



International Atomic Energy Agency

General Conference

Distr.
GENERAL
GC(IV)/INF/29
22 August 1960
Original: ENGLISH

Fourth regular session

THE APPLICATION OF THE WORLD FEDERATION OF TRADE UNIONS FOR CONSULTATIVE STATUS WITH THE AGENCY

Report by the Board of Governors

1. The General Conference will recall that on 2 October 1959 it adopted a resolution recommending the Board of Governors to reconsider the question of granting consultative status with the Agency to the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU). [1]
2. The Board accordingly reconsidered the question and on 22 June 1960 concluded that there was no reason to alter its decision of 1 July 1959 not to grant consultative status to the World Federation of Trade Unions. In addition the Board agreed to submit to the General Conference for its information a summary of the views expressed in the discussions which led up to this decision and arose from it.
3. Those who expressed views on the substance of the matter were the Governors from Australia, Bulgaria, Canada, Ceylon, Czechoslovakia, India, Indonesia, Spain, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Arab Republic, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. A summary of these views in the order in which they were put before the Board is attached as an Annex.

[1] GC(III)/RES/47.

A N N E X

RECONSIDERATION OF THE APPLICATION OF THE WORLD FEDERATION
OF TRADE UNIONS FOR CONSULTATIVE STATUS WITH THE AGENCY

Summary of the views expressed at a meeting of the
Board of Governors on 22 June 1960

1. The Governor from the United States of America said that in May 1959 the Board's Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations had considered the application of the World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU) for admission to consultative status with the Agency and had concluded that that organization did not qualify for admission under the Rules on the Consultative Status of Non-Governmental Organizations with the Agency. [1] On the Committee's recommendation, the Board on 1 July 1959 had rejected by 13 votes to 3, with 3 abstentions, the application of WFTU for consultative status. His delegation was among those which had voted against granting consultative status to that organization. In the view of the United States Government, the reasons for the Board's previous decision remained compelling and valid. No development had occurred which warranted a change in that decision and the United States delegation would vote to reaffirm it.
2. Whatever WFTU professed, the United States Government remained convinced that, by its deeds over the past twelve years, that organization had clearly demonstrated that its aims and purposes did not conform with the spirit, purposes and principles of the Agency, that it would not make a constructive contribution to the Agency's work, and that it was not, in fact, able to represent the interests of workers or to state an independent, as distinct from a governmental, point of view. In other words, WFTU did not qualify under Rule 2, and was therefore ineligible for consultative status.
3. It had been pointed out from time to time that WFTU had consultative status with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and with three specialized agencies. The truth was that WFTU had been granted such status in all of those organizations at a time when it had been constituted on an entirely different basis. The fact that it had once received consultative status could not therefore, in the view of the United States Government, serve as a precedent for new requests for consultative status.
4. He formally proposed that the Board should conclude there was no reason to alter its decision of 1 July 1959 not to grant consultative status to the World Federation of Trade Unions.
5. The Governor from the Union of South Africa said the Board had deferred consideration in January 1960 in the hope that it might prove possible by informal consultation to find a solution acceptable to the parties mainly concerned. [2] His delegation had been represented in those consultations, but they had been unavailing. In the circumstances and in line with the attitude which the South African delegation had adopted in the issue since it had first been raised in the Board he would participate neither in the debate nor in the voting.
6. The Governor from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said that under its Statute the Agency was called upon to enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world and was required to conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations to promote peace and international

[1] INFCIRC/14.

[2] The Governor was here referring to the fact that reconsideration of WFTU's application was on the agenda for a meeting which the Board held on 22 January 1960. On that occasion, however, the Board decided to defer consideration of the question until June.

co-operation. It was therefore clear that the Agency was a universal organization whose activities should be open to participation by its Member States, the specialized agencies and such non-governmental organizations as had aims consistent with those of the Agency. Those were the criteria which the Board must follow when deciding on any application for consultative status. In addition, the Board had approved Rules on the Consultative Status of Non-Governmental Organizations, but they made no mention of the principle the Governor from the United States apparently relied on, i. e. that the grant of consultative status should be governed by ideological considerations.

7. It was indisputable that WFTU fully satisfied the Rules which stated that the applicant must be an international non-governmental organization of world-wide or regional scope (Rule 2(e)). There could be no doubt that WFTU was a world-wide organization: it grouped the trade union organization of 70 countries, with a total membership of 95 million trade unionists. It was gigantic in comparison with the two other trade union organizations - the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the International Federation of Christian Trade Unions (IFCTU) - to which the Board had already granted consultative status.

8. Rule 2(d) stipulated that the organization should have an executive officer, and should have authority to speak for its members through its authorized representatives. The documents previously circulated in connection with the request described in detail the structure and organization of WFTU. It had an established headquarters, together with branches throughout the world; if any Governor had doubts about its organizational structure, the Secretary-General could be invited to attend a Board meeting for the purpose of making a personal request for the grant of consultative status.

9. Rule 2(c) required that the organization should undertake to support the work of the Agency and promote a knowledge of its principles and activities. WFTU supported the aims and activities of the Agency in word and deed; in fact, even before the Agency came into existence, it had supported the principle of the peaceful application of atomic energy. For instance, in 1949, long before the Agency's establishment, the WFTU programme had called for the international control of atomic energy and its scientific development for exclusively peaceful purposes.

10. Furthermore, at its Fourth Congress in 1956, WFTU had set up a committee consisting of experts and trade union workers with special experience in the protection of workers against the effects of atomic radiation. Since the establishment of the Agency WFTU had on various occasions publicly stated its support for the Agency's aims and objectives. In its official communications to the Director General and the Board, it had on several occasions expressed a wish to co-operate with the Agency, in keeping with its belief that everything possible should be done to improve the living and working conditions of workers through the peaceful utilization of atomic energy. It had also specifically stated that it wished to be consulted by the Agency on all atomic matters affecting the working masses and that it would co-operate fully in activities concerning radiation protection, health and safety measures, and so on.

11. Rule 2(d) laid down a further principle: to be eligible, an organization must be of recognized standing. Recognized standing did not have to be confirmed by the grant of consultative status with the Agency. WFTU was universally recognized and, as already stated, was world-wide in scope. It already had consultative status with the United Nations. The Governor from the United States had said that that status had been granted by the United Nations and the specialized agencies at a time when WFTU had conducted its affairs quite differently - a statement that was startling in its cynicism. WFTU had its own programme and statute which had been adopted by a majority, and no delegation could dictate to it or force it to change them. They could certainly be changed, but only by a general congress, representing the workers of the entire world. That was how a normal democratic organization functioned. Nor could one truthfully maintain that WFTU had changed its programme or statute since the granting of consultative status with the United Nations; hence the argument advanced by the Governor from the United States was pointless. Its aim remained unchanged: the defence of the interests of the working masses.

12. It was inadmissible that any Governor should advocate discrimination against the largest trade union organization in the world - an organization which also included the trade unions of the Soviet Union. The Governor from the United States had spoken first in the debate, and had clearly intended to influence the discussion from the start by stating, for example, that no new facts had come to light, and that the Board's previous decision should be reaffirmed, notwithstanding anything that had occurred meanwhile. He was, however, overlooking resolution GC(III)/RES/47, adopted by a majority of delegates to the General Conference, which demonstrated the disagreement of most Member States with the Board's negative decision. Moreover, the General Conference had also noted that WFTU had consultative status with the United Nations and a number of the specialized agencies, and had recognized the fact that its activities were compatible with the objectives and functions of the Agency. That surely constituted an important and undeniable fact.

13. The point at issue was not whether WFTU satisfied the conditions laid down in the Rules. The point at issue was that for ideological and political reasons the United States had adopted a discriminatory policy in relation to WFTU. The reasons for that policy had been revealed by the Governor from the United States in his impromptu statement at the Board's meeting on 1 July 1959, when he had said that it would be inappropriate to grant consultative status to WFTU because it fought for the reduction of armaments, the banning of nuclear weapons and so forth.

14. Neither in the Agency nor in other international organizations had the Soviet Union ever adopted a discriminatory policy of that kind. It had frequently voted for the granting of consultative status to organizations which were ideologically closer to the United States, including a number of trade union organizations. If the United States really believed that practical and useful co-operation was not possible with people who did not share its ideology it would be logical for it to propose the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the Agency. But whether the United States liked it or not, there were communists in the world and the World Federation of Trade Unions existed. It did not exist by permission of the United States, and it was not likely that an organization which represented the interests of 95 million workers throughout the world would alter its statutes merely because in the Board of Governors of the International Atomic Energy Agency a handful of votes was cast against admitting it to consultative status.

15. The World Federation of Trade Unions already enjoyed consultative status with the United Nations and a number of specialized agencies. It was significant, but hardly logical, that those who argued in favour of granting the Chiang-Kai-Shek administration full rights in the Agency because they enjoyed full rights in the United Nations would not recognize the precedent created by the United Nations in granting consultative status to WFTU. That was an example of American "logic".

16. If the Governor from the United States was not convinced by the facts adduced to show that the aims and purposes of WFTU were in complete accordance with those of the Agency, perhaps he would pay more heed to the voice of the General Conference, which had clearly stated in paragraph (b) of the preamble to its resolution GC(III)/RES/47 that "the World Federation of Trade Unions recognizes the objectives and functions of the International Atomic Energy Agency". If the assertion by the Governor from the United States that WFTU did not represent an independent point of view, but expressed its views under the influence of a particular Government, was based on information supplied by Mr. Meany, the leader of the reactionary trade unions in his country, he should bear in mind that the majority of the United States trade unionists did not share Mr. Meany's views and regarded him as a traitor to the working class.

17. There were in fact two reasons why the United States delegation was now opposing the grant of consultative status to WFTU. The first was that the United States Government was mindful of the votes which trade union leaders such as Meany would control during the forthcoming election campaign. The second was that WFTU had once made a complaint against the United States for introducing bacteriological warfare in Korea. Such were the real reasons why the United States was seeking to impose a discriminatory political decision on the Board, rather than allowing it to judge on its merits the request of WFTU to co-operate with the Agency. He urged Governors not to let themselves be swayed by political

considerations of the kind which the United States delegation was seeking to impose on them, but to regard the request in the light of the rules which they themselves had approved. If the Board rejected the request, the Soviet delegation would raise the matter again in the General Conference which would, he felt confident, act more consequentially and boldly than the Board.

18. The Governor from Bulgaria said that the only appropriate response to the General Conference resolution was to grant consultative status to WFTU, whose aims corresponded to those of the Agency. The Board had granted consultative status to a whole series of non-governmental organizations, including ICFTU and IFCTU. WFTU was the most representative and most powerful of the trade union organizations and as such was entitled to be treated in the same way.

19. Apart from the fact that it had had consultative status with the United Nations, the International Labour Organisation and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for more than ten years, some of its activities directly concerned the peaceful uses of atomic energy. At the twentieth session of its Executive Committee, WFTU had set up a Trade Union Committee composed of experts on the peaceful uses of atomic energy and of active trade unionists who were experienced in the protection of workers against radiation; that had been done to encourage the promotion of health and safety measures for the protection of those working in atomic energy. The Board would be guilty of discrimination if it did not grant consultative status to WFTU.

20. The Governor from India said that the political affiliations of WFTU were not relevant to the issue in question. The United Nations, the specialized agencies and the Agency had been established on the basis of co-operation between countries of different ideologies, and if its political affiliations had not disqualified WFTU from consultative status with the United Nations and the specialized agencies, there was even less reason why they should do so in the case of the Agency, a purely scientific organization. He believed that the Agency and WFTU both stood to gain from co-operation, and would, therefore, vote in favour of granting the application.

21. The Governor from Czechoslovakia associated himself completely with the statement by the Governor from the Soviet Union.

22. The General Conference was the Agency's sovereign body and, in asking the Board to reconsider its decision of 1 July 1959, it had already expressed its views on the substance of the matter; the Board would be in an absurd position if the General Conference once again referred the matter back to it for consideration. There were two very cogent reasons for the General Conference resolution: WFTU already had consultative status with the United Nations and certain specialized agencies, and it satisfied the conditions laid down for the granting of such status with the Agency. Consequently, there was no comprehensible reason for refusing to grant the application.

23. His Government could not endorse a policy of discrimination, and would associate itself with the appeal made by the Governor from the Soviet Union to vote in favour of granting consultative status to WFTU.

24. The Governor from Canada said he understood that, at the third regular session of the General Conference, when the General Committee had discussed the question of granting consultative status to WFTU, it had decided to submit a draft of resolution GC(III)/RES/47 to the General Conference to be voted on without discussion, on the clear understanding that the decision of the General Conference would merely constitute a reaffirmation of the Board's right to reconsider a proposal after a lapse of four months. [3] The motion had therefore been a procedural one and could not be construed as carrying any implication as to the substance of the matter.

[3] GC(III)/GEN/OR.7, paragraphs 19 - 23.

25. The Governor from Australia said that over the past year the Australian Government had been pleased to note the Agency's increasing activity in its proper sphere. He therefore regretted that the Board was once again involved in debating an application from a body which, in his view, could not advance the Agency's work; a debate, moreover, that could only exacerbate differences unrelated to that work.
26. His delegation's view was that WFTU did not qualify for consultative status. Its application showed that its interest in atomic energy related more to military than to peaceful uses, and in consequence it was influenced primarily by political considerations. That had been the Australian view when the question had first been raised in the Board and later at the General Conference. Since then the Australian delegation had been given no reason to change its opinion and therefore opposed the application.
27. The Governor from Ceylon thought that as WFTU satisfied the requisite conditions its application for consultative status should be granted.
28. The Governor from Indonesia said his Government had always supported the application of non-governmental organizations for consultative status with the Agency and saw no reason for doing otherwise now. He would vote in favour of granting the application.
29. The Governor from the United Kingdom said he was sure that all Governors deeply regretted the differences of opinion which divided the Board. Those differences had their roots elsewhere, however, and the Board was powerless to resolve them. He realized that the Governor from the Soviet Union and those who supported him had honestly held convictions, and hoped they would recognize in turn the sincerity of those who expressed opposite views. His delegation did not oppose the application for ideological reasons, but because of WFTU's activities. He would not reply in detail to the many points raised by the Governor from the Soviet Union, but his silence should not be interpreted as tacit agreement.
30. The way in which the Governor from Canada had interpreted General Conference resolution GC(III)/RES/47 was entirely correct. His delegation believed no new factor had arisen meanwhile and he would, therefore, vote against the application.
31. The Governor from the United Arab Republic recalled that it was he who had proposed that consideration be deferred to the present meetings in the hope that an amicable and realistic solution might be reached. [2] He still supported the application, for the same reasons as those given by the Governors from Ceylon and Indonesia.
32. The Governor from the United States of America said he would not take up the Board's time by replying point by point to the Governor from the Soviet Union, restricting himself to only two matters. First, he wished to remind the Board of the grossly scandalous charges of use of bacteriological warfare made by WFTU against the United Nations forces in Korea. That was how WFTU had lived up to its obligations, undertaken at the time of its admission to consultative status with the United Nations, to support and promote the work of the United Nations; that was the kind of support the Agency could expect from WFTU.
33. Furthermore, the Governor from the Soviet Union had attacked Mr. Meany, the internationally known and respected Secretary of the American Federation of Labor. Those attacks were devoid of any foundation; Mr. Meany was a man of integrity and deep convictions, and was as entitled to his opinions as were leaders in the Soviet Union.
34. The Governor from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said he did not deny that leaders were entitled to their opinions; it was the Governor from the United States who was attempting to deny that right to WFTU. He had stated that if WFTU changed, he would be prepared to vote in favour of granting consultative status to it. It was true that Mr. Meany's reputation was well known in the United States and in the Soviet Union.
35. After a vote had been taken further statements were made, a summary of which follows.
36. The Governor from Spain observed that several Governors had stressed the fact that nothing new had arisen in the present case to warrant any change of attitude. The item therefore had to be removed from the agenda, and the only way of doing so had been to reaffirm the Board's previous decision.

37. The argument that the Agency should consult the workers in coming to decisions involving the peaceful uses of atomic energy was a weighty one; his own country was constantly concerned with that aspect of problems. However, the technical and professional nature of any applicant for consultative status with the Agency had to be taken into account. When WFTU ceased its militantly political activities, his Government would be prepared to reconsider the application. Meanwhile, it would continue to support the view put forward by the Governor from the United States.

38. The Governor from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics said it might be possible to remove an item from the agenda, but it was not possible to dispose of an organization representing 95 million workers. WFTU was entitled to re-submit its request, and the Board would have to consider it. It was a matter of conscience how each Governor voted.

39. The remarks made by the Governor from Spain were what one might have expected, seeing that his Government had fought on the side of Fascist Germany against the workers.

40. The Governor from Bulgaria expressed his surprise at the discriminatory attitude of the majority of the Board in electing not to change its decision. That attitude was particularly strange in view of the fact that the trade unions of the socialist countries participating in the Board and the General Conference were affiliated to WFTU. He reserved the right to raise the matter in the General Conference.

41. The Governor from Czechoslovakia said that it was clear from the vote that the majority of Governors were inspired by obsolete political arguments and, as a result, were working against the Agency's interests. There was a serious danger the General Conference might come to the conclusion that the Board was hindering the Agency's work.