-operation take? In our view, it is premature to suggest the establishment of a special United Nations agency for this purpose before we have explored more fully the sort of problems that are likely to arise. We are not dismissing the Soviet Union suggestion for such an agency and the functions it might perform, but we do not think the matter is already ripe for a resolution laying down that it should be established. We greatly prefer the approach envisaged in the draft resolution that Australia is sponsoring along with nineteen other delegations. Let us first survey the resources and activities of the United Nations and other international bodies in this field, and then consider the appropriate role of the United Nations and such organization as may be necessary.

(Mr. Walker. Australia)

At the same time, and this is an aspect completely ignored in the Soviet Union draft resolution, we must take account of the legal problems likely to be encountered as man reaches out into space.

The importance of this legal aspect has already been emphasized by other speakers in this debate, better qualified than I to explore the intricacies of the subject. We are particularly grateful for the illuminating statement by the representative of Peru. Without embarking upon any comprehensive legal analysis, I would like to make the point that the choice between various possible legal arrangements for outer space is, in the last resort, a political decision. We would hope that this political decision will be based on the principle that the use of outer space is the common concern, not merely of all States, but also of all mankind. Our objective should be to ensure that the whole of mankind benefits from the results of man's space activities. This principle, which is undoubtedly consistent with the principles of the United Nations Charter, is easily stated, and I hope it will be readily endorsed. But we are still at the very beginning of understanding what legal problems have to be solved, what legal arrangements have to be made, what systems of rules may need to be established in order to preserve and promote this common interest.

I have said that the choice between various possible legal arguments is, in the last resort, a political one. But it must be an informed choice -- a choice informed by a full understanding of the legal nature of various possible regimes and of their probable practical consequences -- and the assessment of these will depend, in part, upon the technical nature of man's activities in outer space and, in part, upon the international situation here on earth.

Even at this early stage there have been discussions of general legal regimes that might be applicable to outer space, including, of course, any celestial bodies on which man may ultimately establish himself. Some have suggested that, even as international law stands at present, it will have to provide the basis on which the relations of men and States in outer space will be governed, unless agreement can be reached on a new regime more closely related to the real needs of the space age.

In the absence of any agreement, it could be that -- prolonging indefinitely the established principle that the sovereignty of a State exists vertically above and below the surface of the earth -- outer space will already be regarded by some

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

legal authorities as being nationally owned in sovereignty by the eighty or ninety States of the world. But, as the representative of Peru so clearly explained, in view of the rotation and revolution of the earth and the movements of the galaxies, the situation of such national space would be continually changing. This could mean that particular parts of space and the bodies occupying them, such as the moon and the other planets, would be constantly passing from the sovereignty of one country to that of others -- an absurd result.

It would also be possible, by applying familiar legal principles, to argue that the surface of any celestial bodies on which man might establish himself should be considered as being open for discovery and occupation by the first comer -- assuming that they are not already inhabited. I do not think this would be politically acceptable in the modern world, particularly with the growing spectre of over-population and the possibility that the peaceful use of outer space might make some contribution towards meeting the Malthusian problem. In any case, we want outer space to be used for the benefit of all mankind.

If the application of one legal principle produces absurd or unacceptable results, lawyers will often attempt to solve their problems by drawing upon some other analogy. So the question is being asked: Does the law of the sea, to which the United Nations has given so much consideration in recent years, supply a possible analogy for the regime of outer space? Is outer space, like the high seas, to be regarded as something incapable of appropriation by any, but open to use at will by all? This idea may be attractive in terms of research activities; but what of economic activities and possible military activities in space? And what happens to our purpose of benefiting mankind as a whole? I must say, as a layman in these matters, that it seems to me conceivable that the legal problems of man's use of outer space may not be solved by the adoption of any comprehensive or general system in advance, but in a more piecemeal fashion. There may have to be a gradual process in which solutions to particular problems are worked out one by one, as the development of various space activities raises new practical issues and yields practical experience. Whether or not analogies with existing legal conceptions are found to be useful guides, many further problems will arise. What rules would be necessary for regulating the use of outer space? Could the necessary framework of regulation be sufficiently provided by a convention or by a series of conventions? Such conventions

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

might have to embody principles the precise opposite of those on which the air navigation conventions have always rested. Or would it be necessary and desirable to establish some kind of international authority with appropriate powers of law making and supervision for outer space?

I ask these questions, which are only a very few of the scores that spring to mind, but I do not answer them. This is not because I think the answers are obvious or easy or likely to command universal acceptance. On the contrary. Yet such questions certainly require answers in practice. For preference, the answers ought to be found before individual States have been driven by actual events to improvise their own individual answers. Experience in Antarctica may perhaps suggest how difficult it may become to consider the problems of outer space impartially and on a universal plane if decision is left until States have established themselves permanently in the field.

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

But to say that decisions on certain legal questions ought to be taken at early stages in man's use of outer space is not to say that we can settle them here and now. The basic choices to be made are, as I said, political in character. But they cannot be made except in the light of technical information -- which of necessity will include a great deal of a rather speculative forward-looking character -- as to the human activities which are possible and probable in outer space, and as to the interests, military, political, economic, scientific, which are to be protected.

The marshalling of this information would be part of the work of the ad hoc committee proposed in the draft resolution we are co-sponsoring.

Perhaps I should conclude by outlining briefly the Australian delegation's conception of the tasks that lie ahead of that ad hoc committee.

The Australian delegation considers that the first step for the United Nations to take is to arrange for a general review of the problem of the peaceful use of outer space. We consider that this can best be done through an ad hoc committee drawn in part from countries that have already made substantial progress in space research or are well equipped to appreciate the emerging problems, and in part from other countries chosen to establish a reasonable geographical balance. The representative of the United States suggested the other day that nine members might be sufficient. While I agree that the committee should be left small at this initial stage, I think it may be necessary to envisage a slightly larger number than nine in order to obtain a fairly representative group. The committee should consist of government representatives, who would presumably be assisted, as necessary, by experts in the fields in which the various member countries have special qualifications or experience.

The first task of this ad hoc committee would be to gain a general picture of what is going on in the field of outer space research, in Member States and through the interested international organizations, and to make some assessment of promising lines of development. It should also, as our draft resolution (A/C.1/L.220) provides, consider the activities and resources of the United Nations and other bodies which at present bear on the peaceful uses of outer space or could be directed towards ensuring that activities in outer space will be developed in the interests of all mankind.

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

I have already referred to the importance of international co-operation, and in this field it is clearly necessary for the United Nations to consider the extent to which, and the manner in which, it can assist the development of such co-operation. Some of the specialized agencies, such as the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), and the International Telecommunications Union (ITU) are clearly destined to play an important part in this enterprise. It seems likely that there will also be a role for others such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and perhaps even the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO).

It will obviously be necessary for the ad hoc committee to consult these organizations as well as other international bodies in the world of science. The committee should then, as we see it, prepare proposals for the consideration of the General Assembly as to what organizational arrangements should be made within the United Nations set-up to promote and facilitate further international co-operation. What those arrangements should be can hardly be predicted at this stage. The first step is to survey the needs and the resources available; then we can consider both programmes and organization. Against this background, the committee should also consider the nature of the legal problems which may arise. It should not get bogged down in the study of specialized legal questions but should seek in this aspect, as in others, to point the way to the next steps that the United Nations might take. In all this, the ad hoc committee would have the assistance of the Secretary-General, who should feel free also to submit concrete proposals for the committee's consideration.

In commending the draft resolution to the First Committee, I desire to stress, as the representative of Argentina did, that this is a non-political approach, which accords well with the scientific spirit and the need for co-operation without regard to ideological differences. As Mr. Amadeo has said, the draft resolution contains no reference whatsoever which might harm the interests or injure the susceptibilities of any country. We hope, therefore, that it will be adopted enthusiastically by the committee.

I say "enthusiastically" because this peaceful enterprise is one that must stir our imagination and raise our hopes for the future. Scientific research has

(Mr. Walker, Australia)

brought us to the threshold of the space era. We can already glimpse something of its prospects as well as its problems. What undertaking could present a greater challenge, or offer more appropriate field of endeavour for the United Nations?

Mr. de FREITAS-VALLE (Brazil): May I be allowed to express the deep satisfaction with which my Government has noted that the question of peaceful uses of outer space is being considered by the present session of the General Assembly. Small and medium Powers can hardly be expected in the near future to embark upon extensive scientific or military programmes for the exploration of cosmic space. Nor is it to be envisaged that the launching of artificial earth satellites would be the foremost concern of such Powers in the years immediately ahead. But it is unquestionable that such experiments encompass problems of the utmost importance for the national security of all nations, small and medium Powers alike. It is precisely for those reasons that it seems to us that the United Nations is the adequate forum to deal with problems of such importance that no nation in the world, be it great or small, can fail to recognize.

We would be deluding ourselves, however, if we failed to emphasize that the efforts to conquer outer space are intimately related to the development of certain devices whose usefulness in the military field is of considerable and growing significance. Though auspiciously inaugurated under the aegis of a non-governmental programme with the co-operation of men of science of almost all countries in the world -- the International Geophysical Year -- the exploratory activities in outer space have until now been carried out exclusively by two great Powers and have been made possible only through the utilization of certain resources originally intended for military purposes. The personnel and material indispensable to the carrying out of those daring projects have been made available by the military establishments of the two great Powers, within the framework of their military endeavours, and in many of their aspects under the cloak of military secrecy. And all indications are that it will not be easy to disassociate future progress in these domains from the strategical requirements of the great Powers.

(Mr. de Freitas-Valle, Brazil)

The feeling of elation that sprang from the launching of the first artificial earth satellites was marred by deep anxiety lest this new conquest of science aggravate the insecurity and the climate of rivalry between the great Powers. This scientific feat took place during the twelfth session of the General Assembly and the anxiety to which reference was made above was immediately reflected in this Committee. Resolution 1148 (XII), of 14 November 1957, included among the items upon which a disarmament agreement should be reached the joint study of an inspection system designed to ensure that the sending of objects through outer space be exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes.

The item now under consideration by this Committee is set out in two versions, which correspond to the approach of the two Powers directly concerned with the problem of the use of outer space. As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the question of the peaceful use of outer space must necessarily encompass the following aspects: the banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes, the elimination of foreign military bases in the territories of other countries and international co-operation in the study of cosmic space. According to the United States, the item under debate is conceived as taking the shape of a programme for international co-operation in the field of outer space. The explanatory memoranda of the two Governments and the statements made in this Committee by the representatives of the two Powers have adequately enlightened us as to the motives which prompted them in placing this question before the General Assembly. The two draft resolutions tabled in this Committee faithfully reflect the alternative approaches.

The Soviet draft resolution lists the principles upon which, in its judgement, a solution should be based in order to urge the banning of the use of cosmic space for military purposes. One of these principles would clearly make any agreement for the peaceful use of outer space depend upon the acceptance of a clause which by its very nature could only be considered within the broad context of a comprehensive disarmament agreement. This is obviously the question of the elimination of foreign military bases. But, just as obviously, this question should be within the purview of the Disarmament Commission, which is the proper machinery within the United Nations for dealing with this matter and its broad implications.

(Mr. de Freitas-Valle, Brazil)

We are bound to point out that the Soviet draft resolution makes no mention at all of the far-reaching juridical problems which arise in connexion with this topic. I do not propose at this stage to indulge in a detailed examination of these problems, since they should be the concern of a technical body within the framework of the United Nations. I would only like to recall that the initiation of outer space exploration has in fact broken down some of the classical principles of international law regarding the sovereignty of States over the space extending above their territories. This is the perfect opportunity for the United Nations to step in and construct a new set of regulations that would terminate the present de facto situation. The fact that our governments did not choose to raise the problem at the time when the artificial satellites were first launched does not mean that we should sit back and let the situation develop uncontrolled. This is an area in which the small and medium-size Powers are properly concerned and want their voices heard.

The alternative proposal before this Committee was presented by Australia and nineteen other countries. In its operative part, the twenty-Power draft resolution calls for the establishment of an ad hoc committee as a preliminary step toward the eventual setting up of permanent organizational arrangements to co-ordinate co-operation in the realm of outer space. Although no reference is made in the draft as to the number of countries to take part in the proposed special committee, the representative of the United States has told us that it should be composed of about nine members. We think that nine is a rather limited number. Perhaps it should be more appropriate to raise that number to fifteen, so that the countries which are not in a position to develop scientific activities in outer space may be more adequately represented in the committee.

With the full support of Latin American representatives, the representative of Argentina and I made a few suggestions before this draft resolution was submitted. By doing so, we intended to rule out the idea of presenting amendments which would complicate the procedure in our discussions. Our suggestions, accepted by the twenty sponsoring Powers, were very forcefully

(Mr. de Freitas-Valle, Brazil)

explained by the representative of Argentina, Mr. Mario Amadeo. We proposed that a reference should be contained in the draft resolution not only to the principle of juridical equality of States but as well as to the idea of equal opportunity of participation in the benefits which may derive from the peaceful exploration of cosmic space, regardless of the scientific and economic development of the States. Whereas the first principle is a deeply seated tradition in Latin American history, the second idea is a new and pressing force in the context of the major problems of today's world. The benefits which may derive from the exploration of outer space should in no way contribute to widening the gap between a small group of highly developed countries and the majority of nations whose most urgent problems are those related to economic development.

The setting up of an ad hoc committee to scrutinize the problems related to the peaceful uses of outer space, in all their implications, seems to be the right decision to be taken now. This question involves pioneering studies of far-reaching scientific, technological and juridical consequences which could not be the specific concern of a political body like our Committee. As it was put forth by Senator Tinaud, the representative of France, the problem is now of methodology. I hope that upon receiving at the fourteenth session of the General Assembly the report of the ad hoc committee that we are trying to set up, everybody will then be in a position to take a decision on the substance of this complex problem.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.