



Ninth Session

FIRST COMMITTEE

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE SEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Monday, 15 November 1954, at 3 p.m.

Chairman:

Mr. URRUTIA

(Colombia)

International co-operation in developing the peaceful uses
of atomic energy: report of the United States of America
[Agenda item 67] (continued)

Statements were made by:

Mr. Moe (Norway), Mr. Lodge (United States of America),
Mr. Cooke (Argentina), Mr. de la Colina (Mexico).

Note: The Official Record of this meeting, i.e., the summary record,
will appear in provisional mimeographed form under the symbol
A/C.1/SR.717 and will be subject to representatives' corrections.
It will appear in final form in a printed volume.

INTERNATIONAL CO-OPERATION IN DEVELOPING THE PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY:
REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA [Agenda item 67] (continued)

The CHAIRMAN: The following is the list of speakers, as of the closing of the list at 1 o'clock: Norway, United States, Argentina, Mexico, the United Kingdom, Czechoslovakia, Bolivia, Lebanon, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Burma, Paraguay, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Dominican Republic, Panama, Poland, India, and the Soviet Union.

With the approval of the speakers scheduled for this afternoon's meeting, I shall now call on the Secretary-General who wishes to make a statement.

The SECRETARY-GENERAL: When the General Assembly, on 25 September, included in its agenda the item on "International co-operation in developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy", proposed by the United States delegation, it was apparent that any action taken along this line undoubtedly would involve considerable new responsibilities for the United Nations.

With this in mind, on 29 September, I appointed a Secretariat Committee which was directed to undertake an internal preparatory study of, first, appropriate methods, procedures and organizational arrangements for the calling and conduct of the international scientific conference to meet in the spring of 1955, as well as the Secretariat responsibilities in this operation, and second, possible organizational relationships of the United Nations with an international agency organized for the aforementioned purposes under the aegis of the United Nations.

The Secretariat Committee proceeded at once to pursue studies relating to various aspects of its task. At a meeting of the First Committee on 9 November references were made to this work of the Secretariat and the question was raised whether the Secretary-General might not make these studies available to the members of this Committee. I indicated in reply that a summary of these studies would be prepared and submitted to the Committee. It would contain information mainly, I assumed, covering constitutional relationships and possibilities which would seem useful to the Committee's work.

(The Secretary-General)

This summary has now been prepared and is being distributed today. I believe that you will find that the material set forth in the summary is more or less self-explanatory and that there is no need for me to elaborate on it here. Primarily factual in the nature of the case, it provides a brief review of existing precedents with regard to the establishment of agencies within the United Nations framework and their relationship to the United Nations itself. There is also an annex setting forth some notes on matters relating to the proposed international scientific conference. I might call to your attention the three unnumbered paragraphs following paragraph 37 of the summary, which may afford some guidance in evaluating the material set forth in the preceding sections of the summary.

A major question in the establishment of the proposed new agency to deal with the peaceful use of atomic energy is whether existing precedents with regard to both form and relationship offer a satisfactory solution. It may well be found that they do not and that a new form and a new type of relationship will have to be devised in order to meet adequately the needs of an unprecedented situation.

If, finally, I may be permitted to express a purely personal opinion, I should venture to suggest that the demands of the entirely new situation with which we are confronted call for an open-minded and even unconventional approach to the problem of organization and relationship. Thus, with respect to the immediate question before us, it seems to me that precedents, helpful though they often may be, need not in any way be considered as conclusive and binding or as presenting models deserving of further detailed study and debate.

I feel sure that from a process of further exploration of practical possibilities in a new direction, unhampered by premature decision as to the exact form of the proposed agency, there can emerge a wholly satisfactory solution.

Mr. MOE (Norway): First of all, the Norwegian delegation wishes to associate itself with many previous speakers who have welcomed the generous offer made by President Eisenhower in his speech last December. At the same time, my delegation wishes to express its appreciation of the initiative taken by the United States delegation in putting this item on the agenda of the United Nations. We are also grateful to the seven negotiating Powers for having submitted in their draft resolution a rough sketch of what the further procedure should be.

At the basis of all human activity in modern civilization lies the magic concept of energy. The industry that turns out the steel for our railroads and bridges, the aluminium for our planes and houses, the textiles for our clothes and the plastics for our gadgets -- it is all based fundamentally on one all-important factor: the availability of energy.

Nobody pondering the implications of the discovery of atomic energy would for a moment believe that it could possibly pass without far-reaching effect on a civilization based on energy, on power production. Atomic energy is a field where international co-operation is as necessary as it is desirable. Let me mention a few reasons.

We do not know how rapid the development of atomic energy will be. But it is evident that its full development as a new source of energy will have a great impact not only on the industrial structure, but also on the geographical distribution of industry in the world, and thereby on international relations.

(Mr. Moe, Norway)

One of the promising aspects of atomic energy is that it might help to solve one of the most pressing and urgent problems of today, the problem of the industrially under-developed countries. It is furthermore obvious that the development of atomic energy will have important economic and social consequences, which might in their turn have a bearing on the international situation.

I shall not discuss the relation between the peaceful uses of atomic energy and disarmament. I should like to say only the following: the possible use of atomic weapons has created great fear all over the world. The secrecy surrounding this technical development has certainly not served to dispel this fear. The secrecy has given added weight to all other elements creating an atmosphere of distrust and mutual suspicion. My delegation is convinced that if, by open and trustful international co-operation, we could contribute to making the secrecy, the distrust and the suspicion disappear, we would have made the first step towards a more calm and quiet approach to the whole question of disarmament.

International co-operation is also desirable because developments will be rapid and fruitful only if we are able to facilitate the access to the necessary raw materials and share in common the progress in technology in this particular field.

International co-operation is necessary because the field of atomic energy is certainly one of those where the technological progress has by far surpassed our small national units. As a matter of fact, only the great Powers are able to handle the question of the development and the uses of atomic energy on a national basis. And even the great Powers have difficulties in proceeding on a purely national basis.

Let me turn for a moment to the special problems confronting the smaller nations in this field. As far as smaller nations are concerned, they have particular problems in obtaining the raw materials which they need to make their contribution to the development of atomic energy for peaceful ends.

Many smaller nations, especially in Europe, have a very high standard based on a long tradition in scientific research and industrial technology. Given

(Mr. Moe, Norway)

access to the tools, they could certainly make a valuable contribution. The initial cost connected with development on a broad front of nuclear technology is, however, so great that most countries in the world find it impossible to provide the necessary funds on a national basis.

To illustrate this point, let me just mention that the consumption of electricity by the establishments controlled by the United States Atomic Energy Commission is greater than the total consumption of electricity in the whole of my own country, Norway; and, after all, the production of electrical energy in Norway per capita is about twice as high as in the United States.

Now, the fact that atomic energy development is an expensive undertaking does not at all mean that smaller nations are prevented from partaking efficiently. It means that they must follow two main principles: They must concentrate on limited objectives and they must co-operate. These principles have already led the smaller European countries into a considerable measure of international co-operation and mutual assistance in the field of atomic energy. I will give a few examples. The Netherlands and Norway have since 1951 had a completely integrated common atomic energy project, starting up in 1951 in Norway the first experimental reactor outside the greater Powers. May I point out that this is, as far as we know, the first and only case of a completely integrated project of two nations in the atomic energy field.

The Dutch-Norwegian undertaking has more or less informal working agreements concerning special projects with France, Sweden and Switzerland. The heavy-water reactors in France, Sweden and the United Kingdom have their heavy-water supplied from Norway. In the staff of the atomic energy establishment in Norway you will usually find scientists coming from as many as ten different nations. This represents therefore on a modest scale an international reactor school, which has functioned for more than three years. Among the nations who have sent their scientists to work at the Dutch-Norwegian centre are: United States, Argentina, India, Italy, Switzerland, Sweden, Yugoslavia.

Furthermore, eight European nations with projects in the field have formed a European Atomic Energy Society to promote development of industrial application of atomic energy. These are: Belgium, France, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. May I here interpose a remark: This Society for atomic energy development should be carefully distinguished from the Geneva Centre of Nuclear Research, which is to be an Institute of Academic Studies in Nuclear Physics -- a European University Department so to say -- with no relation to exploitation of nuclear fission for practical purposes. The confusion here is understandable, but it should be avoided in the discussions on applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

The aims of the eight-nation European Atomic Energy Society are not unlike those of the Agency now proposed, and a study of the European organization might be worth while.

I would like to read out the first part of the statutes of the organization:

"1. The main aim of the Society is to promote co-operation in nuclear energy research and engineering. To achieve this aim the Society will:

- (a) promote the arranging at regular intervals of international meetings for scientists and engineers working in the field of peaceful application of nuclear energy;
- (b) promote the circulation of reports and other information of unclassified nature;
- (c) work for standardization of nomenclature and symbols in nuclear energy;
- (d) promote the study of hazard and safety measures arising from the application of nuclear energy;
- (e) promote publication of nuclear energy works, and possibly encourage the establishment of an international journal in the field;
- (f) establish a centre of information on availability of nuclear energy materials and equipment."

In the European Atomic Energy Society the European nations have found a form of co-operation in the atomic energy field on which it has been possible for the Governments to agree. It appears to us pertinent to mention this in so much detail during this debate because it may have some value for the subsequent discussion of the organization of the proposed agency.

Let me mention a few other details about the atomic energy developments in Europe.

Isotopes are produced and sold commercially by Great Britain all over Europe. On a smaller scale the Dutch-Norwegian Establishment also produces and sells isotopes to other nations.

Experimental reactors are under construction in Switzerland, Belgium and Italy, and plans for reactors exist in Yugoslavia and Germany. As mentioned by my distinguished Swedish colleague, Mr. Sandler, Sweden has recently put into operation its first experimental reactor, and is planning a plutonium-producing reactor. The Dutch-Norwegian group is finishing the design of an electricity-producing experimental reactor of about the same capacity and probably similar to the announced power-plant in the USSR.

Specialists from the Establishment in Norway have been visiting as consultants with the Atomic Energy Commissions in Argentina, Brazil, India and Yugoslavia.

The world's first international conference on reactor technology was arranged in Oslo, Norway, in August 1953 and was attended by representatives of nineteen countries from all over the world.

Uranium is being produced from low grade ores in Sweden. German industry has already uranium-refining plants for sale. Italy and Yugoslavia are preparing production by means of such plants. The British and the French have both generously assisted their less resourceful co-members in the European Society with information, materials and instruments.

I am mentioning all this to make it clear that co-operation can work in atomic energy -- that it does work, and that it enables smaller nations to take their proper place in developing the new force.

I now turn to the draft resolution before us.

I expressed at the outset our great satisfaction with the initiative which has been taken to put the whole problem of the peaceful uses of atomic energy on the agenda of the United Nations.

But this, of course, is only a first step. The problem has many far-reaching aspects and raises a number of questions.

It is understandable that the Powers, which have sponsored the draft resolution, have not been able to present a fully elaborated plan for the structure and the functions of the proposed international organ. This is a difficult and complicated problem where many factors enter into the picture. It is for instance evident that national domestic legislation may limit the possibilities to reach that degree of co-operation, which many of us might find desirable. If this should be the case, it raises the question of the possibility of adjusting national domestic legislation to the necessities of international co-operation. This would necessarily take time. Meanwhile, the establishment of international co-operation on a modest scale has its great value also because it would act as a catalyzer for the process of developing a more extended co-operation.

My delegation should like to point out that important as it is the initiative has been taken to put the question before the United Nations, and still more important is it to see the initiative more vigorously promoted towards the desired goal. This would largely depend on the outcome of the proposed negotiations. If we are not careful the result might well be the opposite of what is expected.

When considering the proposed Agency it would seem natural to view it in the light of its role in the field of international co-operation, and secondly, the relationship between the Agency and the United Nations.

As regards the role of the Agency in the international field, of course, it is difficult to form a hard and fast opinion as long as more detailed information is not available, and therefore the Norwegian delegation is not committing itself when it makes the observations which follow.

It seems to us that a serious difficulty would lie in the obvious concern of the uranium-producing countries regarding the prospect of leaving in the hands of an international agency the powers to dispose of one of their most valuable national assets. Such an arrangement is therefore not contemplated. On the other hand we must appreciate the legitimate concern of the consumers lest their access to raw materials and information be curtailed. Finally, there is the concern of all of us that the United Nations somehow should be made a party to the arrangement as the representative of all categories of nations.

(Mr. Moe, Norway)

In this connexion I might perhaps mention that it would seem reasonable to my delegation that countries which, at present, have no adequate access to raw materials should be represented in the initial stage of preparing the agency.

Bearing in mind these difficulties, we wonder whether it would not be useful to consider the possibility of adopting the pattern of organization which we find in the European Atomic Energy Society. This would mean an agency based on complete self-determination of each member as to its contribution; that is, the same principle guiding the Members of the United Nations when they are called upon to make contributions, for instance, to the Technical Assistance Programme or to UNICEF. This principle would then set the limits for the functions of the agency.

As far as we have been able to understand the proposal of the seven Powers, our suggestion would not mean any substantial departure from what actually is contemplated. Since all transfer of fissionable material through the proposed agency would in any case be based on bilateral arrangements -- possibly formal bilateral agreements -- it would seem to be an unnecessary complication to have the agency involved in the transfer of fissionable material.

Of course, it may appear to be of doubtful value to form an organization for co-operation in this field on a basis of purely voluntary contributions. Our experience in Europe, however, seems to indicate that it may be successful. It should be kept in mind that co-operation is, in spirit and by definition, voluntary. Nobody can expect co-operation to be brought about by a mere majority vote.

I would point out particularly that, even if the transfer of fissionable materials were to take place without the agency's being directly involved, the agency could very well assume the function of being an instrument in the facilitation of such transfers by serving as a centre for information as regards the availability of such materials. This should not be limited to fissile/only, but should include a great number of the scarce metals and other special materials such as sodium, graphite and heavy water, which are all essential to the development of nuclear power.

(Mr. Moe, Norway)

If the agency is established on this basis, very important aims of international co-operation in atomic energy development would still be within its authority. Among these I would only mention the arranging of international conferences, the promotion of exchange of technical information, the study of health and safety precautions, which must go parallel with the practical application of atomic energy. Furthermore, I would mention the question of standardization and the question of publication and dissemination of technical knowledge. Last, but not least, the setting up of schools for training specialists in this field, as suggested by the United States and the United Kingdom, could also be a valuable function within the authority of the agency.

It will be noted that I have tried to approach this problem from a purely practical point of view. We realize that in this case, as in most others, the problem is to reconcile the desirable with the possible. The conclusions which I have arrived at show that we are essentially in agreement with the sponsors of the draft resolution with regard to the operation and functions of the proposed agency.

I now come to the question of the relationship between the agency and the United Nations. Previous speakers have brought up the question of the veto in the Security Council and of how this would apply to the proposed agency. In our opinion, the way in which this problem has been put hardly makes it relevant to the actual situation which will confront us. It seems to us that the proposal contained in the draft resolution makes it obvious that the transfer of fissionable material will be effected on a voluntary basis. This means that every member will have a de facto veto power as far as his own contribution of fissionable material is concerned. It may, of course, be contended that, in case the agency is made a subsidiary organ of the Security Council, the unanimity rule may be applied in questions dealing with the agency's policy.

One could imagine an agency in which, in all cases other than the transfer of fissionable material, decisions are made by a majority vote. If such an agency should be made a subsidiary body of the Security Council, it is obvious that the unanimity rule in that organ would apply. But, as far

(Mr. Moe, Norway)

as we know, nobody has proposed this kind of agency or this kind of relationship with the United Nations. As long as we do not know whether there will be a majority rule in the agency, or what the relations to the Security Council will be, it seems to us to be useless to discuss the problem of the veto in abstracto.

However, I should like to point out that, by following the pattern of the European Atomic Energy Society, the problem of the veto would not arise at all. All contributions to and all participation in the agency would be of a voluntary nature. This means that there would not be any majority vote; every member would, in all matters and not only on the question of transfer of fissionable materials, have a de facto veto as far as his own contribution and participation were concerned. Therefore, by following this pattern the veto would not apply, even if the agency were made a subsidiary body of the Security Council.

The draft resolution before us suggests that, once the agency is established, it shall negotiate an appropriate form of agreement with the United Nations similar to those of the specialized agencies. Taking as a starting point the fact that the sponsors of the draft resolution contemplate the establishment of a relationship between the agency and the United Nations, it would seem both reasonable and logical that the treaty which forms the basis of the agency should be worked out in a way which would take into consideration this eventual relationship with the United Nations. This being so, it would seem equally reasonable and logical that the United Nations should be consulted, preferably at the initial stage of the negotiations, but, in any event, before the treaty is finally formulated.

It has been suggested that this relationship should take a form similar to those between the specialized agencies and the United Nations. To us, this does not seem to be the obvious solution. We are dealing here with a problem which is essentially different in nature from that of any specialized agency. We have a feeling that the problem of establishing a link between the United Nations and an atomic energy agency calls for a radically new and more adequate arrangement than any of those existing within our Organization. In this respect we agree with the opinion expressed by the

MW/rhw

A/C.1/PV.717
19-20

(Mr. Moe, Norway)

Secretary-General in his statement at the beginning of this meeting. We are grateful to him for having submitted the Secretariat's study of the problem, and we are convinced that this study will be of great help to the Committee in dealing with the question.

(Mr. Moe, Norway)

If a new arrangement is necessary it would seem even more desirable that the United Nations be consulted at an early stage. We realize, of course, that each negotiating State is the sole master of what it deems to be in its interest to include in the treaty with regard to the actual working relationship between the contracting parties. However, this need not exclude consultations with an organization with which the contracting parties want to establish a relationship at a later stage. Of course, it could not be suggested for a moment that the United Nations would try to interfere in the process of negotiation of treaties between sovereign States. The interest of the United Nations would be focused on the agency and its functions in their relationship to the United Nations. We may, perhaps, be permitted to suggest in this connexion that if the agency's functions are defined along the lines of the European Atomic Energy Society then it should be much easier to bring the United Nations into the negotiations at an early stage. In any case, it could perhaps be assumed that the eight negotiating States would find it possible to designate special representatives to undertake consultations with the United Nations parallel with the negotiations between the States with respect to the actual treaty provisions which would be necessary for their co-operation on a bilateral or a multi-lateral basis -- whichever of the two systems is contemplated.

In paragraph 2 of part B of the draft resolution (A/C.1/L.105) the seven Powers suggest that the United Nations should organize an international conference "to explore means of developing the peaceful uses of atomic energy through international co-operation".

In his statement in this Committee on 5 November the representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Pierson Dixon, said:

"It is not our expectation that the conference should make recommendations or should concern itself with the proposed international atomic energy agency's organization." (A/C.1/PV.707, p.43)

To the Norwegian delegation it would seem difficult to discuss the "means of developing peaceful uses through international co-operation" without discussing the formation of some kind of an international instrument or machinery.

The formation of an international organ is, after all, considered by the proposing Powers to be the most important means of creating international co-operation. It does not seem quite clear how the conference could explore means of developing atomic energy through international co-operation while at the same time being precluded from making recommendations.

The representative of the United States, Mr. Lodge, in his speech introducing the draft resolution, suggested

"convening an international conference to discover the field in which progress would be technically feasible and to develop procedures whereby the nations of the world can make known their wants". (A/C.1/PV.701, page 23)

Now, to develop procedures whereby nations can make known their wants is different from means of developing peaceful uses through international co-operation, although both undertakings are, of course, of great value. There will, however, certainly be no difficulties in making known the wants of nations.

The Norwegian delegation is keenly interested in doing its part to ensure that this conference, the success of which will reflect on the prestige of the arranging body, the United Nations, shall be one of real substance and value. It is of primary importance that the aim of the conference should be clarified before the United Nations undertakes to organize it.

If the interpretation of the representative of the United Kingdom is correct and the conference should be intended to be a purely scientific or technical conference, without any task of considering organizational questions or of making recommendations on means of developing atomic energy through international co-operation, then there are two possibilities. The conference may be concerned with technology of nuclear power -- which is the area of restricted information where a conference in connexion with the declassification of certain information would be highly valuable and welcomed among the specialists. Or, on the other hand, it may be concerned only with the unrestricted research area -- isotope applications, biology, medicine, nuclear physics and field theory. In this area international co-operation and contacts

(Mr. Moe, Norway)

have at no time been more vigorously pursued than today, and the number of international conferences is already large enough to interfere with the working efficiency of most research institutions.

The Norwegian delegation favours the first kind of conference, namely, a conference on nuclear power technology. This is, in our opinion, the field in which at present the lack of international co-operation is strongly felt, in contrast with the purely scientific field where co-operation seems well established. Such a conference could be of great value for the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes.

As pointed out in a letter to the planners of the United Nations conference, the European Atomic Energy Society decided in June 1954 to organize an international conference on nuclear power technology in Rome in October 1955. I am confident that nothing would be more genuinely welcomed among the European scientists than the idea of co-operation with the United Nations in organizing such a conference. Obviously, however, two separate international conferences with identical agendas should be avoided. In any case, it appears from the letter I mentioned a moment ago that the kind of conference in which the scientists in the European atomic energy commissions are primarily interested is a conference devoted to problems of nuclear power technology and its economic implications.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes briefly to sum up the guiding ideas of this intervention.

We consider it not only as desirable but as necessary to initiate a world-wide, international co-operation for the peaceful use of atomic energy. In establishing an agency for this purpose one has to take into consideration not only what might be desirable but what is possible. In our opinion the start could be made only on a basis of voluntary contributions.

If this principle is accepted the question of the relations between the agency and the United Nations will also be easier to solve. In any event, the United Nations should be consulted and asked for its opinion at the initial stage of the negotiations.

The aims and the agenda of the planned international scientific conference must be clarified.

Finally, let me assure the Committee that the observations made by the Norwegian delegation have been determined by our genuine desire to contribute to the efforts which we are all making in order to arrive at solutions which are in harmony with the magnitude of the task before us. The initiative taken by the seven Powers, we are confident, will prove to be a first step in the right direction.

Mr. LODGE (United States of America): Let me, at the outset, say a word regarding the amendments which the representative of the Soviet Union submitted on Friday. We are studying them carefully, and I hope to give him our reactions this evening.

During last week's valuable debate, some questions were raised by a number of representatives, and today I should like to deal with them in as helpful and as candid a manner as possible.

The first, I believe, was raised both by the representative of the Soviet Union and by the representative of China. It asked whether the pending proposal was narrower than that of the President of 8 December last. I think that was dealt with in the speech which my colleague, Mr. Jackson, made this morning.

Next, the Soviet Union representative made an interesting statement concerning the past and present role of the Soviet Union in connexion with nuclear physics. His survey of the developments of peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Soviet Union seemed to stress Russian accomplishments prior to World War I. But it did point to the successful development of an electric power plant with a capacity of 5,000 kilowatts. We congratulate the Soviet Union on this achievement, although the building of a 5,000 kilowatt pilot plant is still a long way from achieving abundant electrical power.

The status of Soviet atomic power technology was described with commendable modesty in an article in the Soviet magazine Communist in April of this year, by A. Nesmeyanov, who said that Soviet scientists must strive "to make atomic energy available for extensive utilization in industry and in transport". Then the article continues: "The advancement of atomic energy into wide peaceful practice is undoubtedly a matter of a complete epoch."

Without going into the question of how long a "complete epoch" is, it can be set down that one of the ways to speed up the epoch of atomic industrial power is to broaden the exchange of information. We therefore express the hope that the Soviet Union will make public as soon as possible the design for its 5,000 kilowatt atomic power plant. We in the United States have published our designs for various power reactors, copies of which the Soviet Union surely already possesses. If the Soviet Union will put out similar publications -- as General Romulo, I believe, suggested -- they will certainly interest us all and will facilitate international co-operation.

The Soviet representative spoke also of other kinds of atomic progress, notably in the production and use of radioisotopes. It would be interesting to learn what the Soviet programme is for exportation of these isotopes for the benefit of other countries.

As to membership in the agency, we still believe that the door should be left open so that all States can assume the responsibilities and secure the benefits of participation. We were accused by the Soviet Union representative of seeking special privilege and of engaging in exploitation. Let me say that the only special privilege we claim is the privilege of helping as many countries as we can in this field, and the only exploitation we have in mind is the exploitation of atomic energy for peace.

As to the agency's relationship to the United Nations, we have not changed our view that the agency should be under the aegis of the United Nations. As we have indicated in the joint resolution, we contemplate that an appropriate relationship with the United Nations will be worked out once the agency is established. As I said in my opening statement, it would not be practical to spell out the possible relationships at this time, until we know better just exactly what the agency will look like when it comes into being. We agree with the Soviet Union representative that the resolution to be passed by this Committee should not pre-judge the nature of the relationship between the agency and the United Nations. We have not done so in our draft resolution. We agree with him that this is a matter which must be negotiated both among the States which will be forming the agency and between the agency, once it is established, and the United Nations. I shall deal later on in this statement with the problem of the relationship of the agency to the Security Council and the General Assembly.

Let us remember that here are eight nations that are intending to give up fissionable or raw materials which are exceedingly valuable both for the peacetime development of these nations and for their security. Every member of the legislative bodies of these countries, whether he sit in the Belgian Parliament or in the Canadian Parliament or in the French Assembly or in the Portuguese Government or in the Legislature of the Union of South Africa or in the House of Commons in London or in the United States Congress in Washington, would be faithless to his trust if he did not scrutinize closely the treaty which will come before him. Many of you in this room have been members of legislative bodies. These are concerns which we understand and respect.

Also, the offer which we are making today is made possible by the amendments to the Atomic Energy Act enacted at the last session of Congress. This law broadens what we can now do over what we could have done last year. It was at its last session, for example, that Congress authorized us to share information and materials. Obviously, as a practical matter, we must stay within the law.

I said on 5 November that the international atomic energy agency would act as a clearing house for requests for allocations of fissionable materials to projects approved by the agency. The Soviet Union representative interpreted my remarks as follows:

"If plans or projects for the use of atomic materials to be cleared through the international agency from one state to another in accordance with agreement are made contingent on approval by the international agency then that means that the international agency will have the right to approve or not approve the plans of states concerned in the use of fissionable materials for peaceful ends." (A/C.1/PV.715, pp.51-52)

That is not a correct interpretation of our proposal. The agency would concern itself only with fissionable materials specifically earmarked for agency projects by the contributing states. It would have no control over the use of any other fissionable material. Any contributing state would remain free to transfer fissionable materials to another state without securing the consent of the agency.

There are other problems. Many states, for example, will have interests in this organization and sometimes these interests will need to be harmonized. It will be difficult to negotiate and secure agreement upon even a simple organization. The more complicated the organization and the more intricate the negotiations, the longer will be the delay in spreading the benefits of atomic energy. The more we attempt here to fasten a fixed course onto these negotiations, the greater the danger that we shall create unnecessary and even insuperable obstacles in the way of rapid progress. We think that the best way, if not the only way, for us to render a service to the world in this field is to begin by simplifying the organization, by simplifying the negotiations, by concentrating on what is feasible, on what is do-able -- by getting down to work with the least possible delay.

The Soviet Union representative renewed his attempt to chain any progress in international co-operation in developing peaceful uses of the atom to concurrent progress in connexion with a disarmament programme -- although he no longer insisted that other states must first agree on an unsafeguarded paper prohibition of the use of atomic weapons before his Government would join the negotiations in the field of peaceful uses.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

President Eisenhower made it clear last December that, while his proposal was not a disarmament proposal, he recognized that agreement on it might bring peace nearer, and thus bring disarmament nearer -- because, of course, disarmament and peace are not one and the same thing. The President hoped that his proposal would:

"open up a new channel for peaceful discussion and initiate at least a new approach to the many difficult problems that must be solved in both private and public conversations if the world is to shake off the inertia imposed by fear and is to make positive progress towards peace." (A/PV.470, para. 122)

This Committee, of all bodies of human beings in the world, does not need to be reminded of the importance of disarmament or of the vast physical and mental burdens it would lift. Still less do we need to be reminded, after eight years of debate, how difficult it is to disarm when mutual trust is lacking. Disarmament is one element in the building of peace. At least one other element is a new world outlook which may get us into the habit of working together and thus, eventually, of trusting each other. We think that this atoms-for-peace proposal will lead the world away from war because it is a new prism through which we can look at the problems of the world. It is a new place at which to begin.

We must therefore not bog down one proposal by tying it on to another. There already exists a separate framework for disarmament. We here propose a framework for the parallel discussions of the peaceful uses of the atom. We anticipate that genuine progress in either discussion will eventually facilitate progress in the other. We agree with the representative of the Soviet Union when he says that the proposals of the 19 March memorandum do not, in themselves, result in the reduction of the potential force of atomic weapons. Neither do they increase it. But they would result in economic and social benefits to many areas of the world. And we, in our partnership with the other negotiating Powers, are determined that progress in making the atom available for peace shall not be further delayed.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

The Soviet Union representative contended that the exploitation of atomic energy for peaceful uses inevitably implies an increase in the supply of fissionable weapon-grade materials; that the non-dangerous materials diverted to peaceful uses could become dangerous; and that industrial reactors would produce radioactive effluents or by-products which could be used for military purposes. He thereby implied that the agreement for peaceful uses of atomic energy must include an agreement to eliminate atomic weapons. The representative of Sweden also alluded to this problem. We believe, however, that it is not necessary to solve the entire problem of international control of atomic energy and the elimination of atomic weapons before we can have peaceful projects utilizing atomic fission consistent with international security.

Let me reaffirm the belief of the United States, as stated in the published correspondence with the Soviet Union (A/2738), that ways can be devised consistent with international security for developing the peaceful uses of the atom and for safeguarding against the diversion of materials to warlike purposes.

For one thing, there are forms of peaceful utilization in which no question of weapon-grade materials arises at all. In the activities proposed for the immediate future, as described in my speech on 5 November, for example, weapon-grade materials would not be involved in any way.

The problem of radioactive by-products suggested by the Soviet Union representative can also be dealt with.

As for ensuring against diversion of materials from power-producing reactors, this problem is part of the general question of the various interlocking safeguards which are necessary to see to it that fissionable materials provided for or produced in connexion with peaceful uses of atomic energy are utilized only for such purposes and are not diverted to improper uses. This is one problem which must be considered in the course of negotiations to establish the international atomic energy agency, and the various Powers negotiating -- particularly those actually producing fissionable materials -- will obviously make clear their views on this matter. It is theoretically

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

possible, as the Soviet Union representative suggested, to build power reactors that will increase the supply of fissionable weapon-grade materials, but it is not inevitable. We believe that, as power-producing reactors are designed and built in the future, the ingenuity of the scientists and statesmen will find ways of ensuring that materials are not diverted to warlike industries.

Remember that the spread of nuclear materials through the work of the international agency, for the purpose of establishing atomic power plants, would not in any degree complicate the problem of ensuring the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only. That problem already exists as a part of the disarmament question, and the great Powers have been discussing it for years. The international control organ, when established, could function perfectly well in collaboration with the international atomic energy agency. But, in the meantime, we want to get on with the business of helping to bring atomic energy to the service of mankind. Nothing we do to this end need complicate the problem of disarmament control.

The Soviet Union representative has also sought to link disarmament and the peaceful uses of the atom by insisting upon the paramount role of the Security Council in this field. The Security Council, under the Charter, has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The General Assembly likewise has responsibilities in this field. If a situation endangering international peace and security arose in connexion with the peaceful uses of the atom in any country or group of countries, it would be a matter of concern both to the Security Council and to the General Assembly and would doubtless be dealt with by the United Nations as are other situations of this nature. Thus, it is possible, and indeed probable, that in the interests of international security there will be some relationship between the agency and the Security Council, the General Assembly and the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

But the Soviet Union representative harked back to the **General Assembly** resolution of 24 January 1946 creating the original United Nations Atomic Energy Commission -- a body which no longer exists. That was the Commission which was to make specific proposals for the control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes. Since the Commission's primary objective was to deal with atomic disarmament, it, of course, was to report and make recommendations to the Security Council and the General Assembly. The Soviet Union representative now seems to suggest that the international atomic energy agency, whose functions will be wholly different, should be saddled with the same requirement -- and thus be made subject to the veto.

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

The truth, and it is a plain truth, is that the purpose which this defunct commission was designed to achieve has, by a recent resolution and by many previous resolutions, been referred to the Disarmament Commission, which is the body to which the United Nations now looks for action on disarmament.

Questions have been asked by certain other representatives about the nature of the participation of under-developed countries in the agency. This point was adverted to by the representative of Pakistan in his statement. The memorandum handed to the Soviet Ambassador by the United States Secretary of State on 19 March contained a provision that the highest executive authority in the agency should be exercised by a board of governors of limited membership representing governments. The memorandum went on to suggest that in determining the composition of the board of governors, it might be desirable "to take account of geographic distribution and membership by prospective beneficiaries". In other words -- and I stress this point -- our plan contemplates representation on the agency's board of governors of the under-developed countries which will also be participating in the agency.

Another question relates to the participation in the agency of States other than those which are conducting the negotiations for its organization. The Secretary of State, in his opening address to the General Assembly on 23 September, made the United States position on this entirely clear. For example, he said:

"I want to make it perfectly clear that our planning excludes no nation from participation in this great venture. As our proposals take shape, all nations interested in participating and willing to take on the responsibilities of membership will be welcome to join with us in the planning and the execution of this programme." (A/PV.475, page 42)
That continues to be the United States position.

We have never contemplated a closed organization of contributing States. Nor have we contemplated confronting other governments with a fait accompli

(Mr. Lodge, United States)

in the creation of this agency. As we have indicated in the seven-Power draft resolution, we have undertaken to inform the Members of the United Nations as progress is achieved in the establishment of the agency. Moreover, I can give a further assurance in this regard. The Governments engaged in the current negotiation intend to consult those governments which indicate an interest in participating in the agency before the agreement establishing the agency is submitted for ratification. Views expressed by the governments so consulted will, of course, be seriously taken into account.

This, then, is our programme. We want above all to find the quickest way to create this agency. That is what the seven-Power draft resolution is designed to promote. We are pressing on with our negotiations on an urgent basis and ask nothing more than the co-operation and good will of other governments so that by the next session of the General Assembly we shall be able to discuss accomplishments and concrete results of international co-operation in putting the discoveries of atomic science at the service of man.

Just as I began the statement which I have now just concluded, I received a message from Washington, the substance of which I will now lay before the Committee. I hope it will once and for all remove from the minds of all any confusion as to how specific is the United States "atoms-for-peace" proposal and as to whether or not the scope of our proposal has been narrowed. Here is the message.

I have just been authorized by the President of the United States to state to this Committee that the Atomic Energy Commission has allocated 100 kilogrammes of fissionable material to serve as fuel in the experimental atomic reactors to which the Secretary of State and I have previously referred and which are to be situated in various places abroad. This amount of fissionable material is enough to activate a considerable number of these reactors throughout the world.

Mr. COOKE (Argentina) (interpretation from Spanish): In my statement to the General Assembly on 4 October, in which I interpreted the view of my Government, I said:

"The attitude of the United States, which has proposed sharing with other countries knowledge concerning atomic energy for its peaceful employment, has produced great satisfaction in Argentina. This proposal is in keeping with our ideas in this matter, as expressed by the President of the Republic, General Peron. Our thinking has been translated into the activities of our research agency, whose work is along the path of the use of atomic energy for humanitarian purposes."

(A/PV.488, page 50)

Consistent with these words, we wish now to express our support for the draft resolution that was submitted first of all by Mr. Lodge and which is the result of the idea so generously expressed by President Eisenhower. My delegation feels that this idea should be strongly and firmly supported by all so that it will be possible to facilitate the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes in the interests of humanity and as a means of eliminating the atomic race for military purposes.

Before making certain constructive and critical observations concerning the draft resolution that is before us, I should like to refer to the debate which has taken place, the problems which have been raised, and the methods of applying atomic energy for peaceful purposes at this stage of history and of civilization.

The first statement of the representative of the United States was the first of a series of speeches that have permitted those of us with only general ideas with regard to the origin of atomic energy and its possible applications to obtain extremely useful and valuable information. With great detail, Mr. Lodge gave what he called a brief review of the scientific developments that have brought us over the threshold of the atomic age. Mr. Lodge explained what had been done in the United States in the practical application of the atom in medicine, agriculture and other peaceful activities, including the production of energy.

(Mr. Cooke, Argentina)

The representative of the United Kingdom, Sir Pierson Dixon, also made a detailed reference to the scientific contributions of the scientists of his country in disproving the theory of the indivisibility of the atom, which had originally been stated by the Greek philosophers and which had remained unchallenged for more than 2,000 years. The representative of the United Kingdom also stressed the advances made in his country in the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Then the representative of Canada, Mr. Martin, told us that from the very beginning international co-operation had been the underlying characteristic of nuclear physics. After mentioning some of the fundamental discoveries that culminated with the dramatic proof of the power of the atom, Mr. Martin explained what Canada had been able to accomplish in the development of atomic energy, and paid tribute to the valuable assistance received from the United States and the United Kingdom both during and after the war. Mr. Martin said that after the Second World War the efforts of the Canadian scientists had been devoted exclusively to the peaceful application of atomic energy and specifically to the development of energy and power in his country.

At that stage of the debate, Mr. Moch, the representative of France, made a magnificent statement in which he reestablished French prestige. After stating that science is collective and international, and after recognizing that a scientist's discoveries are based upon the common heritage of mankind, that is, on previous investigation, Mr. Moch stated with legitimate and patriotic pride, to the satisfaction of all of us who belong to the Latin world and who admire his country, that the four studies and the understanding of fission and fusion which he outlined were marked by the eight Nobel prizes granted to French scientists.

(Mr. Cooke, Argentina)

We then were told of the atomic mineral wealth of France, the increase of its production, the size of its reserves and the carrying out of atomic efforts in France, efforts which are modest when compared to Anglo-Saxon and Soviet activities and discoveries because, as Mr. Moch said: "...France, maimed and devastated, had to invest more knowledge and enthusiasm than actual budgetary appropriations." (A/C.1/PV.708, page 12) He also stated that the programme of his country on questions of atomic energy was now exclusively devoted to peaceful uses -- and he hoped that they would be able to continue along those lines. He finished by saying, with evident satisfaction:

"France is largely self-sufficient as regards scientists and technicians, equipment and raw materials that have already been inventoried as well as resources to be prospected". (Ibid.)

Finally, Mr. Vyshinsky in his statement last Friday, after vindicating the contribution of Russian science, stressed the stages in the road of development of nuclear power that were helped and carried out by his countrymen. He also referred to what the Soviet Union had been able to do with regard to the peaceful uses of atomic energy, especially in the field of medicine, techniques and the production of electric power. He told us that on 27 June electric power for agriculture and industry was produced by the world's first atomic plant, with electric power of 5,000 kilowatts and that in the Soviet Union work is being carried out to set up atomic plants of 50,000 and 100,000 kilowatts.

Then, this morning, the representative of Poland upheld the prestige of Polish scientists by mentioning some of his countrymen who have had something to do with this process of the discovery of atomic energy.

Before concluding these explanations and statements which I consider to be fundamental, I should like to pay tribute to the scientists of other countries, those true unknown soldiers who made discoveries or who added to knowledge, but who have not been mentioned in this debate for one reason or another.

(Mr. Cooke, Argentina)

The fundamental conclusion that can be drawn from the statements that we have heard is the proof that there exists in the subject of atomic energy a tremendous paradox, that is to say: while the process and the application of atomic energy for military purposes has made extraordinary progress and has already been overtaken by thermonuclear energy, the application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes still appears to be in its infancy. This seems to spring from the statements of the representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada and France, as was so clearly stated this morning by the representative of Israel. They have all alerted us to the needs for not indulging in too many illusions with regard to the immediate possibilities of obtaining great and positive results. The representative of France drew our attention to this matter and pointed out the need for an "energy balance sheet of the universe", to quote his words, and he continued:

"This is a high outlook, which is required both to set our objectives and to prevent exaggerated hopes". (A/C.1/PV.708, page 12)

That was why we must not forget his advice of not forgetting, in this intermediate step between the present and the atomic era, what he called the "para-classical" methods which are interesting temporary solutions. Among these "para-classical" ways of obtaining power and energy he included, amongst others, solar radiation, the tides and winds, the difference of temperature between the waters on the surface and the waters at the depth of the seas, the heat of land, etc.

With regard to the application of atomic energy for military purposes, Mr. Moch, right after he began his statement said:

"The atomic military age has lasted for barely seven years. In January 1950 President Truman ordered the study of the thermonuclear bomb, based not on the fission of heavy nuclei, such as those of plutonium and uranium, but on the fusion of light nuclei, such as those of hydrogen, deuterium, tritium or lithium, under the impact of a temperature of several million degrees, similar to that which prevails in the centre of the sun, and produced by an atomic explosion which acts as the trigger of the thermonuclear device.

(Mr. Cooke, Argentina)

"This second series of experiments, achieved from 1952 onwards, upset our military conceptions even more than the first series, and brought to mankind a threat which is a thousand times more frightening. But to this day it still seems impossible to slow down or to use for peaceful means the phenomenon of thermonuclear fusion. We are, therefore, constrained to limit ourselves to the peaceful applications of nuclear fission." (A/C.1/PV.708, page 7)

It is on that high opinion, with which anyone who knows the subject must agree, that I base the idea that while the efforts for the application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes is a slow and progressive process, whose immediate results are not given to us to appreciate entirely because we are still in the experimental stage, the possibilities of the use of atomic energy for military purposes have travelled a road that has led us to the crossroads where we now stand, that is to say, the tremendous possibility of the destruction of civilization if an immediate and stern reaction does not lead Governments to understand one another and to harmonize their views.

I feel now -- and I do not wish in any way to underestimate the offer of President Eisenhower nor of the resolution before us -- that it is appropriate to establish the true importance, the hierarchy and scope of the international agency that has to be set up. I think that some of the expressions of opinion on this specific point are much more important because, obviously, in many minds there has prevailed the idea that the organ to be set up will practically, from one moment to the next, solve the entire problem of the supply of atomic energy for peaceful purposes in the under-developed countries. Mr. Lodge, in his magnificent and ample statement, Sir Pierson Dixon and Messrs. Martin and Moch, with a true knowledge of the facts, have endeavoured to moderate, in a preventive way, the unexpected enthusiasm, reducing the plan of action of this international agency to its true size and dimensions, and we had explained to us the real facts and the real state of circumstances today in the process of the application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

We have been told that, with regard to the production of electric power by means of atomic energy, this is a problem that has not as yet been solved as regards its practical application. Mr. Moch told us:

(Mr. Cooke, Argentina)

"But even if atomic energy were to become competitive, the fact would remain that the transition from the classical power era to the atomic power era will be a gradual and prolonged one."

(A/C.1/PV.708, page 26)

With the exception of Mr. Vyshinsky, who showed himself to be much more optimistic with regard to the immediate possibilities of the production of electric power by means of atomic energy, all the other speakers whose statements have been essentially technical have agreed with the view that for financial reasons, as well as for scientific reasons, the problem of the production of electric power by atomic means is not as yet solved and may require a number of decades perhaps for its solution. We sincerely hope that they are wrong, and we hope that the magnificent inventive capacity of man, referred to by President Eisenhower, will cut corners and permit us to acquire the rhythm that has already been followed by atomic energy in its military applications.

(Mr. Cooke, Argentina)

We noted with great satisfaction the extraordinary progress permitted by radioactive isotopes, and I think we should express all our warmth for the Canadian man of science who, as Mr. Martin said, have created one type of bomb, the cobalt bomb, that has replaced fear with hope in the hearts of many cancer victims. But let us merely say that, after the diseases of the heart, cancer seems to claim more victims than any other sickness in the majority of countries. We can realize the importance for humanity of the greatest utilization of radium and the development of the cobalt bomb in the diagnosis and treatment of this dreadful disease of humanity. To this we must add the efficiency of the application of the radioactive isotopes in the diagnosis and treatment of other diseases and of medical investigation in general.

It is obvious that even those who sponsored this joint draft resolution are not quite sure of the limits within which this international agency is to do its work. This is quite understandable because, after all, it is an idea that is still being considered. It has not exactly crystallized or taken shape because it lacks maturity in all its basic aspects.

We should also try to reduce the proportions of this future international agency to the true purposes that seem to have inspired the countries whose representatives co-sponsored the draft resolution. After all, we are not setting up a central plant to supply atomic energy for peaceful purposes as those countries whose atomic efforts are null or in which atomic energy has not as yet been developed, may or may not require. Without wanting to underestimate the elements of judgment and the conclusions that have been contained in the technical statements we have heard, my delegation feels that the best framework within which to put the original terms of reference of this agency have been crystallized in the plan formulated by Sir Pierson Dixon. He said:

"...the essential requirements for any advanced project for the use of atomic energy are the following:

- "1. The possession of the basic scientific knowledge and an adequate staff of scientists;
- "2. The experimental tools and equipment with which to acquire familiarity with the technical and economic problems involved, for instance, experimental reactors;

"3. The necessary materials; not only fissile material but also the other special materials that are required in the construction of reactors;

"4. The power production units themselves and, equally important, the economic and technical means to work them effectively.

"It is important to understand that the last of these steps, which is our ultimate goal, can only be reached by way of the first three and in the order in which I have set them out." (A/C.1/PV.707, pages 28-30)

The representative of the United Kingdom draws the conclusion there for the work that has to be done by this international agency which is to lead its members to set up power generators of their own.

With respect to this plan, Sir Piers Dixon ended by saying:

"It clearly could not of itself provide all the basic scientific knowledge for everybody, since the need for this is limitless; but it could do a great deal to ensure that those who need it most are provided with the necessary facilities for obtaining it. If it cannot set up its own schools or provide from its own resources professors and teachers, the agency could arrange for training and tuition at courses in various institutions in member countries; it could arrange for the supply of the complex laboratory equipment, such as accelerators which are necessary to investigate the nucleus; it could create scholarships and foundations; it could provide for the dissemination of published material; it could provide library and information facilities, and in general it could take effective steps to see that the facilities which member countries are prepared to offer are used to the greatest advantage of those who need them most." (Ibid., p.31)

Of course, all these ends seem to be more of a didactic character than of any other. Of course, we might try to avoid this agency becoming a university. We must take into account the fact that the fundamental aspect in the application of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and in production of electric energy by means of this power is the reactors. That is why we have to consider very carefully the statements made by Mr. Lodge on the question of nuclear reactors, which are indispensable for the production of the greatest part of radioactive isotopes and their later application to medicine, agriculture in general and any other need. The setting up of small reactors for research, that may be built in

less than a year and at a cost of less than \$500,000, must be one of the fundamental objectives of the international agency. Undoubtedly this is the type of help that is awaited by many countries because these reactors, as Mr. Lodge explained to us in detail in his statement, will permit an increase in the research and the practical applications of the atom.

It is obvious that this international agency will be based upon the principle that, scientifically, international co-operation is a factor that contributes to accelerate the progress of discoveries and their improvement. Besides this, it has a very generous basis in that those who, because they have more scientific means or possess fissionable material or for all these reasons together, are able to effect economies for other countries with respect to the efforts which they have already made, thus avoiding useless repetition and expenditure of energy and of resources.

I would add that, by means of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, as Mr. Moch stated when he observed the difference that separated the limits of capacity between the industrialized and the non-industrialized countries, we might find the greatest and the best possible way of bringing about a rapid and complete development of the countries that I shall call the "not-industrialized" or the "under-industrialized" in order to satisfy the representative of Peru who stated the other day that he preferred that expression to the "under-developed" countries.

On this point, we must recognize as well the immensity of the offers made by Mr. Lodge and Mr. Dulles on behalf of the Government of their country. Mr. Jackson reminded us of that this morning when he stressed this point, not only in so far as the stage of the setting up of this atomic energy agency but for the intermediate stage as well. The school of instruction with respect to reactors where the students of other countries can be taught the basic principles of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; the invitation to medical experts and surgeons to participate in the work of hospitals where atomic energy is being applied and where it is one of the most important possibilities in the fight against cancer; and the offer of whole atomic libraries and full bibliographical material are all attitudes that warrant our warm recognition and thanks. We must

MA/gd

A/C.1/PV.717
49-50

(Mr. Cooke, Argentina)

express these same feelings with respect to the Governments of the United Kingdom and France which, as far as their possibilities permitted, have made the same offers.

I should like to refer to how this agency is to be set up. I shall be extremely brief. I feel that I must make known the fact that we do not consider that the way chosen is the one most in accord with the purposes or with the democratic feeling that must underlie international agreements made today.

None of the explanations which were given have as yet convinced me that it might not have been better simply to call an international conference to discuss, democratically and in common, all the fundamentals of such an important body. As the representative of Canada said, we understand that all ideas usually emanate from one or a few countries. But this is no reason for us to reject the idea of an international conference when this idea has been put before us. It is not quite appropriate for us first to set up this body, even in principle, and to call on other countries, isolatedly, to discuss, in a fashion that might be termed bilateral, the adherence to the convention or the treaty regarding the subject for which this agency is supposed to be set up.

In the study conducted by the Secretariat of the United Nations, A/C.1/758, on questions bearing upon the setting up of such a body in the United Nations, which was submitted to us by the Secretary-General, chapter III refers to the setting up of institutions by means of a treaty, and it speaks about the relationship between this body and the United Nations. This summary says that in taking into account the practices already followed, a number of procedures and methods can be applied, and this is referred to as "basic methods". The summary then enumerates them as follows:

- "(a) drafting or approval of treaty by the General Assembly;
- (b) drafting of treaty by inter-governmental conference called by the General Assembly (or by the Economic and Social Council); and
- (c) drafting of treaty by inter-governmental conference called by the sponsoring States without prior action by the United Nations."

(A/C.1/758, page 10)

My delegation feels that any of these three methods might have been better and more acceptable, more palatable should I say, to all of us than the method suggested in the document submitted to us as the draft resolution, especially as regards such an internationally important question as the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

With regard to the conference itself, on behalf of the delegation of Argentina I wish to say that we agree with such an idea. As Mr. Lodge and Mr. Martin explained in detail, we understand that this conference must basically be a meeting of world scientists to consider all the aspects of the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

(Mr. Cooke, Argentina)

We feel that it might be extremely interesting to amplify the programme of the conference to cover all types of energy, especially those which Mr. Moch called the "para-classical" and the use of which cannot be discarded, especially during this stage which he called the intermediate stage between the classic and the atomic eras. I feel also that this conference should have a concrete programme. This afternoon the representative of Norway suggested this and I think that such a suggestion is extremely interesting. The Argentine delegation hopes and trusts that the draft resolution before the Committee will be adopted unanimously by the Committee and, in due course, by the General Assembly.

It would be most encouraging if we were to draw up a text that would warrant the approval of all countries represented in the United Nations. We did not know until this morning, when Mr. Vyshinsky spoke, that his delegation had submitted a number of amendments, about which the representative of the United States had promised to make known his views this evening. Had I known about these amendments before, it might have either confirmed my opinion with regard to the unanimity on a text or it might have led me to change this part of my statement. But we do not think it is too difficult to arrive at a text which will be acceptable to all, because we really believe that within the great Powers there is a common desire to carry out the peaceful purposes which we so often hear about in the statements of the heads of their Governments.

We said in the General Assembly that in spite of the anxiety which prevails in the spirit and in the minds of all, tension between the greater Powers has diminished within the last few months. We wished to stress that with regard to the question of the use of atomic weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, destruction, and also with regard to disarmament, we found that the positions were not as intransigent as they had been, and it became obvious that the points of view were coming closer.

This view was proved when we discussed and approved a draft resolution on disarmament, which lays down the bases for the drawing up of an international convention or treaty bearing on the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of the use of atomic and hydrogen weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

As a result of this agreement, in our view the question of the prohibition of the use of atomic weapons has now been left outside of our discussion and we must only consider the item of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in order to bring about progress in the welfare of humanity.

President Eisenhower, Sir Winston Churchill and all the other statesmen and diplomats who for one reason or another have given their opinions on this matter, have expressed the hope that they would be able to count on the contribution of the Soviet Union in the preparation of plans which will accelerate the peaceful uses of atomic energy. They have all recognized the true significance as regards peace among nations, if we could count on the Soviet Union in the international agency. We wish to repeat the conviction and hope that we will not be disappointed in our desire.

The intransigence on the part of the Soviet Union with respect to the priority, as regards disarmament, of an agreement on the prohibition of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction having been done away with, the fundamental objection which might have been raised to the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes has disappeared.

If we analyse the limits and the scope of the proposed agency, and its initial and fundamental terms of reference, we can see that the fears as regards the fact that the organ, in the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy, might increase the development of atomic weapons, are no longer tenable. Personally, I wish to declare that I am entirely convinced by the explanations which were given on this matter by the representative of the United States.

The danger that the development of atomic energy can be turned into use for atomic weapons cannot come from such a research and experimental body as the one we are endeavouring to set up. It might come from the efforts which nations may continue on their own, separately. None of them, by means of the setting up of this agency, would be obliged to stop its progress in developing atomic energy for peaceful purposes. I repeat, that is why this danger might occur, but not as a consequence of the action of such an international agency which, undoubtedly, as it has been outlined to us, is a purely experimental and research body.

For the same reasons, we see no direct relationship that may exist between the plans to develop an international body and the problem of security and peace which would require the intervention of the Security Council and might call for an application of the veto. The sponsors of the idea of setting up this agency have in no way felt that this body was going to be, shall I say, outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations. Perhaps they have tried to place it outside the danger of being crushed by a veto, or in any way being paralysed by action in the Security Council.

But if we analyse the fact that the Security Council's action is basically that of intervening in matters which might affect the peace and security of the world, it is really quite difficult to understand how the action of this international atomic energy agency might give rise to a case where peace and security between nations would be endangered.

This agency will not ask, for example, that the United Kingdom, as regards the nations of the Commonwealth -- as Sir Pearson Dixon very clearly explained to us -- should continue to carry out special agreements or treaties by means of which it will aid the members of the Commonwealth in the development of atomic energy. Nor does it mean that the other countries are prohibited, by the setting up of this agency, from carrying out activity which might be of a bilateral character and according to which, with whatever means they have at their disposal, they will assist other countries, through economic or material means, to develop plans tending to facilitate the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

After all, it is for the stronger and the more developed to help the weaker and the less developed.

Finally, neither in the statement of Mr. Cabot Lodge nor in the statement of the other heads of delegations sponsoring this joint draft resolution, nor in the statement of Mr. Vyshinsky, who has raised certain objections to this draft resolution, have we found anything that might be an absolute bar to understanding. This was categorically stated this morning by Mr. Vyshinsky himself, in his very brief statement. His former objections with regard to the prior adoption, on questions related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy, of a resolution on the prohibition of atomic energy for military purposes, no longer stand. The document which was presented to us by the United States refers basically to the terms of reference which must be drawn up for the proposed agency which will encourage and promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Thus, looking at the problem from this point of view, it is rather difficult, even without knowing the amendments that are to be submitted, for a layman to feel that there is no possibility of unanimity or of agreement. We feel that a text can be agreed upon. At the very beginning of the discussion on disarmament, did we not feel that the disarmament question would stymie all efforts at unanimity? Yet, it did not.

Finally, having carefully weighed the words -- leaving aside the mutual reproaches which perhaps merely tend to justify the different attitudes -- we note an atmosphere which might result in the approval of a unanimous document on this question. Such a result would definitely be a step forward in the path towards peace and a proof of good will on both parts, and it would offer a promise of better and greater solutions for other problems.

Mr. de la COLINA (Mexico) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation had not previously taken part in the general debate on this question because we felt, owing to the importance of the item, that it was preferable first to hear the statements of those delegations whose countries possessed definite scientific knowledge in this matter, statements concerning their manufacturing experience and the extent of their technical resources.

It is after all they who, in delving into the secrets of the atom, have assumed the unavoidable responsibility of utilizing this terrifying and awe-inspiring discovery for the benefit of mankind.

Furthermore, we must not underestimate the help given by the smaller countries. This has been proved most eloquently/^{today}by the representatives of Israel, Norway and Argentina, whose important statements have been of fundamental significance. I am therefore happy to note many points of similarity in their statements and in the statement that my delegation wishes to make.

I wish equally to praise other representatives who have previously spoken and who have not sat back in silence because they represent countries which lack atomic resources.

For a country such as Mexico, whose industrial development is very young, it is difficult to bring a truly valuable contribution to this debate. However, let it not be felt that because of this the experts of my country are unaware of the importance of such studies. A group of scientists, still very small in number but very large in talent, is enthusiastically working at the National University of Mexico on nuclear physics. Among other apparatus, they already have an atomic disintegrator whose electrostatic generator, a type invented by Dr. Van de Graaff, gives out several million volts. Therefore, we can say that the elements of the initial nuclear investigation at the disposal of Mexico today, though very modest because of our limited resources, nevertheless permit us to conduct studies of positive theoretical and practical interests. As a result of the active explorations which have been carried out, I do not think that it would be going too far to say that among the different mineral resources hidden in the depths of Mexico, there are large deposits of uranium.

From what has been said in this Committee, we gather that, except for the obstacles with which we shall always meet when we try to transform atomic energy into peaceful uses, it is not unrealistic to predict that in a few years we shall be able to use this new source of energy with relative ease and without exorbitant costs. This means that we are standing at the beginning of an industrial transformation of greater scope than that which began in the eighteenth century.

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

For the under-developed areas of the world, especially those that lack coal, oil and hydro-electric resources, the discovery and control of the great force that lies in the atom is designed to have extraordinary consequences. As a result of the utilization of such power, these countries will be able to raise their standards of living very rapidly. That is why my delegation was extremely happy to hear the most altruistic suggestion made by the eminent representative of France, Mr. Jules Moch, that the great Powers which possess reactors realize that preference must be given to the under-developed countries and that plans are being prepared that will lead to the investment of much of their nuclear resources in such regions of the world.

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

When the curtain of silence that has hidden the extraordinary advances made in this field at last rises and when scientific co-operation between States on a democratic and reasonable basis becomes the rule, then the doors to free investigation will open and the progress of the use of the creative power of the atom will be accelerated.

Although my Government wishes in due course to make known certain comments on the conference mentioned here to serve as a constitutive basis for the specialized agency that is contemplated in the draft resolution, I feel, nevertheless, that it is appropriate and timely for me to state at this moment that we hope that the links between that new international body and the United Nations will be as close and tight as is permitted by the very nature of the problem and all the different ancilliary circumstances that have been outlined here. Thus my Delegation feels that as soon as it is feasible negotiations should begin with the foreign offices of Members and, of course, also with other nations who may not be Members of our Organization as yet, so as to keep them informed and also to know, in due course, their points of view.

My delegation will on this point, of course, give very careful attention to the documentary report that was just submitted to us by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. I wish to state to him right now that we appreciate such good work. With regard to the technical conference, the organization of which has been sketched here, I feel that we should give great attention to all those measures that might lead to an encouragement to scientists coming from under-developed and under-industrialized nations, especially in atomic matters. I feel we should encourage them and also permit them to explain completely the needs of their countries so as to be able to commence a flow of information between those already possessing the secrets of nuclear power and those who have the need for the use of such nuclear power for the purpose of the development of their territories.

In the development of his evolution, man seems now to stand at the crossroads of his destiny. On the one hand there is an abyss before him where passions boil and seethe. On the other hand, there are magnificent horizons open to him wherein he can see the glory of creative work and the luminous peaks of the heights of happiness. Shall we able to climb that path leading to the

(Mr. de la Colina, Mexico)

heights of happiness and peaceful understanding or are we to fall into the precipice of satanic ambitions? This is the dilemma imposed on humanity by the mighty atom.

In conclusion I wish to state that my delegation is most grateful to the wise Governments that have co-sponsored the draft resolution before us. Particularly do we wish to state that we appreciate the original idea stressed and stated by the President of the United States, who, at a historical meeting of the General Assembly, first sketched the plan which, somewhat modified, is now submitted to us. We also wish to state our appreciation for the splendid clarification given us by Ambassador Lodge in his original first statement and in the statement which he made this afternoon. We trust that the representative of the Soviet Union, whose contribution to the success of this programme would be of great value, will act in a fashion analogous to that of the case of the draft resolution on disarmament and actively participate in this most fecund task, in this generous and transcendental task of international co-operation.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): When we decided to close the speakers' list, and according to the suggestion made by the representative of Greece to ask all representatives to be ready to speak as their turn came on the list, I think it was well understood that that was from the day following the day of closure of the list. Otherwise, nobody would have included his name if he knew that he might have to speak that afternoon. Therefore, I want to tell the representatives on the list that we have applied that rule suggested by the representative of Greece and agreed to by the Committee.

Mr. MOE (Norway): I have asked for the floor in spite of the fact that earlier this afternoon I have taken up much of the time of the Committee. However, my delegation feels that we should not let this meeting end without taking due note of the momentous decision of the United States Government about which Ambassador Lodge was able to inform the Committee at the end of his statement. This is the first time such a great quantity of fissionable

(Mr. Moe, Norway)

material has been put at the disposal of interested countries. I am told this is an amount of fissionable material equal to what is needed to produce ten atomic bombs. By this momentous decision that is put at the disposal of countries for peaceful use.

It is certainly with a feeling of sincere gratitude that everyone who is interested in this matter receives this news, not only because it is a generous gesture in itself but also because it shows how promising international co-operation in the field of atomic energy may be and how far we can go on a purely voluntary basis in this co-operation for the peaceful use of atomic energy. My delegation feels encouraged by the decision of the United States Government and hopes their example will be followed by other countries so that we may all make big steps forward in international co-operation in this field.

My delegation just wanted to make these remarks before this meeting adjourned.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from Spanish): In the copy of the list of speakers that was before me this morning there was an error and I omitted to read a number of names. Therefore, I shall re-read the names: United Kingdom, Czechoslovakia, Bolivia, Lebanon, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Burma, Paraguay, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Dominican Republic, Panama, Poland, United States, India, and the Soviet Union.

Mr. MIRKIAN (Pakistan): I should like to make a brief reference to the important statement made this afternoon by the representative of the United States. In my statement on this subject I expressed the anxiety of my delegation that in the management of the agency that may be constituted for the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy there should be a partnership between the countries who have the knowledge and material for atomic energy and the countries who will be the beneficiaries of this great power. I find from the statement made by Ambassador Lodge that in the governing body of this agency sufficient representation will be provided for the beneficiaries of this programme. It is with great satisfaction and gratification that we note that this suggestion was already in the minds of the representative of the United States and the other sponsors of the resolution before us and has been accepted by them.

The CHAIRMAN (interpretation from French): Two speakers have stated that they were very concerned and very interested in the statement made by the representative of the United States and now a lot of other representatives have asked to speak. However, I do not think we can possibly have fifty or sixty statements on this same matter this afternoon. Therefore, if you agree, I think that the interest which has already been shown by two representatives may be taken to be the feelings of all of us. Of course, this is a very interesting point and if anyone wishes to state something to the contrary, then I shall, of course call upon him to do so, but I do not think it is justifiable to have twenty or thirty statements on this very same subject this afternoon, since the speakers' list is already closed.

Therefore, if there are no objections, we will adjourn now and take the matter up again tomorrow morning.

The meeting rose at 5.10 p.m.