

Supplement
Working file
File

82 *old*
ORIGIN:
S/AE
INFO
DCL
REP
AF
ARA
FE

NO.: CA-640 July 21, 1960

SUBJECT: IAEA Safeguards Document to be Considered at IAEA Fourth General Conference, September 1960.

TO: CANBERRA, CARACAS, LIMA, LISBON, MADRID, MANILA, MEXICO CITY, OSLO, PRETORIA, RIO DE JANEIRO, THE HAGUE, TOKYO

Notd info:
LONDON, OTTAWA, PARIS, VIENNA FOR IAEA MISSION

Reference: Department Instruction CA-10127, June 3, 1960.

IAEA.

1. Recent Developments:

Extensive consultation with British and Canadian representatives has resulted in agreement on a course of action designed to obtain favorable action on the IAEA safeguards document, GC/IV/108, at the forthcoming Fourth General Conference. The general objective of the course of action is to limit debate at the General Conference on the safeguards document to the document as a whole (i.e., avoid paragraph-by-paragraph substantive debate) and to conclude the discussion with the adoption of a procedural resolution which takes note of the document and returns it to the Board of Governors for implementation, along with the records of the Conference discussions and the text of proposals submitted.

During the recent Board of Governors meeting at Vienna, the United States, British and Canadian delegations, each speaking on behalf of the three, held preliminary consultations with the following delegations concerning the proposed tactical plan and the draft resolution: Australia, South Africa, Portugal, Spain, Japan, Brazil, Mexico, Peru, Venezuela, France, Norway, The Netherlands and the Philippines. Most of these delegations reacted favorably to the proposed course of action but, of course, could not make firm commitments of support for it or to co-sponsor the draft resolution pending consultations with their Governments.

2. The Draft Resolution:

The draft resolution (copies enclosed) agreed ^{to} by the three delegations

CONFIDENTIAL

DRAFTED BY:

S/AE: NIManfull:njf 7/18/60

APPROVED BY:

UNP - W. I. Cargo

CLEARANCES:

- ARA - Mr. Wilson (in draft)
- EUR - Mr. Muxley (in draft)
- FE - Miss Bacon (in draft)
- ARS - Mr. Schneider (in draft)

- AEC - Mr. Vinciguerra (in draft)
- AEC - Mr. Quinn (in draft)
- UNP - Mr. Keller

CONFIDENTIAL

(Security Classification)

delegations has been drafted with a view to developing at the outset a reasonable text which could command the support of other Member Governments and would facilitate obtaining the maximum number of co-sponsors in advance of the General Conference. It should be noted that the draft resolution has been carefully drafted to provide maximum tactical advantage at the Conference. While it can be anticipated that certain prospective co-sponsors may wish to amend the enclosed text, it is hoped that such suggested changes can be kept to a minimum and are not aimed at altering the procedural character of the resolution.

3. The Tactical Plan:

The tactical plan agreed by the three Governments involves joint or coordinated diplomatic representations to friendly Member Governments of the IAEA with a view to obtaining agreement of these Governments to instruct their delegations to the General Conference:

- (a) to support the safeguards document, GC/IV/108 as such;
- (b) to support adoption of the draft procedural resolution mentioned above as finally agreed among the co-sponsors;
- (c) to support procedural motions at the General Conference designed to prevent votes on amendments or on any individual parts of the safeguards document;
- (d) to oppose any motions calling for deferral of the safeguards item to a future General Conference;
- (e) to support action referring the document on Privileges and Immunities of the Agency's Inspectors to the Board of Governors to implementation in the same manner as the basic safeguards document, GC/IV/108.

The tactical plan also calls for obtaining the maximum number of co-sponsors for the draft resolution in advance of the General Conference and in this process to attempt to obtain a broad geographical distribution among the co-sponsors, including some of the underdeveloped countries. With regard to the timing of diplomatic approaches, it was agreed that the following sequence would be followed: (1) obtain maximum co-sponsorship in the first instance from friendly Member Countries represented on the Board; (2) following an examination of the outcome of these representations, to approach the Indian and Ceylonese Governments to seek their support; and (3) to make representations to other friendly Member Governments not represented on the Board beginning in August.

CONFIDENTIAL

(Security Classification)

CONFIDENTIAL

(Security Classification)

The three Governments also agreed to support at the General Conference the reference of the safeguards item to the Administrative and Legal Committee for special consideration as proposed by the IAEA Secretariat in its draft agenda for General Conference (GOV/562). Since the main focus of debate at the Conference is likely to occur in this committee, the three Governments consider it essential to elect a friendly, impartial Chairman of this committee. It is anticipated consultations on this subject will be held with other Governments at a later date.

4. Consultations at Vienna:

As indicated in Paragraph 1 above, the United States, British and Canadian delegations at Vienna held preliminary consultations with the delegations of the friendly countries represented on the Board during the recent June Board Meeting concerning the above tactical plan and draft resolution. Separate instructions follow to each addressee post summarizing results of these consultations and additional information which may be useful in approaches to Governments.

For the information of the Mission only, the Department considers it essential to continue to maintain the closest possible collaboration with the British and the Canadians if the common objective of obtaining favorable action on Agency safeguards is to be achieved at the forthcoming General Conference. Considerable time and effort have been devoted to date to developing an agreed course of action. It is equally important that approaches to other Governments seeking support for the tripartite position be carried out on a joint or coordinated basis. The British and the Canadian Governments have been requested to issue parallel instructions to concert with United States Embassies in joint or coordinated approaches to Governments on the safeguards question. END FYI.

5. Action Requested:

Upon receipt of the ^{instru}mentioned in Paragraph 4 above, the Embassies are requested to consult with the British and Canadian Missions with regard to making a joint or coordinated approach to appropriate officials in the Government to which accredited at the earliest possible time, seeking the agreement of that Government: (a) to the tactical approach outlined above, particularly points (a) through (e) of Paragraph 3; and (b) to co-sponsor the enclosed draft resolution.

In making this approach, the Mission should draw, as necessary, ^{upon} information contained in the referenced instruction. Should the officials inquire as to why the United States is opposed to referring the safeguards document to the General Conference for approval, the following additional arguments may be used:

- (a) United States believes that the Board of Governors is the competent body to elaborate and put into effect the Agency safeguards system as required by the Statute. Nevertheless, the United States has gone along with the majority view that the item be referred to the General Conference for "appropriate action under the Statute";

(b) Referral

CONFIDENTIAL

(Security Classification)

CONFIDENTIAL*(Security Classification)*

- (b) Referral of the document for approval would open the door for further delaying tactics by the opponents of the safeguards (i.e., reopening the document to extensive amendment and debate) and invite further referral of the document to a future General Conference;
- (c) The safeguards question has received exhaustive consideration by the Board and by technical experts and reflects a realistic compromise between political and technical considerations. It is unlikely that further debate would produce a better product. Further, the United States considers the safeguards principles and procedures contained GC(IV)/108 as reasonable and adequate, although they are, of course, subject to improvement in light of future experience.

The Mission is requested to report to the Department results of the above approach and subsequent developments on this subject, repeating the reports in each case to the American Embassy at Vienna for the United States Mission to the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Enclosure:**HERTER**

Draft Resolution.

CONFIDENTIAL*(Security Classification)*



National Security Archive,
Suite 701, Gelman Library, The George Washington University,
2130 H Street, NW, Washington, D.C., 20037,
Phone: 202/994-7000, Fax: 202/994-7005, nsarchiv@gwu.edu