



CONTENTS

	Page
Agenda item 67:	
International co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy: report of the United States of America (<i>continued</i>)	371

Chairman: Mr. Francisco URRUTIA (Colombia).

AGENDA ITEM 67

International co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy: report of the United States of America (A/2734, A/2738, A/C.1/758, A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1, A/C.1/L.106, A/C.1/L.107) (*continued*)

1. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines) observed that President Eisenhower's proposal had made it possible to end a period in which the nuclear armaments race, carried on in secret, had exposed the world to the danger of complete destruction. He accordingly welcomed the initiative shown by the United States in proposing, together with six other States, a draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1) designed to implement that proposal, despite the failure of the efforts it had made from 19 January to 23 September 1954 to secure the co-operation of the Soviet Union.

2. With regard to "the benefits arising" from atomic energy—to quote the first paragraph of the preamble—the possibilities were certainly almost unlimited, covering a wide range of subjects and activities including archaeology, fertilizers, vitamins, the treatment of cancer and the artificial production of food. For the Far East, the prospect offered by atomic energy was a social revolution comparable to that which had followed the discovery of the steam engine in the West. The purpose of the fourth paragraph of the preamble was to ensure that scientific co-operation, which in the past had been a matter of individual initiative and had resulted rather from accident than from design, should be instituted systematically under United Nations auspices for the benefit, not of individual States, but of all humanity.

3. The international agency dealt with in section A of the draft resolution must ensure, first and foremost, that the benefits of atomic energy, which nature had placed everywhere, should be brought to all nations without distinction. Secondly, in order to encourage international co-operation in that field, the agency would have three essential functions to perform: it must act as an information centre; as an intermediary to pass on the benefits of atomic energy from one State to another; and as a centre for the training of students. Any attempt to give more exact details about those functions at present might cause delay in the establish-

ment of the agency. It was gratifying that paragraph 2 of section A no longer stated that the agency should be established on the lines of the specialized agencies, but affirmed that the United Nations should bring its influence to bear in a matter which lay within its province almost as completely as collective security. Indeed, when President Eisenhower had announced his dramatic proposal, he had chosen the United Nations as his forum. It was for the Powers participating in the establishment of the agency to use their own judgment as to the degree to which United Nations influence should be brought to bear at the present stage.

4. Mr. Serrano stated in conclusion that no nation faced with a project which represented definite progress had the right to withhold its support; without such support, success could not be achieved in the near future.

5. Mr. SANDLER (Sweden) said that during the general debate (710th meeting) he had reserved his delegation's position on the original draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105), section A of which had not given the United Nations a big enough part to play, while section B, by aiming too high, had jeopardized the practical value of the international conference. Now that the text had been revised (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1) and explanations had been given, the Swedish delegation was in a position to state its views.

6. The elimination of any reference to the specialized agencies as a model had made it possible to prepare a new formula determining the relationship between the agency and the United Nations. Indeed, the discussion had shown that there was general agreement that that relationship should be made closer.

7. To achieve that goal, the details of the agency's constitutional structure should not be determined until the question of defining that relationship had been submitted to the General Assembly. The Swedish delegation hoped that the Assembly would consider that question as soon as possible. In addition, the Secretariat should continue its studies, and the need for consulting the Secretary-General was so plain that it might have seemed unnecessary to give him instructions which were implicit in the facts themselves. From that point of view, the new paragraph 1 of section A was a step forward, since the United Nations was given an active part to play in establishing the agency, which had not been the case under the former paragraph 1. Hence the Swedish delegation was able to accept the revised text of section A.

8. On the other hand, not all the doubts expressed as to the practical value of the international conference had been dispelled; it was true that they would certainly be taken into account in making preparations for that conference, but in the course of those preparations practical considerations must not be sacrificed for the sake of an elaborate setting.

9. One important fact had emerged from the discussion: two States which possessed large quantities of

fissionable materials were prepared, in the context of international co-operation, to make donations of such materials the magnitude of which could be measured in terms of the number of atomic bombs thus foregone.

10. The Swedish delegation was satisfied with the changes made in the draft resolution and the explanations given; not wishing to be a party to delaying the establishment of an undertaking of incalculable potentialities, it was prepared to vote for the draft resolution.

11. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) said that the draft resolution before the Committee (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1) represented the climax of a process which had begun a year before with the proposal made by President Eisenhower (470th plenary meeting) that atomic energy should be delivered from the aura of mystery and fear in which it had been enveloped, and should take its place among the other sciences, to be used for the welfare of mankind.

12. The second step in that process had been taken by the United States Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, on 23 September 1954 (475th plenary meeting). Mr. Dulles, after announcing that it was proposed to set up an international agency and to convene a scientific conference, had made two generous offers: he had said that the United States intended to establish a reactor training school open to foreign students, and to invite foreign doctors and surgeons to take part in cancer research in American hospitals. There could be no doubt that the countries which were termed underdeveloped, but which should be termed under-industrialized, would wish to take advantage of such a valuable opportunity.

13. The third step had been taken by Mr. Lodge, in his statement before the First Committee (707th meeting). Mr. Lodge had reviewed the progress already made, outlined future prospects and, together with six other Powers, had submitted a draft resolution which, in its revised form, was now before the Committee.

14. The delegation of Ecuador supported the draft resolution, but it wished to draw the attention of the co-sponsors to certain points.

15. In the Spanish text of the second paragraph of the preamble, the word "*energicamente*" should be replaced by a more apt translation.

16. In the third paragraph, the word "*cargas*" was redundant, since what had to be done was not so much to lift the burdens of hunger, poverty and disease as to attack the evil itself.

17. With regard to section A of the draft, Mr. Trujillo said that it might give the impression of disregarding the under-industrialized countries. To avoid that impression, the countries participating in the negotiations should invite a group of countries representing various regions of the world to take part in a second phase of negotiations. Latin America, for instance, could be represented on that group by two or three countries such as Mexico, Brazil, Argentina or Chile.

18. Section B, on the other hand, failed to pay sufficient attention to all the social and economic implications of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. It would be desirable to give paragraph 2 a more comprehensive wording; the study carried out by the Secretariat (A/C.1/758) might serve as a guide in that respect.

19. Mr. Trujillo also believed that not one conference, but a series of conferences should be called to lift the veil of mystery and fear in which atomic knowledge was at present shrouded. That could be indicated by a few drafting amendments; reference could be made to "such conferences" or "this first conference", as appropriate, while the beginning of paragraph 2 should read: "*Decides* that international technical conferences of Governments should be held periodically...". The proposed agency might have to organize conferences itself, but it was necessary to state that there should be such periodical technical meetings for the purpose of disseminating knowledge in the field of nuclear science.

20. In conclusion, the representative of Ecuador wished to thank the representatives of the United Kingdom and France for the offers they had made, and also all the representatives who had helped, from the technical, philosophical and literary points of view, to make of the current debate one of the most outstanding which had been held in the United Nations, in a true spirit of international co-operation.

21. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the representative of Ecuador should consult with the authors of the draft resolution.

22. Mr. TRUJILLO (Ecuador) said that he had the text of his amendments before him, and that they were available to the co-sponsors of the draft resolution for their consideration. He was willing, however, to withdraw them immediately if the co-sponsors did not find them acceptable, as he had no desire to prolong the debate.

23. Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma) said that his delegation was as much concerned as any other in the question of atomic energy, which had brought man to a cross-roads; the road man chose now would determine whether he was to go on to greater progress or whether the entire human race was to become extinct. But Burma had a special interest in the question; in common with the other under-developed countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, which had escaped most of the impact of the industrial revolution, it saw in the development of atomic energy a promise of rapid progress. The reason why the Burmese delegation had not so far taken part in the debate was that it still had no atomic scientists, strictly speaking, and that its atomic raw materials remained largely unexplored.

24. Now that the Powers primarily concerned with the development of atomic energy had presented their views, Burma took the liberty of associating itself in the tribute paid to the United States and the other countries which had announced their intention of making certain facilities available to the rest of the nations. Moreover, the draft resolution had been improved, and the fact that the USSR delegation found it acceptable showed that there had been a certain *rapprochement*. Nevertheless, it was to be regretted that Asia and Latin America had not been called upon to take part in the organization of the international agency in any other way than by communicating their views to the Powers participating in the establishment of the agency. The basis on which those Powers had been chosen was not clear. If the determining factors were possession of technical knowledge or possession of raw materials, a better selection might have been made. To give only one instance, India was as qualified as certain other countries from the viewpoint both of research carried out and of mineral resources, and the same was true of several Latin American States. The

situation was all the more regrettable in that those two parts of the world had not derived full benefits from the industrial revolution, and that anything suggesting the old order under which everything had been directed to the welfare of Europe should be avoided.

25. The Burmese delegation appealed to the authors of the draft resolution to make the new undertaking, not only in fact but in appearance, a genuine United Nations effort. True, it had been promised that the draft treaty would be circulated to interested Governments before it came up for ratification. But the difficulties in the way of changing agreements already signed were well known. It would be better, therefore, to place the various States on an equal footing by making them all "founding fathers".

26. The relationship between the international agency and the United Nations should be close, and the Organization's relationships with the specialized agencies should not be regarded as precedents. In particular, the Secretary-General should at least be kept informed of the progress achieved. In short, the United Nations, as such, should play a part in the formative stages.

27. For practical reasons, the Burmese delegation would not propose any amendments to the draft resolution, but it hoped that the negotiating Powers would give consideration to the suggestions it had made for placing the whole undertaking within the framework of the United Nations.

28. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) hoped that the First Committee, which had adopted a draft resolution on disarmament by a unanimous vote (702nd meeting), would also achieve unanimity in favour of the seven-Power draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1), which reflected, in essence, the ideas expounded by President Eisenhower in his historic address to the General Assembly on 8 December 1953 (470th meeting).

29. The revised draft resolution no longer contained any reference, in section A, paragraph 2, to the nature of the agreement to be negotiated between the agency and the United Nations. The delegation of El Salvador did not object to that deletion, which had been suggested by the USSR representative. It felt some misgivings, however, about Mr. Vyshinsky's repeated references to General Assembly resolution 1 (I) of 24 January 1946, establishing the Atomic Energy Commission, and to the idea that the right of veto was the fundamental principle of the collective security system. The Atomic Energy Commission was no longer in existence, and its duties in the matter of making proposals for the prohibition of atomic weapons were now incumbent upon the Disarmament Commission. The agency which was to be set up would have nothing to do with that question; there was therefore no need to link it with the Security Council, the more so as the Council would always be free to act within its terms of reference if international co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy gave rise to friction leading to a situation likely to endanger the maintenance of peace. Thus no specific reference to the Council was necessary in the statute of the agency.

30. The fears expressed by some members of the Committee that the use of the veto in the Security Council might hamper the activities of the agency seemed unwarranted. They would be justified only if it was agreed to adopt the rule of unanimity for deci-

sions reached by the agency. But that did not seem to be the intention of the authors of the draft resolution.

31. The representative of Ecuador had made some excellent suggestions regarding the substance and form of the draft resolution; Mr. Urquía hoped they would be taken into consideration by the authors.

32. Mr. Urquía was happy to note that Brazil would serve on the advisory committee which was to prepare the technical conference.

33. The delegation of El Salvador wished to express its satisfaction that a beginning was already being made in carrying out President Eisenhower's proposal; it would be happy to support the joint draft resolution.

34. Mr. KOS (Yugoslavia) pointed out that international co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy would have beneficial effects for all peoples, and would exert a favourable influence on international relations. He was pleased to note that, as a result of the debate, considerable progress had been made, certain clarifications had been given and certain misunderstandings had been cleared up. The General Assembly would be performing a very great service by recommending the establishment of an international agency.

35. The debate had shown the importance attributed by Member States to the use of atomic energy for industrial purposes, bearing in mind the difficulties of under-developed countries and the instability of the world economy. The revised draft resolution had been substantially improved. It was to be hoped that the relations between the agency and the United Nations would be established on a basis compatible with the Charter, and that States not taking part in the establishment of the agency would still be able to contribute by presenting their comments and proposals. In that connexion, the revised text of former paragraph 3 of section A—now paragraph 4—marked a definite step forward.

36. Moreover, the representatives of the United States and the United Kingdom had stated that the agency should not be a closed organization, and that its establishment should not be presented to States not participating in the negotiations as a *fait accompli*. Those important statements were welcome. The form which consultations between participating States and other States would take had not, however, been defined. The Yugoslav delegation interpreted those statements to mean that the agency would not be established without giving non-participating States the opportunity of studying its proposed statute and submitting their observations. On that understanding, it would support the revised draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105/Rev.1).

37. Mrs. SEKANINOVA-CAKARTOVA (Czechoslovakia) noted that the revised draft resolution was the result of mutual agreement. Its provisions relating to the composition of the scientific conference should, however, be examined more closely. It had been emphasized in the debate that all nations should fully co-operate in the field of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and the sponsors of the draft resolution had themselves stated that they had no intention of excluding any State from the agency. If that principle applied to the agency, it must apply even more to the international conference. Furthermore, it was stated in the preamble to the draft resolution that the benefits arising from atomic energy should be placed at the

service of all mankind and that all nations should co-operate in promoting the dissemination of knowledge in the realm of nuclear technology for peaceful ends. The Czechoslovak representative quoted several passages of the draft resolution which, she said, rightly stressed the fact that the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy were the concern of the whole world. Hence, paragraph 3 of section B, which excluded some States from the international conference, was in conflict with the preamble and other provisions of the draft. It would be ill-advised to exclude any State which desired to co-operate. The purpose of the USSR amendment (A/C.1/L.106) which the Czechoslovak delegation warmly supported, was to remedy that defect.

38. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) stated on behalf of the seven sponsors that the draft resolution had been very thoroughly considered and that a stage had been reached at which it was no longer possible to accept any further revisions. He was grateful to the representative of Ecuador for not pressing his amendments. Nevertheless, the opinions expressed by that representative would be sympathetically considered.

39. In reply to a point raised by the representative of Burma, he recalled that the sponsors of the draft resolution had already made it clear that the board of governors of the agency would include representatives of the under-developed countries and that in determining the membership of the board attention would also be given to reasonable geographical distribution.

40. The adoption of the Indian amendments (A/C.1/L.107) might mean that more than sixty nations could take part in establishing the agency, and that would delay or endanger the success of the project. Mr. Lodge emphasized, however, that the States taking part in the establishment of the agency wished to consult all the Governments interested in the project before the treaty was given its final form and submitted for ratification. The agency would not, therefore, be presented as a *fait accompli*. That was a serious engagement on the part of all the sponsors of the draft resolution.

41. Mr. HUDICOURT (Haiti) noted that, at the present stage, the question of the peaceful uses of atomic energy remained within the exclusive province of nations which were in a privileged position either on account of the research undertaken by their scientists or on account of their raw-material resources. Haiti was not at present among those nations.

42. Nevertheless, the Haitian delegation had followed the discussions with great interest, for it was sure that any progress in that field would help to further the welfare of mankind. It wished to pay a tribute to the generous action of President Eisenhower and to the United Kingdom, France, Australia, Canada, Belgium and many other countries for the valuable offers they had made. The co-operation which was to be established in that field gave reason to hope for the dawn of a new era of peace and prosperity.

43. Mr. AZKOUL (Lebanon) recalled that in the general discussion (718th meeting) his delegation had already said that it would vote for the seven-Power draft resolution regardless of how it might be amended, because the substance of the draft was more important than its form. Lebanon was very interested in the plan for international co-operation, for that plan

would undoubtedly facilitate the solution of social and economic problems which had so far seemed insoluble.

44. He was glad to note that the co-operation of all Member States now seemed assured. The constructive attitude adopted by the delegation of the Soviet Union was particularly gratifying.

45. However, there were still two defects in the revised draft resolution. In the first place, there did not seem to be any obvious connexion between sections A and B, though the agency and the conference were related both in nature and in function. It would therefore be advisable to indicate in the draft resolution the basis on which the two could co-operate. It would also be an advantage if the States participating in the establishment of the agency, or the agency itself if already established at the time of the conference, could take the results of the work of the conference into account.

46. The Lebanese delegation therefore suggested the addition of a fifth paragraph to the operative part of section A reading as follows:

"Invites the Secretary-General to communicate to the States participating in the establishment of the agency, or to the agency if it has at that time been established, the results of the work of the conference to be convened under part B hereof, of this resolution, so that they may be taken into consideration."

Furthermore, if the agency was established before the conference was held, it should be represented at the conference. Thus, in paragraph 7 of section B, the words "and also the international atomic energy agency, if it has at that time been established", should be inserted after the word "agencies".¹

47. The second defect of the revised draft resolution was that the composition of the small committee referred to in paragraph 5 of section B did not adequately allow for proper geographical representation. Latin America was represented by Brazil, North America by the United States and Canada, Western Europe by France and the United Kingdom, Eastern Europe by the Soviet Union, and Asia and Africa by India. India was indeed one of the largest and most representative countries of Asia, but Asia and Africa were not homogeneous entities. It seemed, therefore, that the composition of the small committee might be adequately rounded out by the inclusion of a State from the Middle East, which covered parts of both Asia and Africa.

48. Mr. SKRZESZEWSKI (Poland) observed that the amendment submitted by the Soviet Union (A/C.1/L.106) was designed to allow the participation in the proposed conference not only of all States Members of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies but of all States which so desired. Although no agreement had been reached on whether States that were not Members either of the United Nations or of the specialized agencies should participate in the conference, it was in the interests of the United Nations that the conference should be universal. Scientific progress was possible only if the scientists of all countries were able to co-operate, and he wondered whether any State could be prevented from contributing to or benefiting from the results of scientific co-operation.

49. The representative of the United States had said that he was willing that all proposals should be con-

¹ These amendments were subsequently issued as document A/C.1/L.108.

dered. The best way of doing that would surely be to allow all proposals and points of view to be examined at the scientific conference. The exclusion of some States from the conference would be unfortunate. The Polish delegation therefore supported the Soviet amendment unreservedly and asked other delegations to do likewise.

3. Mr. MENON (India) stated that he had not yet received instructions from his Government and would not be in a position to vote on the draft resolution or another forty-eight hours. The draft resolution was a very important one, and although many reservations had been formulated, unanimous adoption was desirable. He would therefore like to ask the sponsors of the draft resolution for some clarifications, not in order to argue about words, but in order to understand their intentions.

1. Mr. Menon's first observation concerned the second paragraph of the preamble to section A, in which the General Assembly noted that negotiations were in progress. Since, however, the Assembly was not fully informed of the negotiations, it would appear inefficient merely to note the fact of those negotiations.

2. Secondly, paragraph 1 of the same section referred to "the" agency, and not "an" agency, as the Indian delegation had suggested. It would be interesting to know why the definite article had been used instead of the indefinite article.

3. Thirdly, paragraph 2 mentioned a form of agreement between the agency and the United Nations, but did not indicate who would be parties to the act of establishment of the agency. Mr. Menon asked whether the parties would be the seven sponsors of the draft resolution, or whether other States would accede to a multilateral treaty already agreed upon among the sponsoring States, or whether there would be a final act involving a plenary conference or some other method of negotiation, which would enable the other States to put forward their ideas.

4. Fourthly, Mr. Menon did not understand paragraph 3. The record of the discussion of the present item would in any case be available to all Members of the United Nations, and to limit the circulation of such documents to a particular group of States would be contrary to the spirit of the Charter. Moreover, since it was not yet known which States were to participate in the establishment of the agency, how would the Secretary-General know to which States to transmit them?

5. Fifthly, Mr. Menon asked what was to be understood by the words "fully considered", in paragraph 4. Would the Members concerned be asked to make verbal statements, or would there merely be an exchange of written communications in the form of proposals and replies, or would there be negotiations? It was difficult, in any case, to see what was meant by the expression "Members who have manifested their interest", for many Members had manifested their interest merely by taking part in the debate, and the sponsors of the draft resolution had themselves stated that it would be difficult to consult a large number of States. India had therefore proposed an amendment (A/C.1/L.107) to enable Member States that were able and willing to participate in such an agency to co-operate in its establishment by entering into consultations and negotiations with those States which were already so engaged.

56. Finally, the present wording of section B, paragraph 2, might result in the conference duplicating the work of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization or the World Health Organization. It would have been preferable to indicate that the work of the conference in the fields of biology, medicine, etc., should be confined to the utilization of atomic energy in those fields.

57. Mr. NUTTING (United Kingdom) wished to deal with two points raised by Mr. Menon, namely, the question of consultation between the Powers participating in the establishment of the agency and other Member States, and the question of how States which were not so participating could enter into negotiations with a view to joining the agency later.

58. With regard to the question of consultation, it was clear from the debate that many States would wish to offer their views; that was why the sponsors of the draft resolution had suggested, in section A, paragraph 4, that the views of Members who had manifested their interests should be considered. Some form of consultation was thus provided for. Mr. Nutting recalled, in that connexion, that he had already stated (718th meeting) that the United Kingdom would take full account of the views of the Commonwealth countries and other States with which it had bilateral atomic energy arrangements. There was every reason to suppose that, moreover, all the States participating in the establishment of the agency would take account of the views of those States with which they had what might be called "atomic relations".

59. With regard to the second question, there was nothing in the revised draft resolution to prevent any Member State from entering into negotiations with the States participating in the agency with a view to joining the agency. Bilateral negotiation was thus provided for, and that was certainly preferable to multilateral negotiations such as those which Mr. Menon appeared to suggest and which would mean initial negotiations among sixty States.

60. The United Kingdom delegation hoped that the revised seven-Power draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

61. Mr. LODGE (United States of America) wished to reply to the Indian representative's six questions.

62. First, the negotiations in progress mentioned in the second paragraph of the preamble to section A referred, on the one hand, to the negotiations between the seven sponsors of the draft resolution and Portugal and, on the other, to the negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

63. Secondly, paragraph 1 mentioned "the agency" and not "an agency", because at the present stage only one such agency was in prospect.

64. Thirdly, it was not possible at present to indicate how the agreement establishing the agency would be formulated or what its provisions would be. When the agreement was concluded, it would, of course, indicate the parties to it and how the co-operation of other States should be obtained.

65. Fourthly, paragraph 3 of section A was obviously not meant to restrict the distribution of the records of the present debate. All that was intended was that the States participating in the establishment of the agency should give special attention to the views of the States represented on the First Committee.

66. Fifthly, the words "Members who have manifested their interest" should be understood to mean those that had participated in the debate in the First Committee or that might decide at a later stage to communicate their views through the usual diplomatic channels.

67. Finally, in paragraph 2 of section B, it had not been thought necessary to specify that the conference's studies in the fields of biology, medicine, etc., would deal only with the utilization of atomic energy in those fields, because that was clear from the context.

The meeting rose at 6.50 p.m.