In the discussion on the adoption of the agenda, the representatives of Brazil and Colombia, with the support of the President, in his capacity as representative of the United States, after referring to the inter-American system in which they participated, contended that since the Organization of American States had already taken the question under consideration, and since the Inter-American Peace Committee of that regional organization was proposing to send a fact-finding committee to the scene of the conflict, the Security Council should not adopt the provisional agenda and should rather wait until it received the report of the fact-finding committee. The representative of the USSR, in opposing these views, referred to the Guatemalan assertion that the decision of the Council calling for a halt to aggression had not been complied with, and stated that the Council was in duty bound to adopt further measures to ensure the fulfillment of that decision. He also stated that since the representative of Guatemala had objected to having the Organization of American States deal with the question, the Council could not, under the provisions of the Charter, impose a procedure for settlement to which one of the parties involved objected.

At the same meeting, the provisional agenda was rejected by a vote of 4 in favour and 5 against, with 2 abstentions.

The question remained on the list of matters of which the Security Council is seized.

**QUESTION OF ALLEGED INCIDENT OF ATTACK ON A UNITED STATES NAVY AIRCRAFT**

**INITIAL PROCEEDINGS**

By letter dated 8 September 1954, the representative of the United States informed the Security Council that on 4 September a United States Navy aircraft, on a peaceful mission over high seas, had been attacked without warning by two MIG-type aircraft with Soviet markings. The plane had been destroyed and not all survivors had been recovered. The United States Government had protested to the Government of the USSR and reserved all rights to claim damages.
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of New Zealand requested, in the light of his Government’s concern for the maintenance of international peace and security, that an early meeting of the Security Council be called to consider the question of the occurrence of armed hostilities between the People’s Republic of China and the Republic of China in the area of certain islands off the coast of the mainland of China. As a result of these hostilities, a situation existed, the continuance of which was likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

By letter dated 30 January 1955, addressed to the President of the Security Council, the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics requested that the Security Council be convened at once to consider the question of acts of aggression by the United States against the People’s Republic of China in the area of Taiwan and other islands of China. It was stated in the letter that the intervention of the United States in the internal affairs of China and the extension of acts of aggression against the People’s Republic of China were aggravating tension in the Far East and increasing the threat of a new war. In such circumstances, it was the duty of the Security Council to put an end to the acts of aggression by the United States against the People’s Republic of China and to its intervention in the internal affairs of China.

A draft resolution transmitted with the letter proposed that the Council, considering that the unprovoked armed attacks on Chinese towns and coastal areas carried out by armed forces controlled by the United States, constituted aggression against the People’s Republic of China in violation of the obligations assumed by the United States under international agreements concerning Taiwan and other Chinese islands, and noting that they constituted intervention in the internal affairs of China, a source of tension in the Far East, and a threat to peace and security in the area, (1) condemn those acts of aggression; (2) recommend that the Government of the United States take immediate steps to put an end to them and to its intervention in the internal affairs of China; (3) recommend that the Government of the United States immediately withdraw all its naval, air and land forces from the island of Taiwan and other territories belonging to China; (4) urge that no military action be permitted in the Taiwan area by either side, so that evacuation from the islands in that area of all armed forces not controlled by the People’s Republic of China might be facilitated.

The Security Council after discussing the adoption of the provisional agenda at its 698th and 699th meetings on 31 January 1955, included in its agenda the item proposed by the representative of New Zealand as well as the item proposed by the representative of the USSR; it also decided to conclude its consideration of the New Zealand item before taking up the USSR item.

The Security Council considered the New Zealand item at its 690th and 691st meetings on 31 January and 14 February 1955.

Decisions of 31 January 1955 (690th meeting): To invite a representative of the People’s Republic of China to attend the Council discussion, and to defer further consideration of the question

At the 690th meeting on 31 January 1955, the President, in his capacity as the representative of New Zealand, proposed that the Council invite a representative of the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China to participate in the discussion of the New Zealand item and to ask the Secretary-General to convey this invitation to that Government. The proposal was approved by 9 votes in favour and 1 against, with 1 abstention.

A motion for adjournment of the discussion until a later date was then submitted by the representative of Belgium. It was adopted by 10 votes in favour and 1 against.

On 4 February 1955, the Secretary-General circulated to the members of the Security Council an exchange of cablegrams between himself and the Prime Minister of the State Council and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China. In a cablegram dated 3 February 1955, the latter informed the Secretary-General that the People’s Republic would not be able to send a representative to take part in the discussion of the New Zealand item, and would have to consider all decisions taken by the Council concerning China as illegal and null and void. It could agree to participate in the Council’s deliberations only for the purpose of discussing the draft resolution submitted by the USSR, and only when its representative attended in the name of China and the other occupant of China’s seat had been expelled.

Decision of 14 February 1955 (691st meeting): Rejection of the USSR motion to proceed to the consideration of the item proposed by the USSR delegation

At the 691st meeting on 14 February 1955, the representative of the United Kingdom, commenting on the cablegram of the Prime Minister of the State Council and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China, suggested that

“... the Council should not today seek to push matters further forward. It was right that we should meet to consider the reply from Peking to our invitation. But, having done this, the wisest course for us to take now, in the view of my Government, is to adjourn without taking any further decision. The problem itself will, of course, remain under the constant and anxious consideration of the members of this Council.”

148 690th meeting: para. 116. For consideration of the proposal to invite a representative of the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China, see chapter 11, Case 21. In connexion with specific duties conferred upon the Secretary-General, see chapter I, part IV, Note, p. 11.
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The representative of the United States declared:

"... We shall continue our consultations with the members of the Council in an effort to bring about a cessation of hostilities. Until those are completed, therefore, we can adjourn the meeting, subject to the call of the President."  

The representative of the USSR proposed, on the premise contested by other members of the Council that consideration of the New Zealand item had been completed, that the Security Council:

"... shall decide to pass to the consideration of the following agenda item entitled 'The question of acts of aggression by the United States of America against the People's Republic of China in the area of Taiwan (Formosa) and other islands of China'."

The USSR proposal was rejected by 1 vote in favour and 10 against.

---
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