

GENERAL
ASSEMBLY

SIXTH SESSION

Official Records

INDEX UNIT



FIRST COMMITTEE 471st

MEETING

Wednesday, 19 December 1951, at 10.30 a.m.

Palais de Chaillot, Paris

CONTENTS

	Page
Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of all armed forces and all armaments (A/1943, A/C.1/667/Rev.1, A/C.1/668/Rev.2, A/C.1/677 and A/C.1/680) (concluded)	99
International control of atomic energy : report of the Committee of Twelve (A/1922) (concluded)	

Chairman: Mr. Finn MOE (Norway).

**Regulation, limitation and balanced reduction of
all armed forces and all armaments (A/1943,
A/C.1/667/Rev.1, A/C.1/668/Rev.2, A/C.1/677
and A/C.1/680) (concluded)**

[Item 66]*

**International control of atomic energy : report of the
Committee of Twelve (A/1922) (concluded)**

[Item 16]*

VOTE ON THE REVISED DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY
FRANCE, THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE UNITED
STATES (A/C.1/667/Rev.1) AND AMENDMENTS THERETO

1. The CHAIRMAN invited the Committee to vote
on the revised joint draft resolution (A/C.1/667/Rev.1)
and the amendments thereto.

Preamble

2. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment
submitted by Lebanon (A/C.1/678, point 1) to the effect
that a new first paragraph be inserted in the preamble.

*The amendment was adopted by 37 votes to none, with
7 abstentions.*

3. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment
submitted by Czechoslovakia to the effect that the first
four paragraphs of the preamble be deleted (A/C.1/683,
point 1).

*The amendment was rejected by 34 votes to 5, with
10 abstentions.*

4. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment
submitted by Lebanon which called for a change in the
first paragraph of the preamble of the original text
(A/C.1/678, point 2).

*The amendment was adopted by 27 votes to none, with
27 abstentions.*

5. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first paragraph
of the preamble of the original text thus amended.

*The first paragraph of the preamble thus amended was
adopted by 46 votes to none, with 6 abstentions.*

6. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment
submitted by Egypt to the effect that a new paragraph be
inserted after the first paragraph of the original text
(A/C.1/681, point 1).

*The amendment was rejected by 35 votes to 14, with
5 abstentions.*

7. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph
of the preamble of the basic text (A/C.1/667/Rev.1).

*The second paragraph of the preamble was adopted by
41 votes to none, with 14 abstentions.*

8. At the request of the representative of IRAQ, the
CHAIRMAN put to the vote in two parts the text submitted
by USSR (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 1) to replace the third
and fourth paragraphs of the preamble of the draft
resolution.

9. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first part (ending
" ... strict international control over the enforcement of
this prohibition...").

The text was rejected by 40 votes to 11, with 6 abstentions.

10. The CHAIRMAN then put to the vote the
second part of the amendment submitted by USSR
(A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 1).

The text was rejected by 40 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

11. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the amendment
submitted by Peru to the third paragraph of the preamble
(A/C.1/682, point 1) had been accepted by the sponsors
of the draft resolution. He therefore put to the vote the
third paragraph of the preamble thus amended.

*The third paragraph of the preamble, thus amended, was
adopted by 43 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.*

12. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fourth paragraph
of the preamble of the joint draft resolution.

*The fourth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by
43 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.*

13. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the fifth paragraph
of the preamble of the draft resolution.

*The fifth paragraph of the preamble was adopted by 50 votes
to none, with 4 abstentions.*

* Indicates the item number on the General Assembly agenda.

Operative part

14. The representative of EGYPT withdrew point 2 of the amendment submitted by his delegation (A/C.1/681), since it no longer served any purpose.

15. The representative of POLAND re-introduced the Egyptian amendment (A/C.1/681, point 2) in the name of his own delegation and requested that it be put to the vote as a Polish amendment.

16. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by the Polish delegation.

The amendment was rejected by 39 votes to 9, with 9 abstentions.

17. The representative of the UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS requested that the USSR amendment (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 2), to the effect that a new first paragraph be inserted in the operative part, should be put to the vote paragraph by paragraph.

18. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first paragraph of the amendment submitted by USSR (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 2).

The paragraph was rejected by 42 votes to 6, with 9 abstentions.

19. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second paragraph of the amendment submitted by USSR.

The paragraph was rejected by 39 votes to 5, with 13 abstentions.

20. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote point 4 of the amendment submitted by Lebanon (A/C.1/678).

The amendment was adopted by 13 votes to 12, with 33 abstentions.

21. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 1 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution thus amended.

Paragraph 1 was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

22. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 2 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution.

Paragraph 2 was adopted by 51 votes to none, with 7 abstentions.

23. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment to the effect that a new paragraph be inserted after the second paragraph of the operative part of the draft resolution (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 3).

The amendment was rejected by 36 votes to 7, with 15 abstentions.

24. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by Czechoslovakia to the effect that paragraphs 3 to 10 of the operative part be deleted (A/C.1/683, point 2).

The amendment was rejected by 46 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

25. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by Czechoslovakia to the effect that a new paragraph be inserted after paragraph 2 of the operative part (A/C.1/683, point 3).

The amendment was rejected by 42 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

26. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by USSR to replace paragraph 3 of the operative part of the draft resolution by a new text (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 4).

The amendment was rejected by 38 votes to 6, with 14 abstentions.

27. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the amendment submitted by Peru, which called for a change in the third paragraph of the operative part, had been accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution (A/C.1/682/Rev.2, point 4).

28. He put to the vote the introductory sentence of paragraph 3 (ending "for peaceful purposes only") as modified by the amendment submitted by Peru and by the Lebanon amendment (A/C.1/678, point 4) previously adopted.

That text was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

29. At the request of the representative of the UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA, the CHAIRMAN ruled that the five sub-paragraphs of paragraph 3 of the operative part should be put to the vote separately.

30. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the introductory words "The Commission shall be guided by the following principles" and sub-paragraph (a).

That text was adopted by 42 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

31. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 3.

Sub-paragraph (b) was adopted by 42 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

32. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (c).

Sub-paragraph (c) was adopted by 41 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

33. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (d).

Sub-paragraph (d) was adopted by 43 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

34. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote sub-paragraph (e).

Sub-paragraph (e) was adopted by 43 votes to none, with 15 abstentions.

35. The CHAIRMAN noted that as a result of the vote, paragraph 3 as a whole of the operative part of the joint draft resolution had been adopted by the Committee.

36. He put to the vote the amendment submitted by the USSR to the effect of inserting a new text after paragraph 3 of the operative part (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 5).

The amendment was rejected by 42 votes to 5, with 11 abstentions.

37. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment to the effect that paragraphs 4 and 5 of the draft resolution be deleted (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 6).

The amendment was rejected by 44 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

38. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 4 of the operative part of the joint draft resolution.

Paragraph 4 was adopted by 44 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

39. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 5 of the operative part.

Paragraph 5 was adopted by 44 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

40. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment to replace paragraph 6 of the operative part by a new text (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 7).

The amendment was rejected by 41 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

41. The CHAIRMAN observed that the amendment submitted by Yugoslavia to sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph 6 of the operative part (A/C.1/679) had been accepted by the sponsors of the draft resolution.

42. He therefore put to the vote paragraph 6, thus amended, of the operative part.

Paragraph 6, thus amended, was adopted by 43 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

43. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the USSR amendment to delete paragraph 7 of the operative part (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 8).

The amendment was rejected by 43 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

44. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 7 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 7 was adopted by 43 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

45. Mr. LOURIE (Israel) requested that the second subparagraph of the text submitted by the USSR to replace paragraph 8 of the operative part (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 9) should be put to the vote separately.

46. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the first subparagraph of the text submitted by the USSR (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 9).

The text was rejected by 37 votes to 7, with 11 abstentions.

47. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the second subparagraph.

The text was rejected by 41 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 8 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 8 was adopted by 45 votes to 5, with 8 abstentions.

49. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the amendment submitted by the USSR to delete paragraph 9 of the draft resolution (A/C.1/668/Rev.2, point 10).

The amendment was rejected by 43 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

50. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 9 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 9 was adopted by 44 votes to 5, with 9 abstentions.

51. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote paragraph 10 of the operative part of the draft resolution.

Paragraph 10 was adopted by 45 votes to none, with 12 abstentions.

52. The CHAIRMAN suggested that explanations of vote be given after the three-Power draft resolution as a whole has been put to the vote.

It was so decided.

53. Mr. MOCH (France) requested that the vote on the draft resolution as a whole should be taken by roll-call.

54. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by France, the United Kingdom and the United States (A/C.1/667/Rev.1) as a whole as amended.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

In favour : Australia, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, France, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, Iraq, Israel, Lebanon, Liberia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia.

Against : Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Abstaining : Afghanistan, Argentina, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iran, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Yemen.

The draft resolution was adopted by 44 votes to 5, with 10 abstentions.

55. Mr. QUEVEDO (Ecuador) recalled that at the 454th meeting he had stated that the three-Power draft resolution could lead to practical results only if the great Powers reached an agreement.

56. He had, however, voted for it because he felt that the document the Committee had just adopted, as amended

in the course of the debate, left the door open to all Powers, even those who had not voted for it, to seek common ground and enabled them to take part in work which might lead to the desired agreement.

57. ANDRAOS Bey (Egypt) pointed out that his delegation had withdrawn the second paragraph of its amendment (A/C.1/681) not because it had ceased to think that the question of prohibition of the use of the atomic weapon should be referred to the Sixth Committee but because, through the First Committee's rejection of point 1, the Egyptian amendment had lost an essential ingredient. He wished to thank the representative of Poland for having re-introduced point 2 of the Egyptian amendment.

58. Egypt had taken part in the debate without prejudice or preconceived ideas. The amendment had been submitted in a constructive spirit and in the hope that everyone would realise that it was not its intention to favour one or other of the parties.

59. The attitude of the Egyptian delegation had not changed and it had not been convinced by the easy majority gained by the resolution just adopted by the Committee.

60. Mr. VYSHINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had voted against the three-Power draft resolution because, even in its revised version, it was merely an attempt to replace the question of the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of the atomic weapon by proposals which would lead to disclosure of information on armaments.

61. Mr. Vyshinsky declared that the aim of the three-Power draft resolution was to sabotage the reduction of armaments and the prohibition of the atomic weapon. Moreover, the Soviet Union proposals which had been intended to lead to the adoption of measures likely to result in the reduction of armaments and armed forces and the prohibition of the atomic weapon, had all been rejected.

62. Mr. RESTREPO JARAMILLO (Colombia) said his delegation had voted for the three-Power draft resolution because it was convinced that it represented a first step towards the goal to be achieved, which was to check the armaments race. It was obviously impossible, in existing circumstances, suddenly and unconditionally to prohibit the use of the atomic bomb and to solve the disarmament problem by the stroke of a magic wand.

63. Accordingly, his delegation thought the establishment of a body which would resume discussions and give an opportunity to all, and particularly to the great Powers, to reach agreement, constituted an advance.

64. Mr. AL-JAMALI (Iraq) said his delegation had hoped that the Committee's proceedings would culminate in a unanimous recommendation. Since that had not been so, the delegation of Iraq had had no choice but to vote in favour of the three-Power draft resolution, which certainly constituted a good starting point and took account of realities and of international tension.

65. His delegation had approached the amendments proposed to the draft resolution with an open mind. It had always supported the Soviet Union proposals relating to the atomic weapon. On the other hand, it had felt bound to vote against some USSR amendments, such as those recommending an arbitrary reduction of armaments by one-third within one year or the deletion of the very important paragraphs 4 and 5 of the operative part of the three-Power draft resolution. It had supported the Egyptian amendments—the second re-introduced by the Polish delegation—because it had considered that they constituted one of several ways of settling the question of disarmament.

66. Mr. ARDALAN (Iran) said that his delegation had abstained from voting on the three-Power draft resolution and the amendments to it, except for some paragraphs for which it had voted, because they seemed likely to meet with unanimous approval in the Committee. His delegation had abstained because it took the view that so long as agreement had not been reached between the great Powers, the adoption of any resolution, whatever its terms, could not produce the desired results. On the contrary, the attitudes might become more rigid.

67. It was clear from the memorandum prepared by the Chairman of Sub-Committee 18 (A/C.1/677) as well as from the discussion in the First Committee, that the parties were divided on the means rather than on the end to be achieved. That being so, the difficulties were not likely to be ironed out unless the great Powers were willing to show reciprocal goodwill and to make an effort to bridge the gap between their points of view.

68. Mr. KOSANOVIC (Yugoslavia), speaking with reference to paragraph 3 (c) of the three-Power draft resolution, said his delegation would have preferred to leave it to the Disarmament Commission to work out an agreed solution for the problem of the control of atomic energy; for that reason it had abstained from voting on that paragraph.

69. So far as paragraph 3 (a) and paragraph 5 of the three-Power draft resolution were concerned, the Yugoslav delegation believed that it would have been likewise preferable to leave it to the Disarmament Commission to determine the procedures to be followed in the matter of disclosure. There were obviously certain fields where simultaneous disclosure, rather than progressive disclosure, would be possible. Realizing that it would not be possible to begin disarmament without prior disclosure of information, it had therefore voted in favour of paragraph 3 (a) and of paragraph 5, and also in favour of the resolution as a whole.

70. Mr. BARRINGTON (Burma) said that the circumstances in which the Committee had recommended the establishment of a new Disarmament Commission did not hold out a great promise that the new body would be able to achieve what the world expected of it.

71. For that reason, his delegation maintained its position as defined at the 470th meeting. It sincerely hoped, however, that its fears would be disproved by events.

72. Mr. PALAR (Indonesia) recalled that, as he had stated at the preceding meeting, his delegation's objective was to reconcile the views of the opposing parties where possible. In keeping with that attitude, his delegation had only voted in favour of those paragraphs of the three-Power draft resolution on which those mainly concerned could agree. It had abstained from voting on the other paragraphs as well as on the USSR amendments and on the draft resolution as a whole.

73. Mr. Palar reiterated his delegation's sincere hope that the Disarmament Commission, on the establishment of which both parties had agreed, would succeed in lessening international tension and in removing the fundamental causes of the distrust which divided the world into two armed camps.

74. Mr. C. MALIK (Lebanon) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the three-Power draft resolution because it believed it to be the only possible course in the circumstances. Any other course would have meant delaying the efforts to bring the parties together. The best way of reaching agreement was for the parties concerned to continue to meet and to hold discussions.

75. It was because the three-Power draft resolution proposed the establishment of an objective body suitable for such discussions that the Lebanese delegation had voted in favour of it as amended.

76. Mr. CASTILLO ARRIOLA (Guatemala) said the small Powers could at best only offer their moral contribution in the matter under consideration by the Committee. His delegation had supported the proposal to appoint a sub-committee on which the four Powers would be represented since only those Powers could bring about a real settlement of the disarmament problem.

77. His delegation had supported parts of the three-Power draft resolution as its adoption would constitute an advance towards the stage of mutual concessions by the great Powers.

78. Sir Benegal RAU (India) said his delegation had voted in favour of those points on which the great Powers themselves had been in agreement and had abstained on the others, except on the proposals relating to the prohibition of the atomic weapon. Although it had abstained from voting on the three-Power draft resolution as a whole, his delegation remained favourable to the establishment of a Disarmament Commission which it considered to be of great importance.

79. In due course, his delegation would submit to the Disarmament Commission some of the proposals which India had in the past submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission, either in the same form or in an amended form. He added that his delegation would give its whole-hearted support to the Commission.

80. Mr. JESSUP (United States of America) said that his delegation had voted in favour of the three-Power draft resolution as a whole and all its paragraphs because it sincerely believed it to be the most practical and most expeditious means for achieving the objectives set forth in the preamble.

81. The draft resolution, having been sponsored by France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America, had now become a resolution approved by the First Committee of the General Assembly and contained many valuable ideas suggested by various members of the Committee. The resolution should open the way to constructive work and the United States delegation considered that steps should now be taken with a view to widening the areas of agreement.

82. Mr. Jessup wished to point out that the paragraphs of the draft resolution establishing the new Disarmament Commission had been adopted without any opposition, which was a happy augury for the future. His Government would take part in the work of that Commission in the sincere intention of reaching agreement upon the problems of vital importance for world peace.

VOTE ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY POLAND
(A/C.1/680)

83. The CHAIRMAN put to the vote the draft resolution submitted by the Polish delegation (A/C.1/680).

The draft resolution was rejected by 38 votes to 6, with 10 abstentions.

84. The CHAIRMAN said that the draft resolution submitted by the Indian delegation (A/C.1/669) had been withdrawn. He said that the Committee had completed consideration of items 1 and 2 on its agenda.

85. He pointed out that the Committee would begin to deal with item 3 on its agenda (A/C.1/666/Rev.1) at its next meeting.

The meeting rose at 12.45 p.m.