

December 16, 1951

VKP(b) CC Politburo to Vyshinsky

Citation:

"VKP(b) CC Politburo to Vyshinsky", December 16, 1951, Wilson Center Digital Archive, RGASPI, f. 558, op. 11, d. 762, pp. 0052-0054. Contributed by Sergey Radchenko and translated by Gary Goldberg. <https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/209775>

Summary:

A directive from the Politburo, instructing Vyshinsky on voting strategies for a UN draft resolution regarding nuclear armaments control. Vyshinsky is to vote against the draft of the three powers unless India proposes transferring the draft to the Commission; he is also to vote against all points of the draft except the individual secondary provisions.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY)

Original Language:

Russian

Contents:

Translation - English

PRECEDENCE

PARIS - to VYSHINSKY

[Ref] Your N° 650

1. We agree with you that in the event the Indian delegation proposes transferring both the draft of the resolution of the three powers as well as our amendments to the Commission of 12 (on atomic energy and conventional armaments) [you] ought to vote for this proposal.

2. If this proposal of India is not adopted and the matter reaches a vote on the draft of the three [powers] and our amendments to it, then you should vote against the draft of the three as a whole.

As the reason you need to state that the Soviet delegation is voting against the draft of the three because this draft, although individual secondary amendments were made to it, is basically no different than the previous draft and is an attempt to replace the question of reducing armaments and prohibiting atomic weapons with a proposal about collecting information about armaments and is, as before, directed at frustrating a reduction of armaments and the prohibition of atomic weapons. In addition, point out that the Soviet delegation also cannot vote for this draft because all the proposals of the Soviet delegation directed at ensuring the adoption of decisions to prohibit atomic weapons and reduce armaments were rejected.

3. When voting for the draft of the three by points you ought to vote against all the points of this draft except the individual secondary provisions which in and of themselves do not contain anything unacceptable to us and on which you ought to abstain, namely:

concerning the paragraphs of the preamble: the first (about the appeal to remove the burden of weapons from the people and rescue them from the fear of war); the second (about the creation of an effective system of collective security; regarding point 3e (concerning the procedure for ratification of possible treaties about reducing armaments and international control of atomic energy).

We do not consider it advisable to vote in favor of the above points, as you suggest, but we think it necessary when voting to abstain and explain this by the declarative sentences contained in these points differ from the substance of the proposals of the three and are only a cover for their reluctance to prohibit atomic weapons and reduce armaments. By the fact that our delegation will not vote for these points we will stress our negative attitude toward the draft of the three on the whole.

As an exception you ought to vote in favor, as you also suggest, on the question of forming a commission of 12 created instead of the two commissions which exist now, on atomic energy and on conventional weapons.

4. If the draft of the three is voted on, then we cannot agree with you that our amendments are not put to a vote. In this event you should insist on a vote on our amendments and defend them. Our refusal to demand our amendments be put to a vote would be interpreted as our removing these amendments.

5. We also agree with you that in the event Pakistan, Syria, and Iraq introduce a proposal regarding an extension of the work of the Subcommittee of the five you ought not object to this proposal.

Confirm receipt.