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 fulfilment 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 3 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. Believing that the incident was of a type which might endanger international peace and security, the United States requested an early meeting of the Council to consider the matter.

After inclusion of the question on the agenda at the 679th meeting on 10 September 1954, the representative of the United States, after recounting the circumstances of this and earlier attacks by Soviet aircraft on United States planes, stated that, while, in the absence of a negotiated settlement, his government believed cases of this kind could be best resolved by the judicial process of the International Court of Justice, the refusal of the Soviet Government to respond to that reasonable proposal had made it essential to lay the problem before the Security Council in order by discussion there to prevent a repetition of such incidents.

The representative of the USSR contested the account of these incidents given by the representative of the United States, and asserted that in each case there had been violation by United States aircraft of rules and standards of international law, such as violations of Soviet air space. He attributed the incidents to the policy pursued by the United States military authorities and the State Department, a policy which had nothing in common with the peaceful assurances made by the representative of the United States.

At the 680th meeting on 10 September 1954, the President, speaking as the representative of Colombia, stated that he would have favoured, as one of the means of solution, an investigation of the incident in accordance with Article 34 of the Charter.

At the close of the 680th meeting, the President stated that the list of speakers was exhausted and that the Council would be reconvened if and when any delegation so requested.

QUESTION OF HOSTILITIES IN THE AREA OF CERTAIN ISLANDS OFF THE COAST OF CHINA

INITIAL PROCEEDINGS

By letter dated 28 January 1955, addressed to the President of the Security Council, the 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 fulfilment 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 3 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. Believing that the incident was of a type which might endanger international peace and security, the United States requested an early meeting of the Council to consider the matter.

After inclusion of the question on the agenda at the 679th meeting on 10 September 1954, the representative of the United States, after recounting the circumstances of this and earlier attacks by Soviet aircraft on United States planes, stated that, while, in the absence of a negotiated settlement, his government believed cases of this kind could be best resolved by the judicial process of the International Court of Justice, the refusal of the Soviet Government to respond to that reasonable proposal had made it essential to lay the problem before the Security Council in order by discussion there to prevent a repetition of such incidents.
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