



DELEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

5915 THIS DOCUMENT MUST BE RETURNED TO THE SA/R GENERAL FILES

CONFIDENTIAL
OFFICIAL-INFORMAL



Dear Fran:

I owe you a frank assessment of the position of the United States and of other principal Members of the International Atomic Energy Agency as they appear now following the recent General Conference and meetings of the Board of Governors. I am sure that these observations will be supported generally by similar comments from Members of the United States Delegation who have returned to Washington. These views also reflect the substance of a draft confidential report which we sent from here last Friday for further consideration by the Delegation Members now in the Department.

1. United States. The United States emerged from the Conference with its major objectives generally attained but it paid a price for this accomplishment. Some of the other Delegations felt that the United States had too large a list of objectives conceived in its own particular interest and that the United States pushed too vigorously for the achievement of these ends. The list included the appointment of an American Director General, agreement on total emolument of \$40,000 for the Director General, the election of the head of the Austrian Delegation as President of the Conference, adoption of the basic organization chart presented by the United States, acceptance of the position of Special Adviser to the Director General and acceptance of the position of Special Consultant to the Director General. Furthermore, some of these items were agreed to by other Delegations when all the conditions were not known, such as the inability of the Director General to assume his duties until December and his absence from Vienna before the end of the General Conference and the meetings of the Board of Governors. The result was disgruntlement among some of the Delegations, which they took out on the Director General and the United States Delegation, and a sensitiveness about the relationship of the Director General and the Board of Governors. Some were never persuaded that all of

The Honorable
Francis O. Wilcox,
Assistant Secretary for International
Organization Affairs,
Department of State.

LC/M
Anal 40
Hsv
Cat

CONFIDENTIAL

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 901058

303-1501-1A/11-1957
3/18/1973-4/11/77
CONFIDENTIAL FILE

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

our objectives were desirable in themselves and they only went along because of United States drive for them and because of their interest in preserving good relations with the United States. As a consequence, we suffered a certain loss in standing and influence in connection with the Agency among some of the other Members.

At the same time, however, we appreciated more than any of the other major participants the position of the smaller European countries who were not Members of the Board of Governors. We took account of their feelings of being shut out of the most vital and focal organ of the Agency, the Board of Governors, and were responsive to their desire for access to information on the work of the Board. The United States, accordingly, was able to maintain a good relationship with these countries which strongly defended positions taken by us and often turned to us for advice.

2. The USSR. The Soviet Delegation played its part astutely. They were moderate in their political efforts and never pressed any political interest to a bitter fight. They agreed with us beforehand to avoid introducing the Chinese representation issue in the opening meeting, which was highly publicized, and they limited their propaganda references in the general debate to allusions to their disarmament proposals to ban the nuclear bomb and tests of nuclear weapons. When they did introduce the Chinese representation issue and opposed our efforts to obtain a vote to take no decision on the validity of Hungarian credentials, they submitted to defeat without pursuing either matter heatedly and spoke mainly for the record. They acquiesced in the appointment of an American for Director General and went along with our organization chart. They deliberately endeavored to appear cooperative and to contribute to a harmonious atmosphere. They thus gave the impression that they desired to see the Agency operate as an effectively functioning technical organization in which through active Soviet participation they might reflect credit upon the attainments of Soviet science. They tried to pick up credit with other Delegations by appearing reasonable and constructive in discussions and cloaking longer-range Soviet interests as we were obliged to work more directly in the attainment of immediate objectives. Their plans for staffing their Mission to the Agency as revealed in their conversation with Mr. McKinney of October 28 (Embtel 1522) indicate that they hope to take an effective part in the work of the Agency. They are planning to have a staff adequate to make technically sound proposals and to criticize those of other Delegations and of the Agency staff. The impression we have, therefore,

CONFIDENTIAL

DECLASSIFIED

Authority WWW 901058

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

is that they are seeking a position of major influence and possibly of leadership in the Agency's activities.

The question arises why, if this is the Soviet attitude, they did not make a larger offer of materials to the Agency. It is possible that, even though they may be interested in its success, they do not wish to commit themselves to any greater extent until they are certain what the future of the Agency is going to be.

3. Other Members of the Big Five. British and French participation in the Conference and the Board of Governors was on the whole disappointing. They usually supported the positions of the United States but often after unnecessary difficulties. They opposed the interest of the smaller European countries in seeking a larger share in the Agency's activities. They thus for some time opposed the admission of observers from Member States to the Board of Governors and were undiplomatic in dealing with the Western European countries. They did not keep them adequately informed of the proceedings in the Board of Governors and sought to channel contacts with the United States, Canada, and the Latin American Delegations only through themselves. They also gave the impression that their interest in Euratom exceeded that in the Agency and admitted that their main efforts would be directed toward Euratom. The principal British representative, Mr. Michaels, although he did yeoman service for the United States in the Preparatory Commission in New York, did not cooperate too closely with us in the Conference itself and frequently irritated Members of the Conference and of the Board by his condescending remarks and by his impatient efforts to win others to the British point of view.

Canada proved our best friend and most effective proponent in our behalf at the Conference. Ambassador Wershof was a very forceful, effective participant who was always ready to come to our aid and who played a most constructive role in both the Conference and the Board.

4. The Underdeveloped Countries. Of the Asian and African countries, India had the delegation of greatest ability, headed by Dr. Bhabha, its foremost nuclear scientist. Both he and Dr. Rajan, one of India's ablest Foreign Service officers, were exceedingly articulate and active spokesmen. Their ability and the quality of their participation indicated India's serious interest in the Agency and desire to see it flourish as an organization for dealing with atomic energy affairs in international relations. India showed that it is interested not only

CONFIDENTIAL

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 901058

CONFIDENTIAL

- 4 -

in technical assistance benefits expected from the Agency but it is attracted by the Agency as a concept. At the same time the Indians felt some frustration in not being elected to any Conference office or obtaining support for any Indian in a second echelon staff position of the Agency. They expressed their feelings of frustration and sensitivity about the United States drive to achieve its own objectives by making polite but carefully directed thrusts in the Board meetings at proposals of the United States Delegation and at the position of the American Director General.

The Egyptian Delegation was likewise active but in a more aggressive way. Mr. Fahmy in the Board of Governors frequently supported the Soviet line against the United States, but sometimes departed from it or even opposed it or again cooperated with the United States Delegation. One was struck by the appearance that frequently he was not pursuing any particular interest of his Government but injecting his own individual views from his position as Chairman of the Administrative and Legal Committee and as a Member of the Board of Governors for the sake of indulging his vanity.

5. Small European Countries. These States, such as The Netherlands and Norway, had not participated in the work of the Preparatory Commission and did not sit on the Board of Governors. They, consequently, felt that they were not participating fully in the activities of the Agency. Their discontent was increased by the fact that the Conference was organized so as to keep them idle and uninformed between the First Session and the Special Session when the Board of Governors was acting on the recommendations of the Preparatory Commission. The attitude of the United Kingdom and France added to their sense of non-participation and dissatisfaction. The result was to produce a rebellion on the part of these States which was expressed in the desire to open the closed meetings of the Board of Governors to the attendance of observers from the non-Board Members and to obtain reports on the work of the Board. In the end the Board yielded to this pressure and agreed on the attendance of observers and to the transmission to the non-Board Members of agenda of the Board meetings, of final summary records and monthly reports of actions taken. The attitude of the small States thus served to raise essentially an issue of the powers of the Board versus those of the General Conference. This general issue can be expected to arise again in various forms in the future, and a problem facing the United States is how to cope with this issue. If the United States does not continue to be attentive to these aspirations of the smaller States and join with other Board Members in actions which will go toward their realization, the interest of the small States

CONFIDENTIAL

DECLASSIFIED

Authority NRND 901058

CONFIDENTIAL

- 5 -

in the Agency will likely wither. Already some of these Delegations are adopting a "wait-and-see" attitude and The Netherlands Delegation will see how the Agency develops before making further voluntary contributions and will probably not make any contribution to the fellowship program of the Agency during the first year.

Conclusions and Recommendations: The United States has so far exercised the principal leadership in the inception and genesis of the Agency. Many of the Members continue to expect this leadership particularly inasmuch as they are not technically qualified to make concrete proposals of their own and need to await the guidance of more technically developed countries. But as indicated above our standing and prestige in connection with the Agency suffered some losses during the recent Conference and meetings of the Board of Governors. It is believed, however, that this position can be repaired and extended if careful plans are laid and wisely followed for establishing our leadership and influence on a firm basis. It should be less difficult in the future to accomplish such a purpose, since the United States will not be obliged again to press for so many objectives at one time. Toward this end the following recommendations are made.

(1) Continuing manifestations of unreserved support of the Agency as a key United States policy. This is essential if we are to convince a number of Members who now adopt a "wait-and-see" attitude that the Agency has a future to which they can commit themselves.

(2) Sympathetic cultivation of the good will and responsiveness toward the United States of other Members. We should take a perceptive account of their sensitivities in reconciling their interests with our own. Every effort should be made to insure the maintenance of an active, consultative relationship with them based on a "give and take" exchange of views.

(3) Attentiveness to interests of the small European countries not Members of the Board. These States are anxious to cooperate with the United States if we continue to give careful consideration to their needs. It is believed that these States can make a solid contribution to the success of the Agency and, if we fail to insure their interest and active participation, the Agency will receive a blow at its very beginning.

(4) Thorough technical preparation for United States participation. The work of organization has now been largely accomplished and during the next year the activities of the General Conference and the Board of Governors should be increasingly devoted to

CONFIDENTIAL

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NND 901058

technical projects. If the United States is to maintain its initiative and leadership in the Agency, it will be necessary for the United States Mission and Delegation to be prepared to present sound technical proposals, to review those of other Members before the Board and to work with the staff of the Agency in the development of technical projects and in the consideration of its proposals. Without such thorough technical preparation United States participation will suffer especially in comparison with what probably may be expected of the Soviets. As we have learned from conversations with the Soviet representatives here (Embtel 1522), the Soviets are planning to have an eventual staff that will include five to seven scientific members. They tell us that their initial staff will include five to seven officers and will have two scientists trained in nuclear fields. With such a staff they may be prepared to exploit any situation that opens and grasp the technical leadership should there be a default in the United States technical preparation.

(5) Maintenance of adequate staff for the United States Mission.

The preceding statements lead naturally to a consideration of the needs for our own Mission staff. We have given very careful thought to these needs in the light of developments since the meeting of PRECO in Vienna. It seems to us that if we are to discharge our responsibilities adequately the staff within six months should consist of a senior technical adviser, a legal adviser and an executive officer in addition to Mr. McKinney and myself. It would be most helpful to have for the position indicated as legal adviser for want of a better designation Algie Wells, who is now on the legal staff of the AEC. His all-round background in the atomic energy field from his years of work with the AEC, his legal training, his knowledge of the developments of the Agency since the PRECO meetings in New York and his general usefulness as demonstrated by his work on the Delegation here would make him admirably suited to join our Mission staff.

The officer designated as executive officer would in reality be largely a second political officer and would need to give but little time to work of an administrative or executive nature. The officer to be most useful to the Mission should be not lower than FSO-3 in grade with an extensive background in international organization affairs.

This is a long letter but it gives the substance of our thought on the relation of the United States to the Agency to date, and I hope that it may be of some use to the Bureau in the consideration of IAEA problems.

Sincerely yours,

Harold C. Vedeler

Harold C. Vedeler.

DECLASSIFIED
Authority NRND 901058

December 9 1957

THIS DOCUMENT MUST BE RETURNED TO THE NM/R GENERAL FILES

OFFICIAL-INFORMAL
CONFIDENTIAL

Dear Harold:

Thank you very much for your most interesting and informative letter of November 19. Your thoughtful assessment of our position in the Agency is thoroughly appreciated by all of us who are concerned with the welfare of the Agency and particularly with the United States participation in its work. I have circulated your letter throughout this Bureau and have also passed a copy to S/AE.

I hope that the following comments, which relate to the topics contained in your analysis, may be of some interest to you and the Mission:

1. United States. It is of course regrettable that the United States may have been obliged to pay a price for the accomplishment of its major objectives during the recent session of the General Conference. I suppose a large part of this price was inevitable in view of what we set out to accomplish. In any event, your frank evaluation of the net results of our efforts in the Conference is very welcome, and will be helpful in shaping future courses of action. I trust that now that we have passed through the initial--presumably the most difficult--phases of the Agency's life, United States leadership can be exerted in a manner which does not require the direct action that was needed in order to get the Agency going. I take it that once the Board of Governors is meeting on a frequent and more or less regular basis, the increased chances of consultation will lead to the accomplishment of our essential objectives without the abrasiveness to which a lack of consultation inevitably leads. I also hope that any sensitiveness about the relationship of the Director General and the Board of Governors will disappear once Mr. Cole is on the scene. I think he is thoroughly aware of the problems in this respect which he will have to face, and I know that he can deal with them with grace and facility. Incidentally, he has indicated in conversations here very clearly that he does not in the least resent offers of advice from the United States side. On the contrary, he has stated that we should be just as free with our counsel as the other countries and some of them have been very free indeed. I would suggest, therefore, that you will want to make every

effort

Harold C. Vedeler, Esquire,
International Atomic Energy Agency,
American Embassy,
Vienna, Austria.

CONFIDENTIAL

DECLASSIFIED
Authority nnd 901058

388.1501-1/HEA/11-1557

CS/G

CONFIDENTIAL

29 11/10-11

LCN
Anal 4
Rev
Cet

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -

effort to establish and maintain the closest relationships to Mr. Cole. We all recognize that he is now an international civil servant and not a part of the Government of the United States. In my opinion, however, there are very wide limits within which we can quite properly communicate our ideas to him. I am sure that particularly in the early stages of his work in Vienna he will come to rely on our suggestions. We have consulted with him several times here in Washington and have talked quite directly on various problems, particularly the staffing of the Agency. I cannot say that he has accepted all — or even most — of our suggestions but he has certainly welcomed them and I am sure that they will have an influence on his thinking.

I was pleased to note your solicitude for the position of the smaller European countries who were not members of the Board of Governors. This attitude will not only pay dividends to the United States but will undoubtedly contribute to effective action on the part of future Boards, which I assume will include the smaller European countries more or less on a rotating basis.

2. The USSR. Your summary of the operations of the Soviet Delegation corresponds very much with the impression which I received from the reports of the Conference as it was progressing. We have thoroughly discussed with Bob McKinney probable Soviet intentions. Upon his return to Washington he wrote a letter to the Secretary, containing a summary of Soviet intentions and certain concrete recommendations for meeting the formidable Soviet competition for leadership in the Agency's affairs. In case you have not been furnished with a copy of Bob's letter to the Secretary and the Secretary's reply, I am enclosing copies herewith. We are particularly aware of the Soviet offer of fellowships, and are working here to develop a program which should be just as attractive as the Soviet proposition. Of this you will hear more in due course.

3. Other Members of the Big Five. We are worried about the attitudes of the British and French delegations at the Conference and are taking certain steps which we hope will improve the situation. One of these steps is to recommend that in appropriate bilateral discussions during the course of the December 16-18 NATO meeting the United States representative would point out the importance of appointing qualified high-level representatives on the Delegations at the IACA in order to demonstrate that the West continues to feel that the Agency is important and worthy of active support. We are also contemplating that after agreement has been reached as to the size and composition of our Mission to the Agency, consultations might be held with the British and French Embassies here to inform them of our plans and urge them to recommend strengthening their respective missions in Vienna.

CONFIDENTIAL

We

CONFIDENTIAL

- 3 -

We were pleased to have your acknowledgement of Canadian assistance during the Conference. I will take the next opportunity of expressing our appreciation to the Canadian Embassy here.

4. Underdeveloped Countries. I was most interested in your comments on the Indian participation in the Conference. We feel very definitely that through their serious interest in the Agency, the Indians should be considered for one of the second-level staff positions in the Agency. This matter was discussed with Mr. Cole on November 26 (I believe you already have a copy of the memorandum of this conversation). Mr. Cole's present ideas do not include a second-level place for India but run more in the direction of two third level positions. We stressed with Mr. Cole our feeling that some Asian -- and particularly Indian -- representation at the second-level was likely to be most important to the successful functioning of the Agency and I hope that he will come to agree with us on this matter. I would suggest that you take any opportunity which offers itself to press the subject with him.

5. Small European Countries. I would hope that the sensitivity of these countries toward their participation in the work of the Board of Governors may be largely overcome in time, as consultative procedures improve. I thoroughly agree with you that we must continue to be attentive to the aspirations of these states and I know that you and Bob McKinney, as well as the other members of the Mission, will make every effort to see that they are not forgotten. This kind of effort will, I am sure, repay us handsomely.

6. Your Conclusions and Recommendations.

(1) I certainly agree that it is essential that we show continuing manifestations of unreserved support of the Agency as a key United States policy. Apart from the contributions which the United States has already pledged, we hope that within the coming months we can come up with some concrete suggestions for the Agency's program that will very clearly prove our interest in its work.

(2) My view as to the necessity for sympathetic cultivation of the good-will and responsiveness toward the United States by other members of the Agency should already be apparent from the remarks I have made above.

(3) Also, as indicated above, I thoroughly appreciate your concern about the interests of the small European countries not members of the Board.

(4) We are giving much thought in the Department and the AEC to the development of technical projects, now that the

CONFIDENTIAL

- 4 -

initial work of organizing the Agency is well along. We expect that most of the technical work, both on the development of United States projects and the review of other members' proposals, will take place in Washington. We do have in mind, however, that it will undoubtedly be worthwhile to have a strong technical representation in the Mission in Vienna. For the time being this need can probably be supplied by the presence when needed of special technical consultants. Eventually, of course, we may want to have additional technical officers assigned to the Mission on a permanent basis. I understand that the AEC would oppose assigning any more than the contemplated two technical officers for the moment, out of fear that until the Agency program is well under way, they might have too little to do and thus become dissatisfied. As regards the possible Soviet competition, my feeling is that we will have no trouble in securing the persons and the means for meeting it effectively.

(5) We have considered your recommendations regarding the Mission staff and have reached agreement between S/AE, IO and the AEC that for the immediate future there might be a staff of four officers in addition to you and Bob McKinney. This would consist of one senior and one assistant technical adviser (Clyde McClelland), a legal adviser, and an assistant political adviser who could carry out the functions of an executive officer. Your nomination of Algie Wells for the Legal Adviser position is appreciated and I believe will be readily concurred in by all concerned.

May I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the very fine job you have been doing over there. The word that has come to me from people who have recently returned from Vienna has been most favorable indeed, and certainly entitles you to great credit.

Sincerely yours,

S/S-CR
ZK read signed
DFC 9 1957 P.M.

Francis C. Wilcox
Assistant Secretary

Enclosures: (2)

- ✓ 1. Copy of letter from Robert McKinney to the Secretary dated 11/11/57
- ✓ 2. Copy of Secretary's reply dated 11/21/57

WR
IO:UNP:*CH*owsley:sh 12/6/57



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