Bearing in mind the highly contentious nature of the item, Mr. Edmonds added that the United Kingdom authorities are of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served and no real progress made if the matter were to be raised at Buenos Aires. Discussion might in fact unnecessarily arouse the latent suspicions of the more volatile representatives, particularly the Latin Americans, and could easily stir up and bring to the boil fresh dissension and discord. Mr. Edmonds further pointed out that by the time the Second Consultative Meeting gets round to discussing "Other Matters" representatives will be champing at the bit to finish the proceedings and to get home, particularly after weathering the storms which are likely to arise when the United Kingdom, in response to the proposed New Zealand action under the item "Other Matters" (vide my minute of the 25th June), raises the almost equally controversial and vexing question of Administrative Arrangements. In the view of the United Kingdom authorities it would therefore be better to wait until the Third Consultative Meeting before raising the matter of relations with SCAR.

Mr. Edmonds tempered his remarks by pointing out that the South African representatives can of course easily sound out members of other delegations for their views on relations with SCAR outside the conference rooms at Buenos Aires. The rôle of SCAR will furthermore, he added, also no doubt be indirectly raised under the various agenda items relating to logistic activities, radio communications and exchanges of scientific information, data and results.

The United Kingdom's views on the question of Administrative Arrangements were conveyed to the Department in my minute of the 25th June and no further information on this point was gathered at the Foreign Office interview on the 2nd July.

In conclusion we would mention that it has also now been learnt that the United Kingdom's delegation to the Second Consultative Meeting will consist of the same persons who attended the Canberra meeting last year with the exception of the British Ambassador in Buenos Aires who will replace their High Commissioner in Canberra as titular head of the delegation.

Copies to Washington, Canberra and Buenos Aires.

A. J. OXLEY

Minister.

The Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary
of the Republic of South Africa,
WASHINGTON
CANBERRA
BUENOS AIRES

Copy for your information please.

A. J. OXLEY
Minister.

AIRMAIL

CONFIDENTIAL

5th July, 1962.

THE SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Second Consultative Meeting of Antarctic Treaty Powers : Relations with SCAR and Administrative Arrangements

With further reference to your minute 102/2/7/3 of the 11th June, 1962, and in amplification of my evenly numbered minute of the 25th June, 1962, I have to inform you that the Foreign Office's reaction to our aide memoire on the abovementioned subject was conveyed during the course of an informal interview granted to two members of the Embassy by Messrs. Edmonds and Parsons on the 2nd July.

The former, who was Deputy Leader of the United Kingdom delegation to the First Consultative Meeting in Canberra last year and will again act in this capacity during the forthcoming Second Consultative Meeting in Buenos Aires, acted as spokesman and strongly emphasised that the United Kingdom does not favour the discussion of relations with SCAR under the agenda item "Other Matters" at Buenos Aires. He explained that as far as the implementation of the scientific objectives of the Antarctic Treaty is concerned the United Kingdom attaches very great value to SCAR both for its past achievements and its future potential. This view is not, however, shared by all the other Treaty powers, he added, some of whom are anxious to avoid too firm a commitment towards SCAR and it will be recalled that it was only after considerable effort and compromise that the recommendation regarding relations with SCAR was adopted at Canberra last year. This recommendation was moreover accepted only after a reservation had been embodied in its preamble to the effect that the agreement of representatives to the stated rôle of SCAR is without prejudice to the rights of Governments to make such other arrangements as they may deem necessary to further the Treaty's objectives of scientific co-operation. Indeed the question of relations between SCAR and the Treaty powers has proved to be probably the most controversial matter raised both at the Interim Group meetings in Washington during 1960/61 and subsequently at the First Consultative Meeting.

/Bearing ....

A. FORLEY

ПАМЯТНАЯ ЗАПИСКА

В связи с Памятной запиской Посольства Южно-Африканской Республики от 22 июня 1962 года советские компетентные организации выражают готовность обсудить, исходя из рекомендации I-IY первого консультативного совещания по Антарктике, предусматривающей поощрение деятельности СКАР, возможные предложения и рекомендации, направленные на дальнейшее развитие и укрепление отношений с этим комитетом.

Что касается проблем, связанных с предложением о создании секретариата, то, по мнению советских компетентных организаций, процедура, предусмотренная рекомендацией I-XIY первого консультативного совещания, как показывает практика, обеспечивает выполнение необходимых мер, связанных с консультативными совещаниями по Антарктике.

6 июля 1962 года

Washington during 1960/61 and subsequently at the First Consultative Meeting.

/Bearing ....

AIDE MEMOIRE

In connection with the Aide Memoire of the Embassy of the Republic of South Africa of 22nd June, 1962 the Soviet competent authorities, proceeding from recommendation I-IY of the First Consultative Meeting on the Antarctic which envisages the encouragement of activities of the S.C.A.R., express their readiness to discuss any feasible proposals and recommendations aimed at further development and strengthening of relations with this Committee.

As to the problems connected with the proposal to set up the Secretariat the opinion of the Soviet competent authorities is that the procedure envisaged by recommendation I-XIY of the First Consultative Meeting, as practice testifies, ensures the carrying out of the necessary measures connected with Consultative Meetings on the Antarctic.

6th July, 1962

matter raised both at the Interim Group meetings in Washington during 1960/61 and subsequently at the First Consultative Meeting.

/Bearing ....

P.S.16/2

South African Embassy,
//////////////////////

AIRMAIL

10th July, 1962.

THE SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Second Consultative Meeting of Antarctic Treaty Powers : Relations with SCAR and Administrative Arrangements

With further reference to your minute 102/2/7/3 of the 11th June, 1962, I enclose copies of a self-explanatory aide-memoire dated the 6th July, 1962, which has been received from the Soviet Embassy in regard to our proposal concerning the discussion of the abovementioned matters at the Second Consultative Meeting of the Antarctic Treaty Powers.

You will note that the Soviet authorities would welcome a discussion on relations with SCAR but while stating their views on secretarial arrangements have not indicated whether they would wish to have such arrangements discussed at Buenos Aires. The Soviet Embassy spokesman was questioned on this point and he expressed the view that in the absence of anything to the contrary in the despatch received from Moscow, he and his Ambassador assume that the Soviet Union would not have any objection to a discussion of the matter.

(sgd.) W. Mala

Minister.

WM/AG

matter raised both at the Interim Group meetings in Washington during 1960/61 and subsequently at the First Consultative Meeting.

/Bearing ....

When handing over the aide-memoire, we stressed the non-committal and exploratory character of the discussions you have in mind. The officials commented that Australian delegates would prefer to exchange views on these two issues informally with other delegates in the lobbies rather than have a formal exchange of views. They apparently fear that a formal exchange of views may revive all the arguments of the Canberra meeting.

We were invited to have another talk on receipt of the Australian delegate's report on the Buenos Aires meeting of 18th June when developments on the issue of secretarial requirements might be clearer.

Copies to Buenos Aires (Direct) airmail, and Brussels, Paris, London and Washington.

M. SNYMAN

AMBASSADOR

EMBASSY OF SOUTH AFRICA
CANBERRA

REF: 30/18

19th June, 1962

CONFIDENTIAL

The Secretary for Foreign Affairs,
PRETORIA

SECOND CONSULTATIVE MEETING OF ANTARCTIC TREATY POWERS - BUENOS AIRES 18th July, 1962

Your minute 102/2/7/3 of 11th June, refers. The initial reactions of the Australian authorities to the suggestion that an exchange of views should take place under the agenda item "Other matters", on the issues dealt with in Recommendations I - IV and I - XIV of the First Consultative Meeting, are as follows:-

(a) In respect of Recommendation I - IV

The Australians are satisfied, at least for the present, to leave relations with S.C.A.R. as they are and would not like to see a closer definition of the relationship between the signatories of the Treaty and S.C.A.R. According to the Australians, S.C.A.R. was also happy with the present relationship. Australian officials mentioned in passing that S.C.A.R. could perhaps admit scientists from Eastern Germany and Communist China which could complicate matters if the relationship became too close and in a closer relationship S.C.A.R. could perhaps make requests for substantial financial aid. These were some of the considerations why they would prefer to leave the matter as it stands.

(b) In respect of I - XIV

Australia is willing to provide the secretarial or "post office" requirements connected with the implementation of the Treaty between consultative meetings. The Australians have sounded out various treaty members, such as France, the United States and others, who have had misgivings last year about a small secretariat in Canberra and they feel there may be more unanimity this year. They will, however, not renew their offer of last year if there is to be any argument about it. At yesterday's meeting in Buenos Aires, if beforehand there seemed to be general agreement about a small secretariat in Canberra, the British delegate was to take the iniative in placing an item on the Agenda embodying such a proposal. Officials commented that if there was not general agreement on this point, they felt that the time was not yet ripe for the matter to be raised now. They added that if New Zealand had raised the question of interim consultations, as they apparently had in mind to do, the British delegate's intention was to point out that this would upset the package deal reached at Canberra and rather than discuss this aspect, it would be better to discuss administrative arrangements generally instead of just the Secretariat.

/2.....

SUID-AFRIKAANSE AMBASSADE
LONDEN
13 JUL 1962
LONDON
SOUTH AFRICAN EMBASSY

With the Compliments of the
South African Embassy

Canberra

Mr Malan

19th ~~22nd~~ June, 1962

...ide-memoire, we stressed the ...racter of the discussions you ...ated that Australian delegates ... these two issues informally ...s rather than have a formal ...ly fear that a formal exchange ...ts of the Canberra meeting.

...another talk on receipt of the ...

...STING OF ANTARCTIC TREATY
...AIRES 18th July, 1962

... 11th June, refers. The ...n authorities to the ...ws should take place under ...n the issues dealt with in ... of the First Consultative

...I - IV

...sfied, at least for the ...C.A.R. as they are and ...nition of the relationship ...ty and S.C.A.R. According ...so happy with the present ...s mentioned in passing that ...ists from Eastern Germany ... could complicate matters if the relationship became too close and in a closer relationship S.C.A.R. could perhaps make requests for substantial financial aid. These were some of the considerations why they would prefer to leave the matter as it stands.

(b) In respect of I - XIV

Australia is willing to provide the secretarial or "post office" requirements connected with the implementation of the Treaty between consultative meetings. The Australians have sounded out various treaty members, such as France, the United States and others, who have had misgivings last year about a small secretariat in Canberra and they feel there may be more unanimity this year. They will, however, not renew their offer of last year if there is to be any argument about it. At yesterday's meeting in Buenos Aires, if beforehand there seemed to be general agreement about a small secretariat in Canberra, the British delegate was to take the iniative in placing an item on the Agenda embodying such a proposal. Officials commented that if there was not general agreement on this point, they felt that the time was not yet ripe for the matter to be raised now. They added that if New Zealand had raised the question of interim consultations, as they apparently had in mind to do, the British delegate's intention was to point out that this would upset the package deal reached at Canberra and rather than discuss this aspect, it would be better to discuss administrative arrangements generally instead of just the Secretariat.

/2.....

F

B.A. 22/7/1.

Guido 1530,

4th July, 1962.

SUID-AFRIKAANSE AMBASSADE
LONDEN
23 JUL 1962
LONDON
SOUTH AFRICAN EMBASSY

THE SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
PRETORIA.

FINAL DRAFT OF PROVISIONAL AGENDA FOR SECOND CONSULTATIVE MEETING OF ANTARCTIC TREATY POWERS.

The Argentine Ministry of Foreign Affairs has now supplied us with the final draft of the Provisional Agenda for the Second Consultative Meeting of the Antarctic Treaty Powers.

This final draft is the same as the Provisional Agenda which was sent to you in my minute B.A. 22/7/1 of the 15th June, 1962, except in respect of Item No. 15, which now reads as follows:

"Implementation of the Recommendations of the Consultative Meeting of Canberra".

It will be noted that the only difference is the addition of the words "of Canberra".

Copies to London, Washington and Canberra.

WM/AG

Jan Kleick

AMBASSADOR.

B.A. 22/7/1.

LONDON.

Con los saludos de la Embajada de la República de Sud Africa.

With the compliments of the Embassy of the Republic of South Africa.

Met die komplimente van die Ambassade van die Republiek van Suid-Afrika.

Buenos Aires.
4th July, 1962.

B.A. 22/7/1.

SUID-AFRIKAANSE AMBASSADE
LONDEN
23 JUL 1962
LONDON
SOUTH AFRICAN EMBASSY

, 1962.

GENDA FOR SECOND
RCTIC TREATY POWERS.

Foreign Affairs has now
he Provisional Agenda for
e Antarctic Treaty Powers.

ame as the Provisional Agenda
A. 22/7/1 of the 15th June,
5, which now reads as follows:

commendations of the Consul-

only difference is the addi-

Copies to London, Washington and Canberra.

Jan Klerck

AMBASSADOR.

Mr Malan

F

/2.....

P.S.16/2

South African Embassy,
//////////////////////

AIRMAIL

26th July, 1962.

THE ACTING SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Antarctica

For background purposes and to enable the Embassy to keep abreast of developments in Antarctica it would be much appreciated if the Department could, if possible and at its convenience, forward copies of the directives prepared for the South African delegation to the Second Consultative Meeting of Antarctic Treaty Powers, Buenos Aires, July, 1962, and of the delegation's report on the meeting.

We would add in passing that no mention of the Buenos Aires meeting has as yet been found in the British newspapers available in the Embassy.

(sgd.) W. Mala

Ambassador.

WM/AG

Royal Norwegian Embassy

25, Belgrave Square
London, S.W.1

30th July, 1962

Dear Sir,

"With reference to your Aide Mémoire of 21st June and our recent telephone conversation I take the pleasure to inform you that the Norwegian authorities are not opposed to an exchange of views on the two questions raised in the Aide Mémoire.

The authorities are, on the other hand, not especially interested in discussing these questions on the Second Consultative Meeting in Buenos Aires: and take it for granted, as mentioned in the Aide Mémoire, that there will be no question about any binding decision or recommandation at the present time."

Yours faithfully,

Ivar Eriksen

(Ivar Eriksen)
Secretary

W. Malan, Esq.
Second Secretary
The Embassy of the Republic of South Africa
London, W.C.2

P.S.16/2

AIRMAIL

1st August, 1962.

THE ACTING SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Second Consultative Meeting of Antarctic Treaty Powers, Buenos Aires, July, 1962: Discussion of Relations with SCAR and Administrative Arrangements

With further reference to your minute 102/2/7/3 of the 11th June, 1962, I quote below for your information and for record purposes the text of a letter dated 30th July, 1962, received from the Norwegian Embassy in regard to the proposed discussion at Buenos Aires of the two abovementioned matters:

> "With reference to your Aide Memoire of 21st June and our recent telephone conversation I take the pleasure to inform you that the Norwegian authorities are not opposed to an exchange of views on the two questions raised in the Aide Memoire.
>
> The authorities are, on the other hand, not especially interested in discussing these questions on the Second Consultative Meeting in Buenos Aires: and take it for granted, as mentioned in the Aide Memoire, that there will be no question about any binding decision or recommendation at the present time."

The telephone conversation referred to in the letter from the Norwegian Embassy did not in any way amplify the information furnished in writing. All that was added was an apology for the fact that the Norwegian Government's views were being transmitted at such a late stage.

(sgd.) W. Malan

Ambassador.

WM/AG

The Soviet delegation saw no need for any change, and felt that Canberra Recommendation XIV - (3) had not yet been fully used. The remedy lay in the implementation of this recommendation.

The United Kingdom delegation expressed sympathy for the Norwegian and New Zealand problems in regard to administrative arrangements, but felt that it was a bit early to start undoing the work done at Canberra.

The Chilean, Argentine, French and Japanese delegations all thought that this complex problem needed more time for study.

The Australian delegation expressed itself as favourably disposed towards the South African idea as regards continuity and said that sooner or later some person will have to be made responsible for administrative arrangements. In the meantime the Treaty Powers would have to fall back on Recommendation XIV of the First Consultative Meeting.

The New Zealand delegation thereupon withdrew their recommendation, and the South African delegation took the opportunity of restating certain aspects of its viewpoint, especially the need for consideration of the personnel and other problems of the smaller countries.

The general impression left by the discussion is that the subject did not evoke the strong reaction which characterized its treatment at the First Consultative Meeting. Discussions took place in the most cordial atmosphere. It is anticipated that in due course there would be a larger measure of support for the South African point of view.

---000---

The South African delegation had previously circulated a paper as a basis of discussion which is quoted below:

"Having in mind the need of improved administrative arrangements to maintain efficient contact between the Antarctic Treaty Powers and other organisations and to assist them in carrying out their commitments under the Antarctic Treaty, the South African Delegation proposes the following as a basis of non-committal discussion preparatory to a more concrete arrangement to be decided upon at the next Consultative Meeting:

The formation of a working group consisting of the Diplomatic Missions accredited in the Capital of one of the Contracting Parties, preferably in the Southern Hemisphere, to deal with the business of the Treaty Powers.

The tasks of the working group will be:

(i) to make the administrative arrangements for the next Consultative Meeting;

(ii) remind member governments of their commitments under the Treaty;

(iii) co-ordinate and distribute papers amongst the member governments;

(iv) to deal with such other matters as may be entrusted to it by member governments or Consultative Meetings.

The Working Group will remain in the capital mentioned above for the duration of 2, 3 or such number of Consultative Meetings as may be decided upon, having regard to the increased efficiency provided by continuity of personnel dealing with Antarctic problems.

After this period the Working Group could by common consent be established in another capital always bearing in mind that all Treaty Powers should be diplomatically represented in such capital.

The Chairman of the Working Group will be the Representative of the country responsible for convening the next Consultative Meeting.

The Working Group will have facilities provided free of charge by the host government, consisting of an official together with such typing staff as may be necessary to carry out the administrative requirements of the Working Group.

The above measures are designed to eliminate the possibility of even the embryo of a permanent secretariat. It will provide an "address" for the Treaty Powers and thus establish an efficient communications channel for member governments inter se and with other organisations."

The South African viewpoint was put more or less in accordance with your directive. The Norwegian, Belgian and U.S.A. delegations supported the New Zealand recommendation, the former opting for Washington as the only suitable place for preparatory and interim meetings.

12/.....

The draft recommendation eventually arrived at, reads as follows:

"RECOMMENDATION II - X.

The Representatives recommend that their Governments accept the offer made by the Delegation of Belgium, to the effect that the Third Consultative Meeting under Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty be held in Brussels.

This Meeting will be held on a date to be decided upon by agreement among the participating Governments."

The Chilean delegation wished to place on record that they hoped that in the near future the Consultative Meeting will recommend to the Governments that the sessions referred to in Article IX of the Antarctic Treaty be held every two years, on the date considered most appropriate, without prejudice to advancing these dates or convening extraordinary sessions should circumstances render it advisable.

AGENDA ITEM 17: OTHER MATTERS.

Some intensive lobbying was done prior to the discussion of this item and the matter eventually cristallized into two main approaches to the question of administrative arrangements, i.e. New Zealand, who wished to obtain a firm recommendation, and South Africa who preferred to treat the item on the basis of an exploratory discussion. After sounding out most of the delegations, we informed the New Zealand leader that there was not the slightest hope of any recommendation being adopted, but he nevertheless decided to proceed, and introduced the following draft recommendation:

"The Representatives recommend to their Governments:

1. That in future intersession meetings be convened at least quarterly by the Government which is to act as host for the next Consultative Meeting;

2. that these meetings be held under the auspices of the diplomatic mission of that host Government in the capital of one of the Contracting Powers;

3. that the capital should be selected by agreement among the Treaty Powers and should be one in which all the Treaty Powers are represented;

4. that each host Government should be free in accordance with accepted practice to hold such other meetings as may be considered necessary to prepare for Consultative Meetings."

11/.....

their appreciation of the United Kingdom's attitude in withdrawing the item.

AGENDA ITEM 15: IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF FIRST CONSULTATIVE MEETING.

The substance of the recommendation found general approval and it remained only for a Committee on Style to iron out the various observations as regards the wording. The final recommendation reads as follows:

"RECOMMENDATION II - IX.

The Representatives recommend to their Governments:

(a) that they take the necessary steps to examine as soon as possible, in conformity with their legal and constitutional procedures, the recommendations adopted by any Consultative Meeting and that they take a decision on such recommendations as they find themselves able to approve as soon as possible after such recommendations have been officially communicated to them by the Government which was the host for the Consultative Meeting concerned;

(b) that if they find themselves unable to give early approval to one or more of the recommendations of a Consultative Meeting, they should signify their approval of the remaining recommendations, whether separately or as a group, as soon as they are able to do so."

AGENDA ITEM 16: PLACE AND DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING.

In accordance with the tacit agreement arrived at in Canberra that Consultative Meetings be held in the various countries in alphabetical order, the Belgian delegate stated that his Government would be glad to offer facilities for the next Consultative Meeting to be held in Brussels.

The offer was generally welcomed, but there were reservations as to when the next meeting should be held. The Norwegian, French, United Kingdom, found next June the most suitable date, the latter expressing the view that as there were urgent questions on hand the next meeting should be held in a year's time.

The Chilean delegate thought it advisable to increase the periods between Consultative Meetings, and suggested every two years.

10/.....

"RECOMMENDATION II - VII.

The Representatives recommend to their Governments that, in order better to implement Articles II and III of the Antarctic Treaty and Recommendations I-I and I-II of the First Consultative Meeting, they should make appropriate arrangements:

(a) to expedite the execution of administrative procedures required by their laws, regulations and binding international agreements that apply to shipments of samples, specimens, records and scientific instruments related to Antarctic scientific research;

(b) to provide proper care in the handling of this type of shipments."

AGENDA ITEM 13: SUPPORT FOR THE INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE QUIET SUN.

There was complete unanimity as regards this item, and after a few minor amendments to the original draft, the following recommendation was adopted:

"RECOMMENDATION II - VIII.

The Representatives recommend to their Governments that they should encourage, by whatever means they consider appropriate, international co-operation and the interchange of scientific personnel, observations and results, in connection with their respective national programmes of Antarctic scientific investigation and research associated with the International Year of the Quiet Sun (1964-65)."

AGENDA ITEM 14: MATTERS RELATING TO THE EXCERCISE OF JURISDICTION IN THE ANTARCTICA.

This item had already run into heavy weather during the discussion of the Agenda under item 4. The United Kingdom delegation had in the meantime had an opportunity to consult with London as the result of which they now withdrew the item from the Agenda. They, however, again stressed the importance of this subject which must sooner or later be faced. They withdrew the item in the interests of harmony, but added that this was in no way an admission of a principle that one delegation could prevent an item from being discussed and that the United Kingdom would reserve the right to raise this matter again at the next Consultative Meeting. The "dissident" delegations were profuse in

9/.....

"RECOMMENDATION II - V.

The Representatives recommend to their Governments that in view of Recommendation I-VII of the First Consultative Meeting designed to achieve one of the objectives of the Antarctic Treaty, namely the creation of conditions necessary for carrying out scientific investigation, and in view of the logistic symposium organized by SCAR which is soon to take place:

(a) a meeting or symposium of experts should be held, to review the present state of knowledge acquired on the organization of expeditions, logistic support and transport, in order to evaluate such knowledge;

(b) consultations be held during the preparations for the next Consultative Meeting to fix a suitable date, place, organization and agenda for such meeting or symposium."

ITEM 11: INTERCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON THE FULFILMENT OF PLANNED ANTARCTIC ACTIVITIES (SUBMITTED BY ARGENTINA).

In plenary no objections were raised regarding the substance of the draft recommendation submitted, but several drafting changes were suggested. The final recommendation, reading as follows, was adopted unanimously:

"RECOMMENDATION II - VI.

The Representatives recommend to their Governments that they report through diplomatic channels, as soon as possible, and in any case prior to June 30th of each year, on any extensions, reductions or other modifications in the development of the activities previously reported in accordance with Article VII paragraph 5 of the Antarctic Treaty, and Recommendation I-VI of the First Consultative Meeting."

AGENDA ITEM 12: ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES FOR THE INTRODUCTION AND REMOVAL OF SCIENTIFIC SAMPLES, SPECIMENS AND INSTRUMENTS.

This item found general approval and it remained only to find suitable wording for a recommendation which would be consistent with existing regulations in the various countries, and would not offend the susceptibilities of customs officials who were in many cases co-operating very satisfactorily.

A working group eventually produced the following draft recommendation which was adopted:

"It should be realized that only recently had the relevant recommendation of the First Consultative Meeting come into force. Each country has its own particular bureaucratic systems, but it was a vital part of the Treaty and the Governments could not be too punctilious in the timing or the form in which it was carried out". The Australian delegate appreciated the fact that there were various factors operating which militated against an expeditious interchange of information. It was entirely in a spirit of goodwill and co-operation that his delegation had submitted this resolution.

The South African delegation proposed the inclusion of "call signs and frequencies" in the list of information to be supplied under Article VII, paragraph 5, but this proposal was withdrawn when it was pointed out that this specific information should be available to all countries through the ordinary I.T.U. channels.

The final recommendation adopted reads:

"RECOMMENDATION II - IV.

In accordance with Article VII paragraph 5 of the Antarctic Treaty, the Representatives recommend to their Governments that they should endeavour to furnish prompt and full information regarding their Antarctic activities as listed in Recommendation I-VI of the First Consultative Meeting, and within the time limits indicated in that Recommendation."

ITEM 10: INTERCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON LOGISTIC ACTIVITIES (SUBMITTED BY ARGENTINA).

Although their was general agreement that the implementation of Recommendation I-VII of the First Consultative Meeting, as regards a symposium on Logistics, was the responsibility of the Treaty, it was also conceded that the work of the SCAR meeting on Logistics to be held in August 1962 could with advantage be studied before the Treaty Powers symposium on logistics was held. It was accordingly decided to hold the Treaty symposium not too soon after the SCAR symposium. This policy is reflected in paragraph (b) of the adopted recommendation:

7/.....

(e) in the course of the meetings held to prepare the Third Consultative Meeting they undertake the task of formulating, on the basis of the principles enunciated above, the draft text of measures on this subject to be submitted to that Consultative Meeting with a view to its approval and recommendation to Governments."

It was a disappointment to most delegations that so little had been achieved in respect of this important item, but the hope was expressed that agreement on effective measures for conserving wild life would be approved at the next Consultative Meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 8: ARRANGEMENTS FOR RADIO COMMUNICATIONS.

This item was sponsored jointly by South Africa and Australia. As a result of lobbying arrangements the South African delegation opened the discussion by enquiring whether it would be possible to hold a Symposium on Radio Communications in the United States co-incidentally with the SCAR Meeting scheduled for August, 1962, so that experts attending the SCAR Meeting would be available for the Symposium. The Australian delegation supported this proposal and the United States delegation offered facilities for holding of such a Symposium during the last four days of August, 1962, or alternatively during May, 1963.

Some delegations found August of this year too soon to make adequate arrangements, and the following draft recommendation was eventually adopted:

"RECOMMENDATION II - III.

The Representatives, taking into consideration Recommendation I-XI of the First Consultative Meeting concerning Antarctic radio communications, recommend to their Governments that the proposed meeting of specialists in Antarctic radio communications should take place between May 1 and August 31, 1963, on a date and at a place to be fixed."

ITEM 9: THE INTERCHANGE OF INFORMATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE VII, PARAGRAPH 5 (SUBMITTED BY AUSTRALIA).

This item presented no special difficulty. Most delegations admitted that they had tarried in sending the required information, but, as the United Kingdom delegation summed it up,

ITEM 7: MEASURES FOR THE PROTECTION AND CONSERVATION OF LIVING RESOURCES AND EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION ON THE SUBJECT.

In presenting his delegation's draft Convention, the United Kingdom representative stressed i.a. that this was not prejudicial to national sovereignty claims, and amplified S.C.A.R. and Canberra recommendations on this subject. Unfortunately it seemed that the United Kingdom draft reached other Governments too late (in some cases only three weeks before the Conference) to permit of a thorough study of the implications. The result was that a subject which elicited wholehearted agreement in principle from all delegations, had once again to be shelved.

The discussion centred mostly around the question of procedure; whether the instrument ought to be a Convention, a Code or a Set of Rules. The United Kingdom delegation made known that they were not wedded to any particular form as long as it were binding on Governments. Other delegations foresaw complications which would attend a Convention in that it would in some cases have to be ratified by the respective parliaments which would take time and make any subsequent changes which might become desirable, more difficult.

After lengthy discussion in a working group, the following draft recommendation was hammered out which was eventually unanimously accepted:

"RECOMMENDATION II - II.

Recalling and reaffirming Recommendation I-VIII of the First Consultative Meeting, and expressing their conviction that the general rules attached to that Recommendation should be scrupulously observed.

The Representatives recommend to their Governments that:

(a) they collect and exchange information on the measures which they have adopted for the protection of living resources in the Antarctic;

(b) they promote the further exchange and evaluation of information about the existing state of living resources in the Antarctic;

(c) they consult together with a view to the establishment, in an appropriate form and at an early date, of effective and internationally agreed measures on this subject;

(d) these consultations should take into account the rules attached to Recommendation I-VIII of the First Consultative Meeting, the recommendations made on this subject by SCAR, the proposal submitted by the Delegation of the United Kingdom in Document P.3 to the Second Consultative Meeting, and the views expressed by Delegations in the discussion of this item;

5/.....

now evident that the relationship of the Treaty Powers with S.C.A.R left nothing to be desired, mainly as a result of the way in which this matter was being handled at the national level.

The attempt at marrying the Russian and United States proposals, was entrusted to a working group which after lengthy discussion, eventually produced a draft recommendation which was a compromise of the U.S.A., U.S.S.R., New Zealand and Australian views. Further lengthy discussion was evoked in plenary meeting on the language to be used and a special committee consisting of delegates representing the four official languages, was appointed to prepare the following final draft which was approved in plenary meeting:

"RECOMMENDATION II - I.

The Representatives recommend to their Governments that, in accordance with Article III of the Antarctic Treaty and in the light of recommendations made by S.C.A.R., they take measures contributing to:

1. The completion by July 1st, 1963, or as soon thereafter as practicable, of the transmission by scientific organizations to the recognized international data gathering centres of scientific observations carried out in Antarctica from 1957 until 1959 inclusive, and 1960 if possible.

2. (a) The free availability and exchange, by all appropriate means, of scientific observations and results, in every scientific discipline, obtained by expeditions in any part of Antarctica;

   (b) the prompt transmission, preferably within a year of the receipt in each country of the data from Antarctica, of such observations and results to the recognized international data gathering centres, where such centres exist.

3. (a) The free availability of published results of Antarctic research carried out since the beginning of the International Geophysical Year;

   (b) the transmission to the recognized international data gathering centres, before July 1st, 1963, of such publications already issued;

   (c) the transmission to these centres of future publications within two months of their issue or as soon thereafter as practicable."

The South African delegation felt that this recommendation was in accordance with the spirit of its directive, namely to ensure that effect be given to Article III 1.(c) of the Treaty, and that strong support be given by the Treaty Powers to the implementation of S.C.A.R. recommendations without the Treaty Powers unduly encroaching on the work of S.C.A.R.

After lively discussion, the Chairman ruled that this item be left in abeyance and that the meeting should proceed with the consideration of item 5.

The following day discussion of item 4 was resumed, leading to the adoption of a Chilean proposal that the Agenda be divided into two parts, and that the first part consisting of items 1 to 13 be approved for discussion and that items 14 to 18 be decided on at a later stage. This move was designed to give the United Kingdom delegation time to consult with London. The British Ambassador who led the United Kingdom delegation told me in private conversation that they could of course have forced this item through on a vote, but that "some of the opposing delegations" intimated to him that if this happened, they would seriously consider withdrawing from participation in the rest of the proceedings.

ITEM 5: APPROVAL OF DEFINITE RULES OF PROCEDURE.

There appeared to be some difference of opinion as to whether the Rules adopted at the First Consultative Meeting were to be considered as valid for all future meetings. This question was, however, resolved by the formal adoption of the same Rules for the Second Consultative Meeting after Chile and Argentina had made some reservations on the Spanish text which they agreed to revise.

ITEM 6: MEANS TO ENSURE THE INTERCHANGE OF THE RESULTS AND DATA CONCERNING SCIENTIFIC OBSERVATIONS CARRIED OUT IN THE ANTARCTIC.

The original draft recommendation submitted by the U.S.S.R. was fairly well received by the Meeting, but it was pointed out by the delegation of New Zealand, supported by other delegations, that the fixing of dates beyond those recommended by S.C.A.R. (and C.I.G.) and the mentioning of specific data centres would in effect mean that the Treaty Powers would be interfering in the work of S.C.A.R. All delegations clearly preferred to avoid this accusation; in fact one after another hastened to express their admiration of, and satisfaction with the work of S.C.A.R. This attitude was expressed several times throughout the meeting and the South African Delegation was soon convinced that it was no longer necessary to stress this aspect. In the lobbies other delegations concurred with the view that, contrary to the impression left by the First Consultative Meeting, it was

3/.....

SECOND CONSULTATIVE MEETING OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY POWERS: BUENOS AIRES, 18th JULY to 28th JULY, 1962.

ITEMS 1 and 2: OPENING SESSION AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

The Second Consultative Meeting held in the Golden Hall of the Consejo Deliberante (City Hall) in Buenos Aires was opened in public by the Foreign Minister, Dr. Bonifacio del Carril.

In the election of officers which followed upon the Minister's welcoming speech, the Rules of Procedure established at the First Consultative Meeting were adhered to, so that Dr. Pablo Santos Muñoz, leader of the Argentine Delegation was elected Chairman.

ITEM 3:

Opening statements by leaders of Delegations then followed, and most delegates made use of this opportunity to mention their respective achievements in Antarctic exploration and research activities "through the centuries", at the same time giving some indication of their attitude to various items on the agenda. For instance it was immediately evident that several of the delegations, notably Chile, were opposed to the discussion of "Questions relating to the exercise of Jurisdiction" (see further under items 4 and 14).

After the first Plenary Session the Conference went into Committee presided over in order of rotation by leaders of delegations.

ITEM 4: ADOPTION OF AGENDA.

Very strong opposition to the inclusion of item 14 - Questions relating to the exercise of Jurisdiction - was immediately registered by Chile, France, Argentina and the U.S.S.R. on the grounds that:

(a) it would introduce a note of disharmony into the proceedings;
(b) it was not of topical interest;
(c) Article VIII of the Treaty makes sufficient provision;
(d) for several meetings to come it would still be premature to consider this matter.

2/.....

B.A. 22/7/1.

Rivadavia 1829, 2° Piso,

SUID-AFRIKAANSE AMBASSADE
LONDEN
29 AUG 1962
LONDON
SOUTH AFRICAN EMBASSY

9th August, 1962.

THE SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
PRETORIA.

SECOND CONSULTATIVE MEETING OF THE
ANTARCTIC TREATY POWERS: BUENOS AIRES.

The South African Delegation consisting of myself as leader, Dr. E.J. Marais and Mr. M.P. van Rooy as delegates and Mr. J.K. Klerck, First Secretary of this Embassy, as Secretary attended the abovementioned Meeting from 18th July to 28th July, 1962. I enclose herewith the report prepared from notes made by the delegation. Owing to lack of time, it was not possible for a joint preparation of the report in final form, and I have therefore sent copies to Dr. Marais and Mr. van Rooy for any further comments they may wish to make.

In company with the United Kingdom and New Zealand delegations we felt somewhat disappointed with the results of the Meeting. Many of the recommendations appear to be a rehash of former recommendations. However, the discussions were conducted with the greatest cordiality, albeit the tendency to exclude certain subjects the introduction of which could possibly mar the spirit of co-operation. This aspect is more fully dealt with in the report.

As far as South Africa's participation was concerned, I wish to say that our briefing was adequate, and the delegation worked together very harmoniously. I must emphasize, however, that if we are to play a role at these meetings, it is necessary to have the greatest possible measure of continuity of representation in order to build up what might be termed Antarctic experts. The effective contribution made by other delegations with such experts, underlined this point.

The South African Delegation followed the customary practice of offering hospitality in the form of a luncheon for other delegates and their wives totalling 73 people at the Embassy residence. I understand that an amount of R100 has been made available towards the costs of such a function and I should be glad to receive confirmation that I may be reimbursed up to this amount.

1. Minister NV. 30/8
2. Mr Mafan
G.I.G.
30/8

J.C.H. Maree

AMBASSADOR.

JCHM/YS.

F

R.S. 16/2

B.A. 22/7/1.

LONDON.

Con los saludos de la Embajada de la República de Sud Africa.

With the compliments of the Embassy of the Republic of South Africa.

Met die komplimente van die Ambassade van die Republiek van Suid-Afrika.

Buenos Aires.
13th August, 1962.

B.A. 22/7/1.

SUID-AFRIKAANSE AMBASSADE
LONDEN
29 AUG 1962
LONDON
SOUTH AFRICAN EMBASSY

st, 1962.

G OF THE
JENOS AIRES.

on consisting of myself as
an Rooy as delegates and
is Embassy, as Secretary
om 18th July to 28th July,
prepared from notes made
time, it was not possible
in final form, and I have
Mr. van Rooy for any

Kingdom and New Zealand
ed with the results of
ons appear to be a rehash
he discussions were con-
beit the tendency to exclude
ich could possibly mar the
more fully dealt with in

rticipation was concerned,
uate, and the delegation
very harmoniously. I must emphasize, however, that if we are to play a role at these meetings, it is necessary to have the greatest possible measure of continuity of representation in order to build up what might be termed Antarctic experts. The effective contribution made by other delegations with such experts, underlined this point.

The South African Delegation followed the customary practice of offering hospitality in the form of a luncheon for other delegates and their wives totalling 73 people at the Embassy residence. I understand that an amount of R100 has been made available towards the costs of such a function and I should be glad to receive confirmation that I may be reimbursed up to this amount.

1. Minister NY. 30/8
2. Mr Mafan
G/6.
30/8

J. C. H. Maree

AMBASSADOR.

JCHM/YS.

F

P.S. 16/2

AIRMAIL. 22nd August, 1962.

CONFIDENTIAL.

THE ACTING SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

2nd Consultative Meeting of Antarctic Treaty Powers, Buenos Aires, July, 1962.

For what it is worth I would mention that in a recent very informal conversation over lunch with a somewhat outspoken Foreign Office contact concerned with Antarctica the remark was, inter alia, made that at Foreign Office desk level it is thought that the Second Consultative Meeting of Antarctic Treaty Powers was, from a political point of view, very largely a waste of time with little of any real value being decided upon, principally because of the tendency which was displayed to avoid discussion of anything remotely controversial.

The official concerned, added that the United Kingdom is now a little disturbed at the apparent lessening of interest in and apathy towards Antarctica amongst some treaty governments and, while being anxious to ensure that the Antarctic Treaty does not suffer a slow death, is doubtful as to how best to proceed to cure this malaise. He spoke of the somewhat unhappy choice which confronts Great Britain in this regard, a choice in essence between on the hand restricting governmental intervention into Antarctic affairs to the barest minimum - a leave it to the scientists to get on with the job attitude - or on the other hand continuing to participate actively in Antarctic matters including regular attempts to solve the outstanding controversial questions such as jurisdiction and administrative arrangements. Either of these courses of action may possibly bring about the Treaty's end he added - the first may cause its demise by accelerating the tendency towards apathy and inaction amongst some Treaty powers and the second may well be fortiter in re but not suaviter in modo.

I would also mention in passing, that my informant was somewhat puzzled and disappointed that South Africa was one of the last countries to ratify the recommendations of the First Consultative Meeting. I explained that that was not due to any lack of interest or apathy on our part but, as far as I was aware, stemmed from certain minor but nevertheless time-consuming administrative difficulties which were involved in consulting and co-ordinating the views of the various Government departments and outside institutions concerned with Antarctica coupled with some uncertainty which was initially experienced at desk level as to the exact requirements of our constitutional processes relating to the ratification of "recommendations."

2/...

If these suggestions were carried out every publication of interest would be deposited in some stated library in each country concerned. There would be an adequate system to ensure that the location of each publication would be known to the national Antarctic organisation.

Yours sincerely

D G Harper

(D.G.Harper)

W. Malan, Esq.,
Second Secretary,
South Africa House,
Trafalgar Square,
W.C.2.

CONFIDENTIAL.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS:
"DEPUTY, LONDON"
TELEPHONE:
TEMPLE BAR
3241

IN YOUR REPLY PLEASE REFER TO
111/1/2

NEW ZEALAND HOUSE,
415, STRAND,
LONDON, W.C.2.

5 September 1962

Dear Mr Malan,

On 26 April last Mr Drake left with us an aide memoire concerning the proposals of the Government of the Republic of South Africa for a regular exchange of Antarctic publications between South Africa and the other Antarctic Treaty Powers.

We have now been informed that these proposals have the full support of the New Zealand authorities in so far as Expedition Reports and other publications of a general nature are concerned. It is felt, however, that the forwarding of all scientific and other papers of Antarctic interest to a central organisation in each Antarctic Treaty Power would raise so many difficulties as to be, in effect, unworkable. In a small country such as New Zealand, this could be achieved without difficulty; but in the United States, for example, where Antarctic research is conducted by a multiplicity of organisations, including Universities, the plan suggested might well be impracticable. It is considered that much the same result might be achieved by the regular compilation by each Antarctic Treaty Power of an Antarctic bibliography. Such a bibliography would give full particulars of every book, paper or article of Antarctic interest based on work carried out under the aegis of the national Antarctic organisation. The forwarding of copies of the bibliography to the other Treaty Powers would ensure that (1) the organisations concerned with the scientific discipline involved were made aware of all such publications of interest to them and (2) the national Antarctic organisation would be in a position to refer enquiries to the Library holding the particular publication required.

The New Zealand authorities emphasize that they fully agree with Section (iii) of the South African proposals regarding the continuation of such exchanges as are already in operation. It is suggested, in addition, that all national Antarctic organisations might forward to the corresponding organisations in the other Antarctic Treaty countries not only Expedition Reports and similar publications, but also any other books or papers not specifically concerned with one of the major scientific disciplines. Under the scheme referred to above this material would not be automatically forwarded. It would include publications dealing with logistic matters, health and nutrition, the selection of personnel and also publications dealing with several topics under the one cover; in fact, all Antarctic publications other than those the subject matter of which is the concern or a recognised organisation definitely interested in and conversant with Antarctic research in that particular discipline.

P.S.16/2

South African Embassy
//////////////////////

Airmail.

CONFIDENTIAL. (Triplicate)

7th September, 1962.

THE SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Exchange of Publications on Antarctica.

With further reference to your minute 102/2/7/1; 102/2/7/3 of the 20th March, 1962, I enclose herewith three copies of a self-explanatory confidential letter dated 5th September, 1962, from the Office of the High Commissioner for New Zealand outlining the views of the New Zealand authorities on the proposed exchange of Antarctic publications.

We should be grateful to learn in due course whether you wish to comment on the two suggestions made by the New Zealand authorities in regard to (a) the regular compilation and exchange between the Treaty powers of Antarctic bibliographies and (b) the amplification of existing exchanges between national Antarctic organisations by also including books or papers dealing with logistics, health and nutrition, personnel and other matters not specifically concerned with one of the major scientific disciplines.

Sgd. W. Malan
Ambassador.

WM/MJE

publications, but also any other books or papers not specifically concerned with one of the major scientific disciplines. Under the scheme referred to above this material would not be automatically forwarded. It would include publications dealing with logistic matters, health and nutrition, the selection of personnel and also publications dealing with several topics under the one cover; in fact, all Antarctic publications other than those the subject matter of which is the concern or a recognised organisation definitely interested in and conversant with Antarctic research in that particular discipline.

P.S.16/2

7th September, 1962.

Dear Harper,

Thank you so much for your most useful letter No. 111/1/2 of the 5th September, 1962, in which you were kind enough to set out the views of the New Zealand authorities on our proposals in regard to the exchange of Antarctic publications. I have passed on the contents of your letter to South Africa and will advise you in due course of the reaction to your suggested amendments of the proposed exchange scheme.

I was interested to learn from our recent telephone conversation that you have also served in Washington before and that you know Stuart Franklin well. Stuart mentioned that he had seen you here when he passed through London recently on transfer to Pretoria and I am hoping that I shall also have the pleasure of seeing you soon - what about lunching with me in a fortnight or so after your present rush with the P.M.'s Conference is over?

Yours sincerely,

Boet Malan

D. G. Harper, Esq.,
Office of the High Commissioner for
New Zealand,
New Zealand House,
415, Strand,
London, W.C.2.

WM/MJE

COPY/WML.

S.C.5/6.

Moneda 1160,

26th June, 1962.

CONFIDENTIAL

The Secretary for Foreign Affairs,
PRETORIA.

Antarctic Treaty: Participation in Consultative Meetings.

The receipt of a copy of your Note 102/2/7/3 of 4th June, 1962, addressed to the Embassy of Australia is acknowledged, with thanks.

The views expressed in this note were informally conveyed to the Head of the Antarctic Division in the Chilean Foreign Ministry, for which he expressed his appreciation.

He said that the Chileans share our point of view on the question of participation in the Consultative Meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Powers.

Copy to Buenos Aires.

(Sgd.) G.C. NEL
CHARGÉ D'AFFAIRES

CONFIDENTIAL

New Zealand,
New Zealand House,
415, Strand,
London, W.C.2.

WM/MJE

COPY/IF.

SOUTH AFRICAN LEGATION,

No.S.C.5/6. SANTIAGO DE CHILE.

CONFIDENTIAL. 11th April,1962.

The Secretary for Foreign Affairs,
PRETORIA.

Antartic Treaty : Participation of Czecho-Slovakia in Consultative Meetings.

The Head of Antarctic Affairs in the Foreign Ministry, has informed me that Czecho-Slovakia will seek permission to participate in the Consultative Meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Powers. As is known, a Consultative Meeting of the Antarctic Treaty Powers is to be held in Buenos Aires during July,1962.

The attitude of the Chilean Government will be to oppose such participation. It is contended that while in terms of the Antarctic Treaty, membership is open to other countries, participation in Consultative Meetings is limited to those countries, which, either have bases, or, active expeditions in Antarctica. Czecho-Slovakia has neither, only scientists stationed in the Russian Zone. It is believed that Russia will propose participation by Czecho-Slovakia in the Consultative Meetings of the Treaty Powers.

An indication of the Republic's attitude towards such a proposal would be appreciated, by the Chilean authorities.

Copy to Buenos Aires.

(Sgd) G.C.Nel.

Chargé d' Affaires.

COPY.

CONFIDENTIAL.

South Africa House,
Trafalgar Square,
LONDON, W.C.2.
25th June, 1962.

Ref. P.S. 16/2.

THE SECRETARY FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS.

Attendance of Observers at Consultative Meetings of the Antarctic Treaty Powers.

Please refer to your minute 102/2/7/3 of 4th June to the South African Embassy, Washington.

We have informally conveyed to the Foreign Office your views on the above subject, as set out in the Department's Note of 4th June to the Australian Embassy.

The Foreign Office are fully in agreement with the views expressed in paragraph (i) of that Note.

As regards the contents of the first part of paragraph (ii), the Foreign Office reaction was that "they were not too far apart," from us on this score. However, they say their approach is perhaps a little more "positive" than ours, and they still appear to adhere to the concept of "the general will" prevailing in regard to the attendance of Polish observers, as reported in our minute of 15th March.

As regards the position of Czechoslovakia, the Foreign Office view coincides with that of the Department.

Copies to Washington, Canberra and Buenos Aires.

(Sgd.) A.P. DRAKE.
for MINISTER.

CS.

of observer status to Poland (as distinct from Czechoslovakia who has not acceded to the Treaty) the Western Powers, it is felt, should weigh carefully the disadvantages of granting observer status (in the internationally accepted sense of the term) to countries which have acceded to the treaty against the repercussions which may ensue if the Soviet Union is alienated by the Western reaction and decides as a matter of policy to withhold her co-operation. This is a determination which can only be made in the light of developments at the Consultative Meeting.

In regard to Czechoslovakia, the South African authorities feel that no case can be made for the grant of observer status. In other words, observer status can only be contemplated in circumstances where the country in question has already acceded to the Treaty.

So far as observers from international organisations are concerned, the South African authorities feel that each case should be considered on its merits. The strict criterion would be the extent and relevancy of the organisation's interests in the proceedings of the Consultative Meeting, which would have to be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the participants in the Consultative Meeting.

D.B.SOLE

PRETORIA,
4th June,1962.

CONFIDENTIAL.

CONFIDENTIAL.

The Department of Foreign Affairs presents its compliments to the Australian Embassy and has the honour to refer to the Embassy's Aide Memoir of the 3rd March, reference 296/1, in connection with various issues relating to the Antarctic Treaty and the forthcoming Consultative Meeting of the Antarctic Treaty Powers.

The views of the South African authorities with regard to the proposed Antarctic Telecommunications Meeting were conveyed to the Embassy in the Department's Note of the 12th April, reference 102/2/7/3.

In regard to the remaining issues, the views of the South African authorities are:

(i) They agree absolutely that attendance as full participants in Consultative Meetings should be restricted to those countries which have acceded to the Treaty and are able "to demonstrate their interest in Antarctica by conducting substantial scientific research activity there, such as the establishment of a scientific station or the despatch of a scientific expedition." They agree further with the Australian view that a country's Antarctic activities, in order to comply with this prerequisite should be on a national scale and not merely part of the activities of another country, for example, by way of participation in that country's expeditions.

/...

to work out a solution in the Lobbies rather than in Plenary. We have already conveyed our views on this matter to the Australians, British, Americans, Argentinians and Chileans. There would accordingly be no objection to the delegation repeating these views informally to friendly delegations. Our main objective should be the preservation of the spirit of co-operation. If the matter should be forced to a vote, rather than align itself with extreme views, the delegation should abstain. All effort should, however, be made to avoid a vote on this issue.

may qualify to attend as observers. In our view category (b) countries are not eligible to attend even as observers. Category (a) countries, on the other hand, have, in our view a prima facie case for observer status. However, we do not wish to encourage the attendance of observers at Consultative Meetings since it is important to preserve the existing co-operative spirit amongst the Treaty Powers and this can best be achieved by keeping this area free from the political discords which disturb scientific co-operation in other Continents. We also know that some countries, such as the U.S.A., are firmly opposed to the grant of observer status to countries which have acceded but do not qualify in other respects for full participation. While we have no objection in principle, therefore, to observers we would prefer it if the Consultative Meeting ruled against observer status.

However, if a ruling of this nature should be strongly opposed by the Soviet Union and if there is any danger of the Soviet Union withholding its co-operation as a result of such a ruling, it would not in our view be in the best interests of the Treaty Powers to persist in excluding Poland as observers.

The attached documentation explains our views in more detail. The views of some other countries are also given.

Directive:

If the question of observer status is raised, the delegation should be guided by developments and the trend of the discussion. It would be preferable to attempt

/...

SECOND CONSULTATIVE MEETING OF
ANTARCTIC TREATY POWERS.

General.

Attendance of Observers at Consultative Meetings.

Background:

Countries eligible to attend Consultative Meetings as full participants are the original signatories of the Treaty (Article IX, para. 1). In addition, countries which have acceded to the Treaty may participate during such time as that Contracting Party demonstrates its interest in Antarctica by conducting substantial scientific research activity there, such as the establishment of a scientific station or the despatch of a scientific expedition" (Article IX, para. 2).

It has been rumoured that the Soviet Union will ask the Second Consultative Meeting to allow Poland and Czechoslovakia to attend as observers. Poland has acceded to the Treaty; Czechoslovakia has not. Poland has not, however, conducted any "substantial scientific research activity" in the Antarctic and does not therefore qualify for a full participation. Czechoslovakia is ineligible in any event since she has not acceded. The question not yet answered (since it has not yet become an issue) is whether countries which have

(a) acceded to the Treaty

(b) not acceded to the Treaty

/...

line which the United States will take in the event that the question of a Secretariat does come up for discussion at Buenos Aires. I might add that Mr. Owen does not attach much weight to the argument that such a centre for exchange of viewpoints should not be established in a country which is one of the protagonist in the cold war for he argues that the Russians do not presently appear to find the selection of Washington as objectionable. Although Mr. Owen maintains that the United States' purpose in taking this line is merely to ensure adequate means of consultation between the treaty parties in the absence of a Secretariat it is probably correct to say that once Washington is selected as a channel for such consultation, it will be difficult to oppose Washington as the site for a Secretariat when and if the need for such an organ becomes desirable in the future. Mr. Owen, of course, denies that their purpose in proposing Washington as the centre for consultation is in fact done to achieve that very purpose.

SECOND CONSULTATIVE MEETING OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY POWERS : EXTRACT FROM A MINUTE No.143/1 OF THE 19TH JUNE,1962, FROM THE SOUTH AFRICAN EMBASSY, WASHINGTON.

(6) Secretariat:

Although the question of the establishment of a Secretariat is not on the agenda for the Buenos Aires meeting, Mr. Owen envisages that there may be some discussion on this matter. The United States' position is that they are still opposed to the establishment of a Secretariat for they feel that there is not sufficient work for it to do. Mr. Owen points out that in any event it is unlikely, in view of the views held by various countries, that there will be any agreement on the establishment of a Secretariat.

Although the United States does not feel the need for a Secretariat, it does, however, consider that some way should be found to provide for discussions and exchanges of views in the interval between consultative meetings. They feel that a site should be selected at which such consultations can take place and they feel that Washington is eminently suited for this purpose. All treaty parties are represented here and have relatively large missions who would in consequence more easily be able to provide personnel for such discussions than in a country in which missions are rather small. Mr. Owen also maintains that Washington would be most suitable as it is also the point of contact bilaterally between many Antarctic powers. These arguments are, it seems, similar to those which were put forward by the United States during the First Consultative Meeting in Canberra and so you will have heard them before. I nevertheless record them here so that you may be aware of the

/...

Second Consultative Meeting : Agenda Item 17 :

Arrangements with S.C.A.R. (Extract from a report No. B.A.22/7/1 of the 19th June, 1962, from the South African Ambassador, Buenos Aires).

I finally raised the subject matter of your telegram No. P.15 of 11th June, with regard to the discussion of (a) Relations with S.C.A.R. and (b) Administrative arrangements under ite 17 "Other Matters". This was followed by the New Zealand representative with a similar request for discussion under this item of a New Zealand proposal "that in future intersession meetings be held at least quarterly at the Mission in Washington whose Government has offered to act as host for the next Consultative Meeting". New Zealand has no particular preference for Washington, nor the intention to pre-empt other centres. It seemed, however to be suitable in the sense that all participating Governmen maintained fairly large Embassies there with sufficient staff to cope with the arrangements for such meetings, and was aimed also at avoiding complicated arrangements for meetings preceeding Consultative Meetings in for instance Moscow or Tokyo.

The Australian delegate supported the request for discussion of this point and added that his Government was still willing to provide a small Treaty Office in the Department of External Affairs, Canberra.

The only reaction to these requests for discussion on administrative matters came from the Soviet Delegate who stated that his Government was opposed to a permanent secretariat in any shape or form.