

UNITED NATIONS
GENERAL
ASSEMBLY UN LIBRARY

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



GENERAL
A/AC.50/SR.9
22 October 1951
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SEP 18 1950

UN/7 COLLECTION

COMMITTEE OF TWELVE
(ESTABLISHED BY GENERAL ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION 496 (V))
SUMMARY RECORD OF THE NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 28 September 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): Committee's draft report
to the General Assembly.

<u>Chairman:</u>	Mr. DAYAL	India
<u>Rapporteur:</u>	Mr. LUNS	Netherlands
<u>Members:</u>	Mr. TEIXEIRA SOARES	Brazil
	Mr. GEORGE	Canada
	Mr. WEI	China
	Mr. ALBORNOZ	Ecuador
	Mr. TINE	France
	Mr. DERINSU	Turkey

Members (continued):

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

Secretariat:

Mr. PROTITCH	Principal Director 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): COMMITTEE'S DRAFT REPORT TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands), Rapporteur, said that in the original draft report submitted to the Committee he had tried to give a complete though concise account of the Committee's discussions. It had been his hope that the report would be adopted in a short time. However, the reactions it had aroused among some delegations and the various controversial amendments submitted to it had made it clear that it would not be adopted without protracted debates. Since most representatives had to leave for Europe and were therefore anxious to complete the Committee's work as soon as possible, he had thought it might expedite matters if he were to prepare a very short factual report which would not go into the substance of the discussions. That "skeleton" report would be forwarded to the General Assembly together with the summary records of the meetings held by the Committee and the various annexes which had been attached to the original draft report.

In conclusion, he suggested that the Secretariat should produce and circulate his last draft of his report as quickly as possible.

/At the

At the suggestion of the representative of France, the CHAIRMAN called for discussion of the annexes pending the circulation of the new short report prepared by the Rapporteur.

Mr. TINE (France) said that in paragraph C of Section 1 of its suggested revisions to the draft report, the United States delegation had proposed the deletion from the list contained in Annex II of some documents which were already contained in other more general documents listed in that annex. That was a most commendable principle which might be adopted by the Committee as a general rule for the whole of Annex II.

Mr. TEIXEIRA SOARES (Brazil) supported the suggestion made by the French representative and also the United States proposal that the first progress report of the Commission for Conventional Armaments should be added to Annex II.

Mr. CAMPBELL (United Kingdom) said that, in view of the proposal just made by the Rapporteur for a short and factual report, which seemed in principle to be a good suggestion although it was still to be examined in detail, it might be preferable to dispense with Annex II altogether. That would also preclude unnecessarily long and complicated discussion. He therefore wished to make that suggestion.

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands), Rapporteur, agreed with the United Kingdom representative, pointing out that a very clear picture of the discussion would be obtained from the summary records to be attached to the short report and the documents in any case were well known.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) said that both the original report and Annex II suffered from the same defect. The USSR delegation had distorted those documents by both additions and changes. In numerous respects, the additions inserted by the Soviet Union were duplications of documents already contained in other items listed by the Rapporteur. The aim of the USSR additions and revisions seemed to be to emphasize the allegedly important part the USSR delegation had played in the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission on Conventional Armaments, whereas its role had in fact been extremely limited.

/In fact,

In fact, the Soviet Union had absented itself from the work of the Commission on Conventional Armaments and the Atomic Energy Commission the previous year. To allow the USSR insertions and revisions would completely distort Annex II. The United States was not interested in a word-counting game in which it would add documents to the Annex in order to match the Soviet Union's propaganda tactics. Consequently, he agreed with the United Kingdom representative's proposal to delete Annex II altogether for he felt that the new single commission would be able to judge matters for itself, without having its attention drawn to any specific documents. Moreover, deleting Annex II would be consistent also with the abbreviated form of the new factual report suggested by the Rapporteur, should the Committee decide to adopt the shorter report.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) pointed out that the question of deleting Annex II had arisen as a result of the position taken up by the United States. Originally, when the views to be given on the question of atomic energy were those of the United States, the United States representative had wholeheartedly supported the proposal to include that annex. The documents listed in the first draft of the annex had reflected only the views of the United States. There was another point of view, however, that of the USSR, which had been defended by the representative of that country ever since the question had first come up, when the General Assembly had adopted the resolutions of 24 January and 14 December 1946. According to that point of view it was essential to prohibit atomic weapons and establish international control over such prohibition and that the reduction of armaments, and not a race for armaments, was necessary. Thus, the Committee had before it a perfectly clear picture. There were two points of view: the point of view of the United States, which was directed towards preventing the prohibition of atomic weapons and towards rearmament, and the point of view of the USSR, which was directed towards the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments.

In those circumstances the General Assembly must have a clear idea of the struggle that had taken place on the question of the prohibition of atomic

weapons and the reduction of armaments and of the position held on the question by each of the parties concerned. Thus, both the report itself and its annexes should contain or list all the important material and documents which reflected both points of view on the substantive question of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments.

The United States representative had tried deliberately in his statement to misrepresent the existing position and to distort the facts. He had alleged that there was a disproportion between statements made by the USSR and those made by the other representatives. It might well be that certain representatives had spoken less than others, but if the statements of all those representatives were taken together, it would be found that the expression of one point of view, that of the United States, took up three quarters of the report, whereas the expression of the Soviet Union's point of view took up only one quarter of the report. As for the assertion by the United States representative that the USSR representative's statement contained arguments not used at the meeting, it was based, not on the official records of the Committee, but on minutes written by employees of the United States delegation. The Statement contained only what had actually been said by the USSR representative, and the United States representative's allegation was therefore unfounded.

With reference to the United States representative's argument that the USSR proposals should be omitted from the annex on the grounds that the documents concerned were incorporated in other documents in the annex and were therefore repetitive, he would point out that the documents explaining the United States position were repeated several times; for example the first, second and third reports and recommendations of the Atomic Energy Commission and the resolutions (AEC/42 and AEC/43) of that Commission all expressed the United States point of view in various forms. But the General Assembly was not only concerned with obtaining an explanation of one point of view, that of the United States. The General Assembly had to be acquainted with both the existing points of view -- that of the United States and that of the USSR.

/In reply

In reply to the United States representative's comments on the fact that the USSR had not taken part in previous debates on the questions of atomic energy and the reduction of armaments, he stated that the Soviet Union had always held the initiative in those matters, had consistently and unremittingly fought for the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments and had directed all its proposals to that end.

The first draft of the report, as amended by the USSR, gave a more accurate account of the discussion of the question in the Committee, and insisted that annex 1, the United States document "General views of the United States..." (A/AC.50/1) should be deleted from the report, on the grounds that it was out of order, since it had no bearing whatsoever on the Committee's work. Moreover, the real purpose of those "views" of the United States was to subordinate the new commission's activities to the unacceptable and inconsistent United States plan and to bring about a deadlock at the very outset of its operation, by predetermining its composition, functions and work. The United States representative could explain his plan when the new commission began to operate. In conclusion, he proposed that the annex should contain the recommendations of the General Assembly, on the one hand, and the USSR proposals, on the other. Such an annex would enable representatives to the General Assembly to form a clear idea of the two points of view on that important question.

Mr. WEI (China) pointed out that the question before the Committee was not the structure of the report or the contents of annex II or annex I, but the proposal for the deletion of annex II. He supported that proposal because the Committee had dealt with a procedural problem, not with matters of substance, and had not drawn up terms of reference or even a name for the new commission. Moreover, those documents were already well known and the new commission would be supplied with all the relevant documentation.

The United Kingdom proposal for the deletion of annex II was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

/Mr. TINE

Mr. TIME (France) explained that in his original remarks he had simply suggested a method of discussing annex II. When the United Kingdom representative had proposed the total deletion of the annex he had heartily endorsed the proposal because he had from the outset considered it unnecessary to include such an annex.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) proposed formally that annex 1 should be deleted from the report. That document expressed the United States' views on the future structure and work of the new commission, and not the views of the Committee; he could see no reason why special attention should be paid to that point of view, more particularly as the Committee had just decided to delete the list of documents which reflected the two points of view. There were no grounds whatever for retaining the United States document as an annex to the report.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) said that there was no real connexion between annexes I and II. Annex II was supposed to relate to the work of the two existing Commissions, whereas annex I was a paper which his delegation had submitted to facilitate the work of the Committee of Twelve. If the Rapporteur's suggestion for a short factual report was adopted and the summary records were attached to that report, then annex I could well be deleted and the paper could simply be attached to the summary record of the meeting at which it had been submitted (A/AC.50/SR.4). He did not feel very strongly on the point, but he thought that the papers submitted by any delegation should be attached to the relevant summary record. For example, although the USSR amendments (A/AC.50/5) to the United States draft resolution (A/AC.50/4/Rev.1) were incorporated in the body of the report, he saw no reason why they should not also be attached to the summary record of the seventh meeting at which they had been submitted.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that it was impossible to form an opinion of the new report submitted at the current meeting while the debate was in progress; it was essential to have time to study it, and the new version of the report should therefore be discussed at the next meeting. A cursory perusal of that document showed that it merely contained an enumeration of the proposals that had been approved and the results of the votes, and that the explanations given by representatives

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands), Rapporteur, pointed out that it was his duty to try to produce a comprehensible document. As the Committee had discussed the United States paper at some length, he had originally incorporated the text of the paper in the body of the first draft of a report covering the first six meetings. Later, at the request of the USSR representative, the paper had been taken out of the body of the report and attached as an annex, in order to avoid giving the impression that it was anything more than a working paper submitted by a single delegation. All that was being done in the report was to relate what had actually taken place in the Committee and if the USSR delegation had submitted a working paper that too would naturally have been attached to the report.

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he was obliged to object to the retention of the United States document as an annex. That document laid down directives for the composition of the commission, its status, rules of procedure, functions etc., whereas the General Assembly had set up the Committee of Twelve "to consider...ways and means whereby the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments may be co-ordinated and on the advisability of their functions being merged..." (resolution 496 (V)). The Committee therefore had no right to associate itself with the United States document, since that document was not in order.

He again proposed that the United States document should be deleted from the report.

Mr. WEI (China) proposed that the discussion on the annexes should be postponed until the new draft report had been discussed and that the meeting should be suspended for a few minutes in order to enable representatives to read the new draft report.

The meeting was suspended at 11.55 a.m. and resumed at 12.10 p.m.

The CHAIRMAN opened the discussion on the new skeleton draft report submitted by the Rapporteur.

/Mr. TSARAPKIN

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) opened the discussion of the new version of the Committee's report by stating that that version was unsatisfactory. It gave no idea of the Committee's work, since it merely set forth the official documents submitted to the Committee. The report of the Committee of Twelve in that form could not satisfy the General Assembly. He thought the first draft of the report more suitable, and proposed that the report should be left in its original form.

Mr. WEI (China) preferred the shorter report as it gave a bird's-eye view of the Committee's proceedings and anyone who was interested in a more detailed description could easily refer to the summary records.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) praised both reports submitted by the Rapporteur but preferred the new short report as he thought it reproduced the Committee's decisions in a more convenient form for the General Assembly.

Regarding the question of annexes, he had noted that the summary record of the fourth meeting simply referred to his delegation's paper by number and did not include the text or even a summary of the proposals. The record of that meeting would therefore be quite meaningless unless the full text of the United States paper was attached to it. Consequently, he proposed that the Committee should adopt the short report with the summary records annexed and the United States paper attached to the summary record of the fourth meeting.

Mr. ALBORNOZ (Ecuador) said that, as the United States paper had served as a basis for part of the Committee's discussion, it should logically be attached to the report in order to make the document comprehensible. He therefore supported the United States proposal.

/Mr. GEORGE

Mr. GEORGE (Canada) said that he would not oppose the new skeleton report because of the short time available to the Committee. However, while he did not endorse the reasons of the USSR representative, he also felt that, as the Committee had been asked to report upon a question, it would have been better to retain the first report prepared by the Rapporteur which was objective and explained the Committee's work. He had no objection to the deletion of annex II as the bibliography on the subject was extensive and familiar to everyone, but he did regret that the Committee had no time to discuss and adopt the original full draft report.

Mr. TEIXEIRA SOARES (Brazil) said that both draft reports were excellent documents. He felt that the short report would be quite adequate if it was accompanied by the summary records and the United States paper.

The United States proposal that the Committee should adopt the short draft report and annex the summary records thereto with the United States paper attached to the summary record of the fourth meeting was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) proposed that the papers prepared by the Secretariat regarding the work of the League of Nations on disarmament, which had originally been listed as annexes III and IV of the first draft report, should also be transmitted to the General Assembly.

Mr. LUNS (Netherlands), Rapporteur, said that that had been his intention when he had submitted the short draft report.

Mr. PROTITCH (Secretariat) said that the papers in question had already been given general distribution and were in the hands of all delegations to the General Assembly. He therefore suggested that for budgetary reasons it would be preferable simply to make reference to them at the end of the report and avoid the reproduction of voluminous documents, circulation of which had been made before.

Mr. NASH (United States of America) agreed to that suggestion.

/Mr. TSARAPKIN

Mr. TSARAPKIN (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) stated that he had already had occasion to object to the preparation of documents on the work of the League of Nations. He now felt obliged to repeat that the General Assembly had laid down the functions of the Committee of Twelve when it had set up that Committee. The Committee had been set up to consider ways and means whereby the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments could be co-ordinated; it was difficult to see any connexion between that and the unsuccessful experience of the League of Nations, or anything in common between the Committee's task and the League's experience. The second function of the Committee of Twelve was to consider the advisability of merging the functions of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments. There again it was not clear how the experience of the League of Nations could prove useful, since it was a fact that neither the Atomic Energy Commission nor the problem of atomic energy had existed at the time of the League of Nations. There was therefore no reason for the Committee of Twelve to submit documents on the experience of the League of Nations. The Committee should not submit those documents, since it was not competent to do so; only those who wished to complicate the issue could insist on dragging in the experience of the League of Nations. The Secretariat's work of compiling those documents had been a waste of time; it had been performed to serve the obvious aim of the United States delegation to complicate the straightforward question of the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments by introducing questions that were not relevant. What was needed was a new and fresh approach to the problem, and not the experience of the League of Nations.

Reviewing the Committee's work, he pointed out that the USSR delegation had endeavoured to achieve a common language in order to find ways and means of prohibiting atomic weapons and reducing armaments and to reach agreement on the solution of the problem. With that purpose in mind, the USSR delegation had submitted some brief but highly significant amendments. Those amendments stated that the new commission should prepare plans for the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments. The USSR delegation had proposed that that statement should be inserted in the relevant paragraphs of the United States

/resolution

resolution, and had pointed out that paragraph 4 of that resolution should be deleted, since it linked the activities of the new commission with the unacceptable and inconsistent Baruch-Acheson-Lilienthal plan, which had led to a deadlock in the work of the Atomic Energy Commission.

It was obvious that if the new commission was to be guided by that plan, its work was inexorably doomed to the failure which the United States was so persistently trying to bring about. The USSR amendments clearly stated that the new commission must prepare plans for the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments. Unfortunately, the USSR amendments had been rejected and the United States draft resolution, which was intended to prolong the deadlock in those questions had been adopted. Generally speaking, the work of the Committee of Twelve had not been satisfactory, since no progress had been made in solving the problem of the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments. The deadlock remained. The reason for that was that the United States was not interested either in the prohibition of atomic weapons or in the reduction of armaments. Its interests, on the contrary, lay in a race for atomic weapons and for armaments. The USSR delegation had always fought and would continue to fight for the prohibition of atomic weapons and the reduction of armaments.

The United States proposal that the Secretariat papers on the experience of the League of Nations should be referred to in the Committee's report was adopted by 10 votes to 1, with 1 abstention.

The CHAIRMAN thanked all the delegations for their co-operation and the Secretariat for all its assistance.

The meeting rose at 12.55 p.m.

17/10 p.m.