



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

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

UN LIBRARY

APR 13 1951

UN/SC COLLECTION

GENERAL
A/AC.50/SR.7
12 September 1951
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

COMMITTEE OF TWELVE

(ESTABLISHED BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 496(V))

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE SEVENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 23 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. ALBORNOZ	Ecuador
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. LUNS	Netherlands
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. CALERO RODRIGUES	Brazil
	Mr. NORMAN	Canada
	Mr. WEI	China
	Mr. TINE	France
	Mr. DAYAL	India
	Mr. DERNISU	Turkey
	Mr. TSARAPKIN	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
	Mr. COULSON	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
	Mr. NASH	United States of America

Members: (continued)

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. DAYAL (India) said he had indicated in previous statements his delegation's general attitude to the problem before the Committee and had expressed the hope that the Great Powers would be able to accept in principle the proposal to merge the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments into a single Commission, thus ending the somewhat illogical arrangement whereby two separate bodies dealt with a matter which could more appropriately be considered by a single body. That arrangement was, he believed, one reason why comparatively little progress had been made in the past in the limitation and control of armaments, both atomic and conventional.

The adoption of a correct procedure for the consideration of the problem would at least prepare the ground for a better direction and co-ordination of effort, though the problem of limiting armaments in a world full of dangerous tensions would not thereby be automatically solved. What was required was the will and determination on the part of all concerned, and particularly of the Great Powers, to bring armaments under control.

/His delegation

His delegation hoped that when the new commission was set up it would give earnest consideration to the problem of effectively banning the use of the atomic bomb. If atomic energy could be used in the wider interests of humanity, for the control and cure of disease, for scientific research, in industrial processes, and to augment the world's power resources for domestic and industrial purposes, it could indeed usher in a new era. Wrongly used, it could be the greatest instrument of destruction the world has yet seen. His delegation felt that the United States draft resolution (A/AC.50/4/Rev.1) did attempt to offer a genuine basis for the consideration of the problem of limitation and control of armaments. While the new commission to be set up under the draft resolution would derive the fullest benefit from the experience of its predecessors, it would not be bound by previous plans but would be prepared to consider on their merits, any other plans which might be brought forward. In the detailed terms of reference which would be drawn up, he hoped that flexibility and a spirit of accommodation, rather than rigidity, would prevail. His delegation would like to see the early establishment of the consolidated commission so that even in the midst of the current armaments race there might be a constant reminder of mankind's objective: a world free from fear and the spectre of war. In that hope and belief, his delegation would vote for the draft resolution.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that since his delegation maintained its view that the question of the reduction of armaments and the question of atomic weapons formed an indivisible problem, it did not in principle oppose the establishment of a single commission within the framework of the Security Council to deal with both questions, provided the basic objective of that commission's work was the general reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons.

In view of the importance of obtaining unanimity among members of the Committee, his delegation wished to propose certain amendments which, if adopted, would enable his delegation to support the United States draft resolution. He moved the amendments contained in document A/AC.50/5.

/The CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN proposed that the meeting should be suspended to allow time for the USSR amendments to be circulated in writing to the members of the Committee.

The meeting was suspended at 10.55 a.m. and was resumed at 11.50 a.m.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) said he was not sure that he fully understood the scope of the proposed USSR amendments (A/AC.50/5) to the United States draft resolution (A/AC.50/4/Rev.1). The problem with changing language in a preamble was that such recasting sometimes had significance for some; that it did not have for others. Although the importance of the preamble should not be exaggerated, he saw no need to insert the words "the prohibition of the atomic weapon" in the second and third paragraphs. The fourth paragraph of the preamble adequately covered that point and had the further advantage of reproducing the text of the relevant paragraph of General Assembly resolution 496 (V) verbatim. Moreover, the United States delegation thought that the deletion of the fourth paragraph might be interpreted as an attempt to depart from a decision of the General Assembly. Therefore it could not support the third amendment.

His delegation had no strong views on the proposed USSR amendment to the operative part of the United States draft resolution. The wording of that amendment seemed inadequate, however, in that it related only to atomic energy and conventional armaments and made no reference to armed forces. He therefore suggested that if the USSR delegation was amenable to the idea of omitting all references to a title, the phrase "to be known as the Commission for the Control of Armaments and Armed Forces" in paragraph 1 of the operative part of the United States draft resolution might well be deleted and that it should be left for the General Assembly to decide the question of the title to be given to any new body which might be established in accordance with the proposals contained in the draft resolution.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), in reply to a question by the CHAIRMAN, indicated that, if necessary, his amendment could be clarified later on.

He understood the Committee's desire to reach a solution to the problem of the international control and reduction of armaments which would be

acceptable to all the Member States and the five Great Powers in particular. He did not feel, however, that the failure of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments to achieve greater progress could be ascribed solely to the fact that two different bodies had been tackling a problem which should properly have been dealt with by one. The mere establishment of a new organ to carry on the work of the two Commissions would not end the present stalemate unless the whole problem of atomic energy and conventional armaments was approached with a different attitude. Some concrete evidence of good faith should be forthcoming to substantiate the avowed desire of some delegations to get out of the impasse in which the United Nations^{HOW} found itself.

The United States draft resolution, in the fourth paragraph, referred to a plan which had not provided a solution to the problem and which, in the view of the USSR delegation, would tend to perpetuate the same evils which had hitherto prevented the United Nations from settling the question of the international control of all armaments and armed forces.

He urged the Committee to give careful consideration to the proposed USSR amendments and in particular to the proposal that the fourth paragraph of the United States draft resolution should be deleted.

QUESTION OF THE COMMITTEE'S DRAFT REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands) suggested that a preliminary draft report of the proceedings of the first six meetings should be prepared and circulated to the members of the Committee for their comments. The remainder of the report could be drafted after the Committee had concluded its work.

After a brief discussion, the meeting was adjourned until 29 August.

The meeting rose at 12.35 p.m.