

3. *Countries to do the approaching.*

The United States considered asking all the principal suppliers' group, but decided that Australia, Belgium, France and South Africa, though they might support safeguards at the Conference, were probably not prepared to campaign actively in advance. This assessment is probably sound, but we might offer to approach the Australians ourselves to see whether we could build up some enthusiasm. We might also offer to participate in a joint approach to the South Africans.

4. *Method and substance of the approach.*

The United States is preparing a "layman's version" of the safeguards paper and plans to have experts brief their missions so that the latter may approach the governments to which they are accredited. We have suggested that it would seem optimistic to expect that the technical complexities of this difficult subject could be adequately conveyed in the circumstances of a conventional diplomatic demarche and have proposed that technical briefings might be carried out for the interested delegations in Vienna, prior to the opening of the Conference, in order to explain why we consider that the safeguards paper as it stands, without amendment, should be adopted. The approaches in capitals might concentrate on rallying support for the general principle of safeguards and emphasizing the great desirability of reaching a decision this year.

5. *Other details.*

The following further points might be discussed:

(a) *Presidency of the General Conference.*

It is again being suggested that a useful and fairly harmless concession to the Soviet bloc would be to name an East European as president of the General Conference. Last year the United States delayed a decision on this question and then bull-dozed a Japanese into offering himself as a candidate. In view of the post-summit political climate, there does not seem to be much chance that the United States would support an East European candidate this year, though the eminent Soviet scientist Emelyanov might be an excellent one. We could, however, take this opportunity to urge the United States the need for taking an early decision on this question and try to find out what their position is likely to be.

(b) *Membership of the Board of Governors.*

Thirteen members of the Board of Governors will be designated under Article VI of the Statute. Ten more will be elected by the General Conference in the fall. It is not expected that there will be any change in the five "most advanced" members (Canada, United Kingdom, United States, France and USSR). The second five, which are designated as being regionally the most advanced, are at present Brazil, South Africa, India, Australia and Japan. The Argentine may try again this year to wrest the Latin American designation from Brazil. We understand that the United States is trying to dissuade Argentina — probably by suggesting that it should stand for one of the two "floating seats" up for election at the General Conference. There is some possibility that the U.A.R. may make a bid for the Middle East and African seat now held by South Africa. The U.A.R. has no claim to be the regionally most advanced country and we have assured South Africa of our support. The method of designation adopted since 1958 at Indian insistence blurs the distinction between "most advanced" and "regionally most advanced." Our representative has been instructed to make the usual statement for the record, pointing out that this method is contrary to the plain terms of the Statute, and it might be worth while to mention the matter at this meeting.

(c) *Bilateral Agreements.*

It is possible that the United States officials may raise the question of bilateral agreements referred to in the attached Washington telegram Number 1351 of May 24.† They themselves are re-examining the early bilaterals which now come up for renewal with a view to