



UNITED NATIONS
 CENTRE FOR DISARMAMENT
 DEPARTMENT OF
 POLITICAL AND SECURITY COUNCIL AFFAIRS
 Reference Library

UNITED NATIONS
 GENERAL ASSEMBLY



GENERAL
 A/AC.50/SR.8
 18 September 1951
 ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE OF TWELVE
 (ESTABLISHED BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 496(V))
 SUMMARY RECORD OF THE EIGHTH MEETING
 Held at Headquarters, New York,
 on Wednesday, 29 August 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

CONTENTS:

- Adoption of the Provisional Agenda
- Consideration of the resolution adopted at the three hundred and twenty-third plenary meeting of the General Assembly on 13 December 1950 (496(V)) (continued): draft resolution submitted by the United States of America (A/AC.50/4/Rev.1; A/AC.50/5)
- Question of the Committee's draft report to the General Assembly.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. LACOSTE	France
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. LUNS	Netherlands
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES	Brazil
	Mr. GEORGE	Canada
	Mr. WEI	China
	Mr. ALBORNCZ	Ecuador
	Mr. DAYAL	India
	Mr. DERINSU	Turkey

Members (continued):

Mr. TSARAPKIN	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Mr. COULSON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Mr. NASH	United States of America
Mr. NINCIC	Yugoslavia

Secretariat:

Mr. PROTITCH	Acting Assistant Secretary-General in charge of the Department of Security Council Affairs
Mr. FREY	Secretary of the Committee

ADOPTION OF THE PROVISIONAL AGENDA

There being no objections, the CHAIRMAN declared the provisional agenda adopted.

CONSIDERATION OF THE RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THIRD PLENARY MEETING OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY ON 13 DECEMBER 1950 (496(V)) (continued):
DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (A/AC.50/4/Rev.1;
A/AC.50/5)

Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES (Brazil), commenting on the USSR amendments (A/AC.50/5) to the United States draft resolution (A/AC.50/4/Rev.1), said the USSR delegation had suggested only one change in the operative part of the draft resolution: it affected the proposed name of the new commission. He felt that the question of a name was not of great importance since it was not an essential element in the work of the commission and would in all probability be discussed by the General Assembly. Accordingly, the best course appeared to be, as the United States representative had suggested at the previous meeting, to leave the question open, and the Brazilian delegation was prepared to move formally that the name should be omitted from the draft resolution.

With regard to the other amendments proposed by the USSR, he saw no advantage in adding the words suggested to the second and third paragraphs of the preamble. The commission's objects were quite clearly described and it was not for the Committee to attempt in the preamble of its resolution to lay down terms of reference for the new commission.

/Observing

Observing that the USSR representative wished to insert a reference to the general reduction of armaments and to the prohibition of the atomic weapon, the Brazilian representative pointed out that the United States draft resolution mentioned "international control of all armaments and armed forces, including atomic energy". "Control", like the word "regulation" in Article 26 of the Charter, implied the idea of reduction. It was clearly stated that the atomic weapon would fall within the scope of the commission's terms of reference.

Whereas the USSR representative wished the prohibition of the atomic weapon to be referred to in the second and third paragraphs, he had proposed that a similar reference in the fourth paragraph should be omitted because of the Soviet Government's opposition to the plan previously approved by the General Assembly. The fourth paragraph, however, in no way limited the work of the new commission; all it said was that the work done in the past was a useful contribution to the solution of the problem and should not be completely disregarded. The fourth paragraph was no obstacle to the possibility of co-operation between the Soviet Union and the other Great Powers in an effort to establish effective control of atomic energy.

To sum up, the Brazilian representative said his delegation supported the preamble of the United States draft resolution and was prepared to move that the name of the new commission should be omitted from the operative part.

Mr. COULSON (United Kingdom) said the statement made by the USSR representative when introducing his delegation's amendments was equivalent to an assertion that Soviet co-operation in the implementation of the draft resolution was conditional on the deletion from the resolution of the reference to the plan for the international control of atomic energy which had been approved by the General Assembly. The next stage would probably be that the USSR would insist on the General Assembly's plan being dropped altogether. Such action would be unacceptable to the United Kingdom Government. While the plan approved by the General Assembly might not be the only possible one, it was the most satisfactory plan yet devised. His delegation therefore could not agree to the deletion of the fourth paragraph of the draft resolution.

He had no serious objection to the amendments proposed by the USSR to the second and third paragraphs of the draft resolution's preamble but felt that they became unnecessary if the fourth paragraph was maintained.

He supported the Brazilian representative's suggestion concerning the new commission's name, which was a comparatively unimportant question.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) said the statement he had made at the preceding meeting represented his delegation's views on the amendments to the draft resolution.

He fully supported the Brazilian representative's suggestion that the question of the commission's name should be left to the General Assembly and proposed that the words "to be known as the Commission for the Control of Armaments and Armed Forces" should be omitted from paragraph 1 of the operative part of the draft resolution. Since with that deletion the USSR's sole objection to the operative part would be met, he hoped that the USSR delegation would thus be enabled to vote in favour of the operative part.

His delegation could not agree to the deletion of the fourth paragraph of the preamble and hence saw no object in the other USSR amendments to the preamble.

Mr. DAYAL (India) referred to the statement made by him at the previous meeting when he had indicated that his delegation supported the proposal for merging the two Commissions. He had hoped that that proposal would meet with the general acceptance of all Committee members, especially of the Great Powers. While the operative part of the United States draft resolution had met with general acceptance, some difficulties had apparently arisen with regard to the preamble. He shared the view expressed by the United States representative that preambular language, in general, was somewhat of a nuisance and did not affect the operative part. He had hoped that the preamble could have been so worded as to eliminate the possibility of unnecessary controversy. It would be unfortunate if the Committee failed to reach agreement on the basic proposition owing to differences of opinion over the preamble. Accordingly, his delegation, while supporting the draft resolution in substance, would be constrained to abstain in the voting on the Second, Third and Fourth paragraphs of the preamble which were not really material to the substance of the proposal. His delegation would similarly abstain on the USSR amendments to these paragraphs.

He supported the Brazilian representative's suggestion to leave the matter of the name of the proposed Commission to the decision of the General Assembly.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said it had been pointed out by the USSR delegation at the previous meeting that the adoption of the USSR amendments would make it possible for the USSR delegation to support the proposal for the creation of a single commission. As it stood, however, the draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation was unsatisfactory and unacceptable.

The United States delegation and the delegations supporting it were stubbornly opposed to mentioning in the resolution that the single commission was being created to work out plans for the reduction of armaments and armed forces, and the prohibition of atomic weapons and other means of mass destruction. At the same time, the draft resolution referred to the inconsistent and unacceptable Baruch-Acheson-Lilienthal plan which had repeatedly been rejected by the USSR, and which obviously could not serve as a basis for the work of the new commission. If some insisted that the Baruch-Acheson-Lilienthal plan should serve as a basis for the work of the new commission, that only meant that in fact they had no intention of seriously working out plans for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons. That meant too that the new single commission would find itself in the same impasse as the two existing commissions. In those circumstances, there was no reason to expect that the new commission would be able to achieve any positive results; besides, the United States draft resolution did not expect that. Its aim was to prevent an agreement on the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons and other means of mass destruction. That was fully understandable, since the United States had started preparing a new war and was engaged in a mad armaments race.

The USSR delegation had confined itself to submitting the absolute minimum in the way of amendments in order to achieve an agreement, to throw light on the problem, and to make it clear that the new commission was being set up to work out plans for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons. If the commission was being created for those aims, the USSR delegation would support the draft resolution. If, on the other hand, it was being created to continue to prevent the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons, then the USSR delegation was against it.

/The United States

The United States proposal spoke of control. The USSR delegation was in favour of a reduction of armaments and armed forces, of the prohibition of atomic weapons and of control over the execution of those measures. Control however, could be established only if there was something to control. Control could be established over the implementation of an agreement for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons and other means of mass destruction, but if there was no such agreement, there was nothing to control, and in that case all decisions on control would lack any point and would merely hang in a vacuum.

That was why the USSR delegation had submitted an amendment to the second paragraph of the United States draft resolution. All the above considerations applied also to the third paragraph of the preamble, which spoke of "co-ordinated plans". If the draft resolution spoke of co-ordinated plans, it should also indicate which plans. The USSR amendments made clear what plans were meant in that case. What was so unacceptable in those amendments? The rejection of the USSR amendments meant that the United States and the countries supporting it were against the prohibition of atomic weapons and against the reduction of armaments and armed forces. It followed, therefore, that the aim of the United States resolution was not to achieve the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons. He could not support such a resolution.

Having read out the fourth paragraph of the preamble, he asked how the draft resolution could seriously speak of any useful work having been accomplished by the Commission on Conventional Armaments, when all it had done in fact was to keep on transferring the contents of one empty vessel into another, preparing various completely unnecessary studies and surveys, piling up unnecessary work on the Secretariat, and creating the appearance of doing something. All that "work" of the Commission had nothing in common with a real reduction of armaments and armed forces or the prohibition of atomic weapons. In fact, the gist of the Commission's recommendation was that countries should re-arm first and then see what they could do. So much for the work performed by the Commission on Conventional Armaments. As for the Atomic Energy Commission, the aim of the Baruch-Acheson-Lillienthal plan was to bring all the atomic industry of the world under the domination of

American monopolies, and not to prohibit atomic weapons. It made no provision for the prohibition of atomic weapons. The plan spoke a great deal about controls, but was silent as to what was to be controlled. The very conception of control was simply that the atomic raw materials and industries belonging to other countries should be handed over to or placed under the control of American monopolies. Far from prohibiting atomic weapons, that plan only created obstacles in the path of prohibition. The aim of the USSR amendments was to remove the obstacles to the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments and armed forces. That was why his delegation had proposed the delegation of the fourth paragraph of the preamble.

The Brazilian representative had said that it was not for the Committee to define the terms of reference of the new commission. The aim of the USSR amendment, however, was only to specify what plans were to be worked out. The draft resolution spoke of co-ordinated plans; the USSR amendments made it clear what co-ordinated plans were meant, namely plans for the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons and other means of mass destruction. While the United States draft resolution in fact determined in advance what the work of the new commission was to be, the USSR amendments merely made clear what plans were meant.

If the Committee did not accept the USSR amendments, the creation of the new commission would not change anything in the existing state of affairs and would not break the deadlock -- the problems of the reduction of armaments and armed forces and of the prohibition of atomic weapons would remain unsolved.

The CHAIRMAN, speaking also on behalf of certain other members declared that the grave conclusions drawn by the USSR representative in his speech and the serious accusations which he had made against their Governments were completely unwarranted.

The CHAIRMAN inquired whether the USSR amendments (A/AC.50/5), the United States draft resolution (A/AC.50/4/Rev.1) and the verbal United States amendment offered during the meeting should be put to the vote, paragraph by paragraph.

It was so decided.

/The first

The first USSR amendment was rejected by 9 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The second USSR amendment was rejected by 9 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The third USSR amendment was rejected by 9 votes to 2, with 1 abstention.

The fourth USSR amendment was rejected by 9 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The United States amendment to delete the phrase "to be known as the Commission for the Control of Armaments and Armed Forces" in paragraph 1 of the operative part was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

The first paragraph of the United States draft resolution was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

The second paragraph of the United States draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The third paragraph of the United States draft resolution was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The fourth paragraph of the United States draft resolution was adopted by 9 votes to 1, with 2 abstentions.

The fifth paragraph of the United States draft resolution was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

The operative part of the United States draft resolution as amended was adopted as a whole by 11 votes to 1.

The United States draft resolution as a whole was adopted by 11 votes to 1.

Mr. WEI (China), in explaining his vote, said he had not spoken on the proposed USSR amendments to the United States draft resolution for he had made his position clear in the early stages of the debate, when he had expressed the hope that the United States draft resolution would be adopted unanimously.

So far from agreeing that the USSR delegation's proposed amendments were insignificant, he felt that they actually carried the most serious political implications. The first and second USSR amendments were in essence a restatement of two groups of USSR proposals which had previously been rejected by an overwhelming majority in the Security Council and the General Assembly. It was only natural that the USSR should attempt to introduce those same ideas into the United States draft resolution, but the Committee would be going counter to the instructions laid down in resolution 496(V) if it were to accept those amendments.

/He had

He had voted for the United States amendment to paragraph 1 of the operative part of its draft resolution (A/AC.50/4/Rev.1) because he thought that the General Assembly should settle the new body's title.

Mr. NINCIC (Yugoslavia), in explanation of his vote, said he had abstained from voting on the first two USSR amendments to the United States draft resolution for he felt that those points were adequately covered in the original text of the draft resolution and that hence the USSR amendments were unnecessary. He had voted in favour of the proposal to omit the fourth paragraph of the United States draft resolution because it seemed to prejudice the substance of the work of the proposed new organ. As he supported the operative part and most of the preamble of the United States draft resolution, however, he had voted in favour of the text as a whole.

QUESTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S DRAFT REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Second statement of the USSR representative, A/AC.50/SR.8, page 8

Following a brief statement by Mr. LUIS (Netherlands), Rapporteur, on the preparation of the Committee's report, Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) recalled that during the discussion on the preparation of the report at the previous meeting of the Committee, he had pointed out that it was premature to draft the Committee's report before the Committee had discussed the USSR amendments. This remark had evidently been disregarded, since the Rapporteur had decided to prepare parts of the report.

The United States working paper had been included in the Committee's draft report under the heading of "general considerations", although the Committee had decided that those "considerations" should be annexed to the report. If they were included in the body of the report, United States "considerations" ceased to be United States "considerations" and became considerations purporting to represent the Committee's views. Consequently the United States "considerations" should be excluded from the body of the report.

The annex to the report listed documents reflecting the work of the two Commissions. In that connexion, he recalled that two different views had existed and indeed still existed in those Commissions, namely the United States point of view and the USSR point of view. If the Committee wished to give both views, it should abandon the principle of including in the annex only those resolutions and proposals which had been adopted by the Majority of any United Nations organ,

since it was known that all adopted documents reflected the United States point of view. Otherwise, the other point of view, that of the Soviet Union, demanding and insisting on the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments and armed forces, would not be represented in the list of documents annexed to the report.

He felt that the annex should reflect both points of view so as to give the General Assembly an accurate picture of the situation in the two Commissions.

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands) Rapporteur, recalled that at the previous meeting he had explained his intention of drafting a preliminary report on the proceedings of the Committee's first six meetings and he thought that the USSR representative had agreed to that procedure. He assured the USSR representative that the list of documents to be annexed to the report would contain all those additional documents which the USSR representative wished to see included.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) said he had no objections to annexing the United States working paper to the Committee's report, provided that the substance of his remarks on the subject was given in the body of the report.

It was so decided.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) outlining his position regarding the report, said that when compiling the annex to the report the Rapporteur should include in them the relevant USSR proposals concerning the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of atomic weapons and other means of mass destruction.

In reply to Mr. LUNS (Netherlands) Rapporteur, he offered to give the Rapporteur a list of the documents which he felt should be mentioned in the annex.

The CHAIRMAN pointed out as an example that the annex already listed two reports of the Atomic Energy Commission which set forth the proposals and the views of the USSR.

Mr. WEI (China) congratulated the Rapporteur and the Secretariat on the draft report on the proceedings of the first six meetings of the Committee, which set forth clearly and concisely the two opposing viewpoints which had been expressed

/Mr. LUNS

Mr. IJNS (Netherlands) Rapporteur, suggested that the next meeting of the Committee should be held about a week after the last part of the Committee's report had been circulated to the members for their comments. That would give the members time to forward their views on the final portion of the draft report to the Secretariat.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) also suggested that the Rapporteur might circulate to the Committee the draft report with a new list of the documents to be incorporated in the annex, and later the comments of members on the draft report. In order to give the Committee time to study the material and formulate its views on the draft report, he suggested that the next meeting should not be held before Friday, 14 September 1951.

After a brief discussion, the CHAIRMAN proposed that the representative of India, who would be the next Chairman, should fix the date of the following meeting.

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 12.15 p.m.